

gated by the social insistence upon converting the meaning of the smile from malevolent intent to benevolent intent. Finally, this apparent divergence of opinion is bridged by others who solve such problems by blending the dichotomy and who see man as basically ambivalent. For these persons the smile is a naturally ambivalent gesture which can be and is used to express the gamut of human feelings.

This is not the occasion to review some of the attempts to test these and other dependent hypotheses using caricatures, photos, and smiling models with infants in laboratory conditions. As I have read them I find them indeterminate although interesting. We do not have very reliable information about infant smiling in cultures other than those of the Western world. At the time of this writing I do not know whether infants in all societies smile prior to any socialization nor do I know what happens to infants in any particular society who do not smile at all or who smile all the time. On the other hand, there is considerable clinical and anecdotal material to indicate that at least in Western cultures children must learn to smile in appropriate situations. That is, they must learn how and when to smile; if they do not they are somehow isolated for special attention.

It is this latter point which is relevant to our communicational studies. Smiles do not override context. That is, insofar as we can ascertain, whatever smiles are and whatever their genesis, they are not visible transforms of underlying physiological states which are emitted as direct and unmitigated signal forms of that state. And, the fact that subjects are not always aware that they are or are not smiling or are not always skilled enough to emit convincing smiles upon demand does not relegate such smiles into the realm of the psychologist or the physiologist. Linguistic or kinesic structure is no less orderly because performers are not conscious of their utilization of it.

At this stage of the study of smiling (I am fictionalizing the order of investigation and discovery somewhat for purposes of discussion) it had become clear that not only could I not support any proposition that smiles were universal symbols in the sense of having a universal social stimulus value but, insofar as the study of communication went, my work was only complicated by assumptions about communication as an elaboration of a panhuman core code emergent from the limited possibilities of physiological response. However, I could not rid myself of the nagging question occasioned by negative evidence from quite another level. I had talked with a great many

anthropologists who had studied in the most widely diversified cultures and none reported the absence of any smiling from their field work. And, in fact, none reported societies in which smiling never appeared in situations which could be interpreted as pleasurable, friendly, benevolent, positive, and so on. The question was: Even if smiling does not have the same meaning in every society and is not traceably a direct response to a primitive affective state, doesn't its universal distribution as a facial phenomenon give us the right to call it a universal gesture? Obviously it does if we are speaking at the *articulatory level* of description. That is, if a smile is the bilateral extension of the lateral aspects of the lip region from a position of rest, all members of the species *Homo sapiens* smile.

There then emerges the second question: Does not the fact that smiling in every culture can be *in certain of its contexts* related to positive response indicate that man, as he gained spoken language in a prelanguage situation, utilized this expression as a device for interpersonal constraint (in the Durkheimian sense) and that smiling is a kind of urkinesic form which has been absorbed into human communicational systems as they developed? The only answer that I can give to this is that I don't know. Important as it might be to answer this question, at this stage of research I am not particularly interested in origins or in the ethnography of atavistic or "vestigial" forms. However, I am interested in determining, in a descriptive sense, what it is that we mean when we say that someone "smiled." I am interested in being able to examine the structure of events relevant to "smiling" in order to deal with the social situations of which it is a part.

Over the past decade I have been engaged in intrachannel structural kinesic research. I have become aware that, similar to other "gestures," "smiling" is not a thing in itself. The term "smiling" as used by American informants covers an extensive range of complex kinemorphic constructions which are reducible to their structural components. The positioning of the head, variation in the circum-orbital region, the forms of the face, and even general body position can be and usually are involved in the performance and reception of what the informant reports as "smiling." I have learned that "he smiled," as a statement on the part of an American informant is as nonspecific and uninformative as the statement on the part of the same informant that "he raised his voice."

Only by intrachannel analysis have I been able to free myself from an ethnocentric preconception that I know what a smile is. We