LANGUAGE IN THE CONTEXT OF TOTAL BODY COMMUNICATION

POYATOS, FERNANDO

Linguistics - An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences , Volume 14 (168)
de Gruyter – Jan 1, 1976

- Publisher Walter de Gruyter
- Copyright Copyright © 2009 Walter de Gruyter
- ISSN 0024-3949
- D.O.I. 10.1515/ling.1976.14.168.49

1. THE PROGRESSIVE LOCALIZATION OF LANGUAGE WITHIN CULTURE, AND THE FALLACY OF THE PURELY "LINGUISTIC" APPROACH

1.1. The study of language - even if we think only of the communicative activities developed in the vocal-auditory channel - should not be limited any more to the traditional "linguistic" approach that concentrates on an arbitrarily pre-established set of segmental and suprasegmental elements, but ignores whatever seems to lie beyond the accepted phonological system, our system!; or, in a very western attitude, shunts it as "non-speech",

1 even though it is part of the phonological systems of lesser-known languages. Furthermore, the term "language" itself becomes, in the study of communication phenomena, a concept open to various interpretations and definitions -- and not restricted to vocally articulated signals emitted by humans -, usually dictated by the particular field of research where they originated.

2 What has become apparent is that we cannot carry out an in-depth analysis of language, vocal or nonvocal, from within a single discipline without unrealistically dissociating it, first of all, from a given cultural context, and secondly, from the mechanism of personal interaction.

In culture we find a series of conditioning factors (geographical, ethnic, socioeconomic, psychological) and other extralinguistic elements that complement the semantic contents of verbal language (nonverbal vocal acts, gestures, spatial and temporal behaviors). And in the social interactive mechanism typical of a culture, we find a set of rules and patterns that definitely affect verbal language, both morphologically and syntactically, and gives it the characteristics of a true living communicative system. Language, then, cannot be approached "linguistically" only. Today we want to analyze and understand not just its internal morphologico-syntactical and phonological structure as a conveyor of meaning (and even this engages the participation of acoustic and physiological phonetics), but its intimate and multilayer relationship with the biological characteristics of the individual

(biology and biogenetics), his state of health (medicine), his ways of life (anthropology), his personality configuration (psychology), his normal or pathological state (psychiatry), his behavior in society (social psychology), Linguistics 168, pp. 49-62, ©Mouton Publishers 1976 etc.

Even if we try to concentrate on the written language of the literary work, we must acknowledge certain cultural factors that will imply some of the perspectives just mentioned, for it is culture that constitutes the total context in which language exists and the catalyzing element of all the activities concomitant with the strictly linguistic core of language, which can be said not to exist by itself.

1.2. In other words, we must seek the total context of language, and since language is the fundamental system of communication, we should first try to locate language, that is verbal language, within the communicative activities of a culture. The progressive localization - depicted in the diagram below of its purely verbal form among all the other means of communication used in a culture through time and space, reveals not only the elasticity of the term language as a vocal-auditory system of symbolic signs, but the full reality of what is, or can be, treated as language.

FORMS OF COMMUNICATION WITHIN A CULTURE Direct personal interaction Interactive Face-to-face Verbal-Vocal Nonverbal-Vocal Total body communication Reduced (impaired Nonverbal-Nonvocal people, obstacle) Delayed Ã personal

1 Epistolary communication interaction < Delayed Indirect Non-interactive Communication Personal or impersonal Audiovisually recorded Acoustically recorded Graphically f recorded l^ Vocal-Verbal Vocal-Nonverbal Nonvocal-Nonverbal ^ Þ Uteratu M Objectual communication Man-shaped environmental communication This broad view of the ways in which communication takes place within a culture3 clearly indicates that it can be: a) a two-way transaction which developes in direct (on-the-spot) personal interaction, either as a face-to-face encounter, or as reduced interaction (when deafmute, deaf, or blind people are involved, when full interaction is impeded by distance, or in what I have termed the invisible dyad, as in telephone conversation, or when there is a wall in between); or in delayed per-

