

Michał Pawlak

University of Lodz

ON KAIROS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: APPLICATION OF THE IDEA IN MULTINATIONAL ENCOUNTERS

1. Introduction

The present paper explores one of the rhetorical issues derived from antiquity, which is the idea of Kairos (*καιρός*), and its impact on the modern intercultural communication. This issue seems to be intriguing and worth analyzing due to the interdisciplinary features of the notion of Kairos itself and its possible usefulness in improving and understanding of the act of intercultural communication.

A wide range of meanings attributed to *καιρός* made its idea to appear in many aspects of the ancient culture. Developed for the first time in Greece, afterwards it was recognized and adopted by the Romans, who called it *occasio*. The importance of *καιρός* arose from multiplicity of its concept, which made *καιρός* useful and applicable not only to theoretical considerations, but, what is more significant and what decided about its long lasting character, to practical human activities. In this way the problem of *καιρός*, besides naturally the terms of classical Greek rhetoric and literature, where it held a position of “a dominant issue” (Kinneavy, 2002: 58), was discussed on many different levels by various ancient authors. But, beyond the fact that *καιρός* was implemented by ancient writers to other fields of interests than just the art of rhetoric, the aforementioned remark is the most important for our research. Considering that the theory of modern rhetoric owe its basis to antiquity, any kind of verbal intercultural communication should also refer to some of the ancient ideas of speech.

This paper deals with the problem of *καιρός* from the intercultural communication perspective with its pragmatic aspects and explores the following problems: can the rules of ancient *καιρός* be applied to intercultural communication and if so, to what extent? Is there any existing model of

καιρός created for the needs of verbal intercultural communication? If so, what are its main features and can it be taught in order to make the act of intercultural communication more effective? What profits can intercultural communication obtain after the καιρός theory is applied to it? If there is no already existing concept of καιρός for intercultural communication, how can such καιρός rules be created in order to exploit the advantages of καιρός for the purpose of intercultural communication? And finally, does καιρός have any disadvantages and whether these weak points, provided they exist, can refrain one from using the καιρός concept within intercultural communication?

The above stated research questions reveal complexity of this specific problem. However, before proceeding into their examination, we shall consider what the ancient concept of καιρός exactly was, what its main features were and how they might comply with pragmatic aspect of modern intercultural communication. Finding a link between καιρός and intercultural communication would be of utmost importance for finding an answer to the questions this paper poses. Another crucial issue refers to the fact that every kind of successful verbal intercultural communication is based on an ability of interlocutors to communicate efficaciously by using the same language which nowadays tends to be English. Setting a paneuropean communicative standard which, considering the present linguistic knowledge of EU citizens, would be a code based on English, would surely facilitate the communication process between speakers of different L1s (first languages). Establishing such unified English code would naturally involve creating its structural pattern and pragmatic rules. It should be considered how Kairos would apply especially to that second field which is directly connected with the efficacy of communication, also in its intercultural context.

Assuming that Kairos may be seen as a component of the three ancient speech theories (naturally to various extent in each of them), which are: dialectics (the art of discussion and reasoning dedicated to revealing a false argumentation and to getting as close as possible to the truth), rhetoric (the art of using the language to persuade the audience to one's point of view), and at last eristic (an artificial rivalry; the art of conducting a dialogue in a competitive way), therefore multinational conversation in its general and specialized form as well (e.g. multinational business communication), while deriving its basic rules as any modern kind of conversation from the antiquity, should possess also some characteristics typical for καιρός. However, before investigating what kind of characteristics these may be, we must refer to the ancient idea of Kairos and define its main attributes.

2. The ancient idea of Kairos: the art of not missing the right time and what does it mean to be appropriate?

The ancient idea of Kairos was strictly associated with passing of time (Χρόνος). The existence of Kairos depended on time; without time, there would be no Kairos at all. However, while χρόνος designated for the Greeks many and various aspects of elapsing time, in some cases in a very general manner, καιρός was much more specific and underlined an effective value of time and its qualitative nature (Smith, 2002: 46–57). The ancient concepts of Kairos' time described Kairos as “an individual time having a critical ordinal position set apart from its predecessors and successors” (Smith, 2002: 52). Kairos was regarded as a very important feature of time, because according to the Greeks it indicated a suitable moment, a most favorable one for something to be done. As time cannot be reversed in order to change our bad choices into advantageous ones, learning how not to miss once and for all those right moments and how to profit from them by following the indications given by καιρός became of great interest to the Greeks. However, apart from being applied to the specific measure of time, καιρός also pointed quality and conformity of many other elements, some of them connected e.g. with a human body, whereas other ones used in reasoning on such issues as rhetoric, literature, aesthetics and ethics, to which fields the idea of καιρός became a strategic one (Sipiora, 2002: 1).

The practical aspect of καιρός was one of its most distinguished characteristics. The Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott provides us with definitions and uses of καιρός, its adjective form καιρίος (καίριμος) and their derivants, that have been preserved in the works of different ancient authors (Liddell-Scott, 1897: 727–728). I have classified those examples into three main thematic groups:

I. Time.

A. Positive meaning of time.

1. General expressions of time.

- a) Those that identify καιρός simply with χρόνος and apply to common understanding of time as some particular moment or season, e.g. καιρός χειμῶνος.