2. THE ACTUAL OCCURRENCE OF THE BASIC TRIPLE STRUCTURE AND THE BORDERLINE BETWEEN VERBAL AND NONVERBAL

2.1. If, in the total communicative picture of a culture, we isolate what is traditionally known as spoken language, we realize that the treatment it deserves is not the one usually given to it as an autonomous system. Far from it, a critical analysis of the most abundant type of signs in a conversation reveals that what gives shape to

"language" -- around but not always simultaneously with it - is a series of structured elements subtly interrelated which cannot be ignored. Those elements support, emphasize or contradict the essential message conveyed by words and sentences (with their stress and intonation contours), and - as I will indicate later -- condition the words themselves, being, in turn, regulated by them in the conveyance of meaning. Without considering them part of language, one has hitherto tried to isolate a sentence as representing a complete unit of meaning, distinguishing patterns of stress, pitch and pausal phenomena, but nothing else. And yet, that combination of phonemes and morphemes acoustically perceived appears quite lifeless if we only attach to it stress, pitch and juncture, for any stretch of speech under normal circumstances carries some extralinguistic elements which constitute what most of us agree more and more in calling paralanguage; and, if visually perceived, that sentence is accompanied by certain kinesic elements, hardly noticeable perhaps, but closely related to both the linguistic and paralinguistic co-structures.

2.2. This is what I presented at the 1971 meeting of the Northeast Modern Language Association as the Basic Triple Structure of Human Communication Behavior. A very cursory comparison of language, paralanguage and kinesics suggests why none of them can be isolated in the actual occurrence of language, either from the structural point of view as shown in interaction, or from the semantic one, which even in the literary work is reconstructed by the reader according to his sensitiveness and to the elements provided by the writer.4

2.2.1. Language, as a string of spoken words and sentences, shows, morphologically, a) a segmental level formed by vowels and consonants made up of phonemes, or smallest distinctive units (with their alophones or variations), combined to form morphemes (words, suffixes), or smallest semantic units, which are themselves combined to form syntagms and syntactic constructions; to that almost lifeless body we must attach,

b) a suprasegmental layer formed by what is commonly referred to as intonation, consisting of four degrees of relative loudness or stress, four different pitches, and three terminal junctures (rising, falling, level); these intonation patterns have no referential meaning in themselves, unless they qualify the lexical construct, although a paralinguistic inarticulated closed-lip expiration of air can convey different meanings simply by varying its most important component, intonation.

2.2.2. Paralanguage, simultaneous or alternating with those essential segmental and suprasegmental elements, shows a series of nonsegmental vocal effects and sounds that cover a very wide range of acoustic phenomena determined, first of all, by the

anatomy and physiology of the individual's vocal tract, and secondly, by the idiosyncratic use he makes of those possibilities. The problem with paralanguage is that it does not seem to offer a unit analogous to the phoneme, susceptible of being built up into larger structures. All we can do is abstract a specific quality of the voice, say, syllabic duration (within primary qualities), 5 and establish a scalar series of degrees below and above a medium line, that is: overclipped--clipped--medium--drawled--overdrawled; or velar control (within qualifiers), which makes voice very nasal--nasal-- medium-oral-very oral. Other features, which override actual "speech" (differentiators), admit, a) a scalar classification of, for instance, giggling which, at any rate, would also depend upon other features, such as the velar control just mentioned, or pitch, thus showing also five degrees in each case), or b) a sort of class ranging, in the case of laughter, from closed-lip muffled snickering to uprorious guffawing. But there is a group of paralinguistic phenomena, alternants (Poyatos, 1975b) independent from what we consider "words", and whose status must be investigated, as they convey as much meaning as lexical constructs) and appear either as actual phonemes (if not from the point of view of English), or as inarticulated sounds that are diffi- cult to measure according to a base line and whose variations may or may not produce a semantic change.

2.2.3. Kinesicsf however, has revealed, when applied to its analysis the methodology of linguistic structuralism, a smallest discrete element, the kineme (analogous to the phoneme), made up of various alokines. Kinemes combine into morphological constructs called kinemorphs and kinemorphemes, and these in turn form kinesyntactic constructions. What is more, some suprasegmental elements, namely kinemes of stress and juncture, have been reported by Birdwhistell (1970) as appearing in the linguistic-kinesic stream (while the relationship between linguistic pitch and body movement seems to be under study). In addition, parakinesic degrees of intensity, range and velocity (akin to stress and articulatory tension, syllabic duration, and speech tempo) have also been identified.

2.3. Before outlining the totality of the emitting and perceiving channels of what earlier I called direct personal interaction within culture, I would like to acknowledge, just in passing, the conceptual disagreements among some authors as to what is verbal or nonverbal, linguistic or paralinguistic,7 and offer the following definitions: By verbal-vocal communication I understand the acoustic non-autonomous vocal system formed by segmental lexical structures and their essential suprasegmental patterns of stress, pitch and juncture. By nonverbal-vocal communication, the acoustic non-autonomous system, whether respiratory or not, formed by the extreme variations of the suprasegmental patterns of stress, pitch and juncture, and the

phenomena today studied as paralinguistic, many of which go beyond the traditional phonemic norms as "marginal" and "non-speech" sounds, and to which pauses can be added as perfectly encoded and decoded semantic components of paralanguage. By nonverbal-nonvocal communication, the rest of the acoustic, visual, olfactory and tactile means of conveying information and eliciting interaction, and they can complement each other. It is, however, between verbal and nonverbal that we find a most uncertain boundary and, therefore, the inevitable inconsistency between what we consider linguistic or paralinguistic, an inconsistency that becomes most obvious when we try to analyze alternants from the articulatory, semantic and cultural points of view (Poyatos, 1975b). Although alternants are anthropophonemically possible, they have been traditionally regarded as abnormal, when they actually belong within our audible communication system in close interrelatedness with other nonverbal modalities, some of them being treated by linguists as elements of certain languages, such as that of the African Bushmen (Stopa, 1972). In fact, each language, or rather, each culture contains a great number of paralinguistic alternants that are encoded and decoded by interactants in countless everyday situations. If they were consistently represented by the existing orthographic symbols, and complemented by some additional ones, they could perfectly well appear as dictionary entries and be used by the letter-writing layman as well as by the professional novelist or playwright. Why should no1 they be able to resort to that repertoire of vocally-produced messages which actually exist in their minds when they are at work, which they have learnec to use in the proper context, but which, due to traditionally restricting spell ing and "linguistic" rules and taboos, they cannot represent vividly? I agree with Lieberman (1975) that "phonetic" elements of human language need not be restricted to the accepted segmental elements conveyed by tradition? orthopgraphy; and just as he suspects that an advanced hominid species like classical Neanderthal man, while lacking many of today's segmental phoneti elements, probably used "tone of voice" for different semantic constructs, and that the pretended "rigid dychotomy" between 'linguistic' and 'paralinguistic' is an artifice if something that cannot be transcribed with the IPA symbols is automatically called "paralinguistic," I would think that phonetic semantic constructs like alternants may have preceded the appearance of human language, in fact, the analysis of alternants may have an important place in glottogenesis.

3. THE TOTAL COMMUNICATION COMPLEX OF HUMAN INTERACTION Having tried to compartmentalize spoken words and the communicative phenomena most inherent to them, I must now emphasize the fact that isolating the linguistic-paralinguistic-kinesic constructs when studying the actu; interaction situation is not enough for a true picture ofthat situation. The integrative study of all the behaviors

that complement, and even replace at times, the basic triple structure, is now emerging as an interdisciplinary field of research that should be seriously acknowledged by linguists as much as anthropologists, social psychologists and psychiatrists, ethologists, and even literary critics. And not individually, but in close cooperation.

3.1. At the I Congress of the International Association of Semiotics Studies (Poyatos, 1974), I elaborated somewhat on the notion that most of the semantic content of personal face-to-face interaction is conveyed by the bo</ through motor, respiratory, dermal, thermal, and secretional channels, corre spending to activities like gesturing, phonetic articulation, skin papillary eretion (goose flesh), emotional changes in temperature, and perspiration. In turn, those activities that take place during interaction provide only complementary information facilitated by the physical environment -- which is also perceived in a sensorial way -- and, both sensorially and intellectually, by the rest of the cultural context; while the communicative behaviors themselves are always subject to the biophysicopsychological and socioeconomic-geographical background by which sender and receiver are conditioned individually as well as culturally. According to the sensorial channels involved in either the emission or the perception of messages, human communication -- which, for much needed comparative studies, I would subsume under Sebeok's (1969) zoosemiotics -- can be distributed into five categories: acoustic, visual, olfactory, kinesthetic, and tactile, covered by the broader ones mentioned earlier: verbal-vocal and nonverbal-vocal, for acoustic; and nonverbal-nonvocal, including the other channels in addition to the acoustic one. The acoustic one, like the visually perceived one, includes a great part of the sign-carrying activities our species can produce, some of which are not just anthroponemic. Our bodies can produce sound,

a) by vocal modifications of respiratory air, as in language and most paralinguistic phenomena, or simply by its two inarticulated phases (inspiration-expiration), as in some paralinguistic acts (a sigh, a pre-speech inspiration);

b) by nonvocal-nonrespiratory sounds produced by the body itself in several bone joints; c) by intestinal gas expelled through the anus, or stomachic one let out by the mouth; and d) by abrupt contact of various parts of the body, mainly the extremities, against itself, against other bodies, or against objects. It is in paralinguistic alternants that not only vocal sounds (a hiss) and nonvocal ones (a nostril ingression) overlap, but also respiratory (a sigh) and nonrespiratory ones (a click). In what I have called visual-acoustic kinesics, the visual and acoustic categories overlap too, and it includes different types of kinesic behaviors (fingersnapping, clapping, desk-tapping, back-slapping). Visual communication shares, therefore, the acoustic types of motor-based

nonvocal sounds -- that is, in kinesics -- while containing its own three groups of movements and movement-based positions of the body (hand and face gestures, eye movements, contact with oneself, handling of personal objects, contact with others, and all postures). Within motor-based visual behavior we find the four proxemic distances distinguished by Hall (1966): public, social, personal, and intimate, plus the one I call far distance; and the distance kept from object-adaptors like desks or counters.8 Then, still within visual communication, but as a static subcategory, are: the handling of certain objects that we adapt to our bodies as if they were part of them (clothes, glasses, jewelry), messages emitted by grooming, color and gait, dermal changes that can affect interaction (blushing, goose flesh), and secretions (tears, perspiration, mucus). Olfactory communication shares the last group of visual-static cues, that is

4. SEMIOTIC APPROACH TO THE EMISSION AND PERCEPTION OF VERBAL AND NONVERBAL SIGNS

In the detailed morphological and semantic analysis of language and its total interactive context, which I have outlined in this paper, there are three perspectives that may help us probe deep into the structure of human communication:

4.1. The first one concerns the different functions that verbal language, or any other communicative modality for that matter, can perform in interaction. Each activity can act, a) as modifier of either our own behavior (my verbal repertoire may determine my kinesic one; my kinesic one may modify my proxemic one; my olfactory perception can modify my paralanguage), or our interactant's (my verbal language can affect your facial expression; your blushing can modify my choice of words); or b) simply as context of other concomitant activities in either our multirepertoire or our interactant's. In turn, both modifying and contextual activities can perform one of the two main roles of body behavior in interaction: a) self-regulatory function, within one own's repertoire, by which one of my own nonverbal activities, for instance, can regulate (which is not the same as modify), the production of my other verbal and nonverbal activities, in terms of order of occurrence, amount displayed and beginning and end of the display; or b) interactional function, between sender and receiver, by which that same nonverbal activity can regulate your behavior, that is, the flow of our interaction, by means of cues (words, pitch changes, gestures, pauses) which indicate my intention to conclude the conversation, change the subject, contradict or agree with your words, etc. As we try to analyze systematically how language and the rest of the communicative activities actually perform in everyday life, either as eliciting forces or simply as context of human acts, we must necessarily distinguish: first, the correspondence between those acts and their meanings (culturally, as well as cross-

culturally) and secondly, the various ways in which those consciously or unconsciously emitted and perceived signs are coded.

4.2. As for the conveyance of the meaning, I would like to differentiate simplifying somewhat the schema proposed by authors like Ekman and Friesen (1969) - three types of coding:

a) arbitrary, that is, when the sign bears no resemblance to what it signifies, as it happens with non-onomatopoeic words, an OK gesture, a perfume used for sexual attractiveness, etc.;

b) imitative, when the sign does resemble what it means (its significant), being either iconic (when it looks like what it means, as in the case of illustrative gestures), or echoic, as we can call it when it sounds like what it means; in which case I subdivide echoic signs into onomatopoeic (a hiss to signify a flat tire) and intrinsic (being its significant, like a human growl meant as such); and

c) intrinsic proper, when it does not resemble, but is its significant (not a threatening fist, but the actual agression; the imitation of someone's gestures).

4.3. Finally, I would like to suggest that the activities concurrent with language may have a definite effect on the decoding process of verbal signals; which demonstrates once more how unrealistic it can be to analyze meaning in terms solely of the morphological and syntactical constructs of lexemes. I would depict this influence diagrammatically as follows: concurrent nonverbal activities sender's encoding | ,,, T' ,,,,,,,, VERBAL SIGNS concurrent nonverbal activities --*~ receiver's ^ decoding One should not forget that encoding is not necessarily a conscious affair, and that the signs - let us say words - emitted, as far as the speaker is concerned, reach the decoding end of the process "colored" in a way that may not have been meant by their sender.

4.4. This aspect of the multisensory conveyance of meaning in communication links with a new perspective in the analysis of the novel on which I have been elaborating lately (Poyatos 1972, 1975a). Based on the transmission of the narrative character through his nonverbal repertoires, it offers various research possibilities dealing with the author-character-reader relationship, a process that begins with a multisensory perception of signs, translated into only visual ones (the printed text, mostly words), and is completed when the reader produces a sort of countertranslation into a multisensory decoding of what had to be expressed just with the written text. Many of the implications in such a process are related to the described or represented nonverbal behaviors of the characters, and these behaviors play, in addition, important stylistic, communicative, and technical functions in the narrative. Here I

will indicate only that the novelist, conscious of the subtleties that would be lost otherwise, is compelled to resort to the description of the be- haviors concomitant with verbal language. The traditional "He said with . . . voice," "She sighed," "Ah, she said suspending her breath," or "He paused," illustrate the author's concern for the semantic functions played by the nonverbal features of vocal communication; just as descriptions like "He frowned," "Her eyes wide open," or "With a faint smile," try to acknowledge other interactive elements. The problem is, of course, that while there is a limited number of signs to indicate, not too accurately, a few paralinguistic phenomena (?, !, ?!,!!, CAPITALS, italics, hy-phen-a-tion, Ugh, Er-, Mh-hm), there is absolutely no way to signify even some overriding kinesic features, like standing, sitting, or running, that could be combined with written words and paralinguistic representations to depict the basic triple structure better (the only serious attempts being, in research, Birdwhistell's [1952, 1970], or Kendon's [1975] kinegraphs). I hope that the theoretical and methodological ideas outlined in this paper have at least demonstrated that there is a great deal more to investigate about language than just verbal constructs. The true exhaustive analysis of people's communicative mechanism in interaction is a rather interdisciplinary affair in which linguistics occupy (and not always) a preponderant place, but not an autonomous one.

NOTES

1. There are a great number of sounds, perfectly normal from the physiological point of view, which, as Pike (1943) complained, are traditionally considered either as marginal sounds because they do not seem to occur as phonemic norms in a given set of languages (whispered sounds, clicks, pharyngeal sounds, glottalized stops, ingressive sounds), or as nonspeech sounds, equally normal from the anthropophonetic point of view - but further away from traditional "speech norms" (coughs, nareal sounds, glottalized sighs, glottalized gliding vowels). Besides the fact that these sounds have been wrongly relegated to a status of abnormality and nonspeechness, and therefore excluded from phonemic charts, their semantic value within man's vocal communicative repertoire is such that a study of the functions they play and of their "lexical" value, would certainly enrich, not just the anthropolinguistic field, but other areas referred to in this paper. 2. One could pick at random different conceptual definitions, such as those by: anthropologist-linguist Franz Boas (1911); "communication by means of sounds produced by the articulating organs," obviously admitting certain "paralinguistic" sounds; the philosopher and pioneering semiotician Charles Morris (1946), who sees language as composed by a plurality of man-produced signs with an unchangeable meaning known to a number of interpreters (which would seem to subsume verbal as well as nonvocal signs); the

paralinguistic pioneer George Trager (1958), "the cultural system which employs certain of the noises made by what are called the organs of speech, combines into recurrent sequences, and arranges these sequences in systematic distributions in relation to each other and in reference to other cultural systems," which establishes a clear difference between linguistic vocal sounds and paralinguistic ones; the sociologist Joyce Hertzler (1965), "symbols, which have a specific and arbitrarily determined meaning and common usage for purposes of socially meaningful expression, and for communication in the given society ... this symbol system usually consists of certain more or less convention- alized signals and gestures, but specially of orderly . . . spoken sounds . .. "; the animal behaviorist W.H. Thorpe (1972), admitting the vagueness of the colloquial use of the term language, points out the widespread tendency between students of animal behavior and physiological psychologists to apply it to the most elaborate forms of animal communication, specially the one carried out through the vocal-auditory tract for the transfer of social information, which broadens the scope of the term; and the anthropologically and physiologically oriented linguist Philip Lieberman, who studies nonhuman primate's speech (1972), and uses the term language, not as coterminous with speech, like many do, but as "a communicative system that is capable of transmitting new information," that is, "a communication system that places no restriction on the nature of the quality of the information transferred" (1975), by which he opposes the traditionally anthrocentric approach to the conception of language as belonging to present-day homo sapiens only.

3. An advanced culture is understood, since a primitive one would lack the more elaborate systems, relying more on a limited objectual type of signs and, above all, on verbal and nonverbal bodily systems. 4. In the new perspective of narrative technique referred to in 4.4, we find how the selective use of the characters' nonverbal behaviors (given careful attention by many writers, although much restricted by the very limited means for representing those behaviors), not only affects the reader's decoding process, but plays very important technical functions.

5. I have defined paralanguage as: the nonverbal voice qualities, modifiers and sounds produced or conditioned in the areas covered by the supraglottal cavities (from the lips and the nares to the pharynx), the laryngeal cavity and the infraglottal cavities, down to the abdominal muscles, which consciously or unconsciously man uses supporting or contradicting the linguistic, kinesic or proxemic messages mainly, either simultaneously or alternating with them. The paralinguistic categories indicated here, originated in Trager's (1958) taxonomy, but an extense elaboration of it, includes: Primary Qualities (timbre, pitch level, pitch registers, pitch interval,

intonation range, resonance, volume, syllabic duration, overall tempo, and general rythm of speech); Modifiers: Qualifiers (glottalic control, velar control, articulatory control, articulatory tension, pharyngeal control, laryngeal control, labial control, and respiratory control) and Differentiators (forms and degrees of whispering, loud voice, crying, laughing, coughing, yawning, etc.); and Alternants, commented upon in 2.2 (articulated, either vocalic or consonantal [bilabial, labiodental, whistling, clicking, velar]; inarticulated, and pausal). 6. I would define kinesics as: the systematic study of psychomuscularly-based body movements and/or their resulting positions, either learned or somatogenic, of visual, visual-acoustic and tactile or kinesthetic perception, that, whether isolated or combined with the linguistic-paralinguistic structures and with the situational context, possess communicative value, either in a conscious way or out of awareness. 7. This disagreement can be exemplified by the following instances: While Ekman and Friesen (1969) include within nonverbal behavior only "any movement or position of the face and/or the body," thus not differentiating between nonverbal and nonvocal, Duncan (1969) includes paralanguage (another term subject to discussion [Abercrombie, 1968; Lieberman, 1975]), kinesics, proxemics, olfaction, skin sensitiveness to touch and temperature, and even the use of artifacts, such as Ekman and Friesen's "objectadaptors"; and in body motion or kinesic behavior he includes facial expression, eye movement and postures. Lyons (1972) distinguishes, first, vocal signals from nonvocal ones, according to whether they are transmitted in the vocal-auditory channel or not (by this term implying the two end-points: sender and receiver), and then considers language as made up of verbal (extrictly lexical) and nonverbal (prosodic) components, the latter, of course, being still vocal; while he is inclined, with Abercrombie, to apply the controversial term "paralinguistics" to features playing a supporting role, such as gestures and eye movements, and to include both prosodic and paralinguistic phenomena within nonsegmental (linguistic, therefore, subsuming for him verbal and prosodic) Argyle (1972) comes the closest to my own classification by calling kinesics and proxemics nonverbal, as well as what he refers to as nonverbal aspects of speech, or paralanguage. Laver and Hutcheson (1972) identify verbal with actual words, nonverbal with vocal or nonvocal conversational behavior (for them paralanguage) apart from words, thus distinguishing: vocal-verbal (words), vocal-nonverbal (intonation and paralanguage), nonvocal-verbal (written or printed language), and nonvocal-nonverbal (kinesics: facial expression, gesture and posture); four means of communication which offer linguistic, paralinguistic (for them nonlinguistic, nonverbal phenomena, either vocal [tone of voice] or nonvocal [kinesics, proxemics and related modalities]) and extralinguistic features ("by definition non-verbal, non-linguistic and non-paralinguistic"; either vocal

[biologically, psychologically and socially-based voice qualities] or nonvocal [as the style of dress]). Although my own classification coincides with their definitions of verbal, nonverbalvocal and nonverbal-nonvocal, I have elaborated further by encompassing the rest of the communicative systems, which I study as Total Body Communication, within nonverbalnonvocal.

8. Since this paper does not deal specifically with the classification of nonverbal categories, I am avoiding the terminology I would use otherwise, proposed by Efron (1941) and Ekman and Friesen (1969), which I do not apply to kinesics only, as they do, and to which I have added object-adaptors. 9. I have suggested on different occasions (Poyatos 1975a, but also in earlier papers) chronemics as an area of study that would deal with our conceptualization and handling of time as a biopsychological and cultural element lending specific characteristics to social relations and to the many events linked with the communicative continuum, from linguistic syllables and flitting gestures to meaningful glances and silences. Since chronemic behavior identifies situational contexts, cultural backgrounds, and personality and biological configurations, one should consider these elements as complementary to language and other communicative behaviors; not only in "social time" (time as handled in social relations within a culture as well as cross-culturally), but in "interactive time" (time used in the various forms of interactive encounters, and in the production of the various communicative activities themselves).

REFERENCES

Abercrombie, David 1968 "Paralanguage," British Journal of Disorders of Communication, 3, 55-59.

Argyle, Michael 1972 "Non-Verbal Communication in Human Social Interaction," in R.A. Hinde (ed.), Non-Verbal Communication. London: Cambridge University Press, 243-269.

Birdwhistell, Ray L. 1952 Introduction to Kinesics: An Annotated System for Analysis of Body Motion and Gesture. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Foreign Service Institute

Birdwhistell, Ray L. 1970 Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. New York: Ballantine Books, 1972.

Boas, Franz 1911 Handbook of American Indian Languages. Introduction. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.

Duncan Jr., Starkey 1969 "Nonverbal Communication," Psychological Bulletin, 72:2,118-137.

Efron, David 1941 Gesture and Environment. New York: King's Crown. Now as Gesture, Race, and Culture. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1972.

Ekman, Paul and Wallace V. Friesen 1969 "The Repertoire of Nonverbal Behavior: Categories, Origins, Usage, and Coding," Semiotica, 1, 49-98.

Hall, Edward T. 1966 The Silent Language. New York: Doubleday and Company.

Hertzler, Joyce O. 1965 A Sociology of Language. New York: Random House.

Kendon, Adam 1969 "Progress Report of an Investigation Into Aspects of the Structure and Function of the Social Performance in Two-Person Encounters," in M. Argyle, Social Interaction. London: Methuen; New York: Atherton.

Kendon, Adam 1975 (pre-publication manuscript) "Some Functions of the Face in a Kissing Round," forthcoming in Semiotica.

Laver, John and Sandy Hutcheson (eds.) 1972 Communication in Face to Face Interaction: Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lieberman, Philip 1972 The Speech of Primates. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Lieberman, Philip 1975 "Linguistic and Paralinguistic Interchange," in A. Kendon, R. Harris and M.R. Key (eds.), The Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Lyons, John 1972 "Human Language," in R.H. Hinde (ed.), Non-Verbal Communication. London: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, Charles W. 1946 Signs, Language and Behavior. New York: Prentice Hall. Pike, Kenneth 1943 Phonetics. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Poyatos, Fernando 1972 "Paralenguaje y kinesica del personaje novelesco: nueva perspectiva en el analisis de la narracion," Revista de Occidente, Nos. 113-114, 148-170.

Poyatos, Fernando 1974 "The Challenge of 'Total Body Communication' as an Interdisciplinary Field of Integrative Research," paper read, and forthcoming in the proceedings of, I Congress of the International Association of Semiotic Studies, Milano.

Poyatos, Fernando 1975a "Towards an Exhaustive Intercultural Analysis of Human Communication," paper read at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago.

Poyatos, Fernando 1975b "Forms and Functions of Nonverbal Communication in the Novel," paper read at the joint session of the Canadian Association of Semiotic Research and the Canadian Comparative Literature Association, Edmonton; in The Canadian Journal of Research in Semiotics (in press).

Poyatos, Fernando 1975c "Cross-Cultural Study of Paralinguistic 'Alternants' in Face-to-Face Interaction," in A. Kendon, R. Harris and M. Key (eds.), The Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction. The Hague: Mouton Publishers. Sebeok,

Ramsay, Thomas A. and Alexandra (eds.) 1969 Approaches to Animal Communication. The Hague: Mouton Publishers. Stopa, Roman 1972 Structure of Bushmen and its Traces in Indo-European. Krakow: Polska Akademia Nauk, Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej.

Thorpe, W. H. 1972 "The Comparison of Vocal Communication in Animals and Man," in R.A. Hinde (ed.), Non-Verbal Communication. London: Cambridge University Press.

Trager, George L. 1958 "Paralanguage: A First Approximation," Studies in Linguistics, Vol. 13, 1-12; also in Dell Hymes (ed.), Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics, New York: Harper & Row.