2. Accurate estimations of positive time.

- a) Those that apply to “the exact or critical time”, “to the proper time or season of action”, to something which is suitable or proper for particular moment of time and should be done and benefited within that time, e.g. καιρικός, καιρῶ χρεῖσθαι or καιρός ἐστι, and those related to something which

is situated “in” or “at the right time”, “in season” or can be called “seasonable” or done “timely” (προς καιριον, ἐπὶ καιροῦ, κατὰ καιρόν, συν καιρῷ) and is seen as “opportune” as τὰ καιρία “timely circumstances and opportunities”, with special reference to verbal communication and perfect timing (τὸ ἀεὶ καιριον or the expression καιριος σπουδῆ that can be translated as a proper haste), with possibility of using to such actions as: to come and arrive (προς τὸ καιριον), to speak and to say something suitable and reasonable (χρῆ λέγειν τὰ καιρία; εἴ τι καιριον λέγεις), to make one’s mind up reasonably or to decide reasonably (δραῖν, φρονεῖν τὰ καιρία; καιριωτέρα βουλή).

b) Those that designate time suitable for particular activities (e.g. καιρολυσία – “fit time for bathing”; καιροσκοπέω, καιροτηρέω, καιροφυλακέω – which all mean, in general, waiting for opportunity or profits; also expressions connected with verbal communication such as: καιριολεκτέω – “to use a word appropriately”).

B. Negative meaning of time.

1. General expressions of time.

a) Οἱ καιροί = “the state of affairs, mostly in bad sense”.

2. Accurate estimations of negative time.

a) Those that apply to not suitable or proper moment for doing something, with such phrases as: ἀπο καιροῦ, ἄνευ καιροῦ, παρὰ καιρόν, πρὸ καιροῦ also in reference to verbal communication ἐπὶ καιροῦ λέγειν.

b) Those that apply to a dangerous moment: ὁ ἔσχατος καιρός (“extreme danger”).

II. Place (context) and form.

A. Positive meaning of space.

1. Accurate estimations of space.

a) Those that apply to dimension of space, to something which is situated “in” or “at the right place”, with phrases such as: ἐν καιρίῳ or κατὰ καιριον.

2. Shape of a human body.

a) Those that apply to something very important and vital, that cannot be replaced and that needs a special attention because of its susceptibility to harm, in reference to parts of the body (τὸ καιριον) and also to something very serious such as wounds.

III. Qualities.

A. Positive qualities.

1. Being in proportion and being advantageous.
 - a) Those that apply to positive qualities described by *καιρός* such as: “due measure”, “proportion”, “fitness” or to *καιρός* as “someone’s advantage, profit, fruit of or from something”: e.g. *τίνα καιρόν με διδάσχεις; ἐπὶ σῶ καιρῷ.*
2. Being most important.
 - a) Those that apply to something chief or principal (*κυριώτατα*), *καιρόν ἔχειν τοῦ εἶναί*: “to be the chief cause of something”.

Taking into account the aforementioned applications of *καιρός*, one can reach the following conclusions. Firstly and most obviously, the various definitions of *καιρός* can be divided into three primary categories. Two of them, time and place, can be seen as being among the most important and universal problems that not only the ancient Greek culture greatly considered. The third category shows the qualities of the idea itself, qualities which pertain to adored by ancient culture, both Greek and Latin, issues of proportion, balance and accuracy. This feature makes *καιρός* adjustable to theoretical considerations on such issues as rhetorics or ethics and to their practical dimension as well. In most of the cases *καιρός* and its derivants define positive meaning of time in a particular moment. For the most part, *καιρός* does not respect general expressions of time and its “quantity of duration” (Sipiora, 2002: 2), although they may occur. However such expressions do not consist of its main interest. As far as time is concerned, *καιρός* exposes and underlines a particular and exact moment which is suitable and opportune, or in some cases is not, for doing something or having something to be done in order to obtain one’s goals or gain profits from doing something in a propitious nick of time. Hence, the connection between time, represented by the specific, opportune and reasonable, that is carefully chosen, moment and benefit, that is generated by exploiting such proper moment, seems to be the most distinctive and crucial characteristic of *καιρός*.

The efficacy of *καιρός* depends on perfect timing i.e. the ability of making a right decision instantly by using an appropriate medium (Heinrichs, 2007: 295). It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to learn how to discern, if some moment is right for taking actions, because direct hints cannot be indicated due to the unpredictability and uniqueness of only once-existing moments and opportunities. Therefore, it is easy to misinterpret such a moment and become misled by its sham advantages. The effective use of *καιρός*, apart from being determined by time factors, is also influenced by charac-

teristics belonging to a person or persons taking part in an activity. Most of them are non-assessable, such as intuition, fast processing of incoming information or any useful personal skills, but the other ones such as e.g. knowledge of the problem that applies to a particular action or proficiency in undertaking of an action can be undoubtedly judged. However, awareness of specific conditions how *καιρός* functions, does not ensure success and reaching its main goal which is a benefit or superiority over an opponent or interlocutor in an opportune nick of time. The final result of trying to obtain *καιρός* is hard to predict, because it depends on many factors and on a favorable set of circumstances that refer to “setting” a speech act in a specific time and place. If *καιρός* really “happened”, the outcome of the undertaken action would be positive. For this reason, risk and the problem of its recognition and assessment have been tightly linked with *Kairos* and play a very important role in profiting from it. A well undergone process of risk management enables one to justly evaluate his chances of success and increases the possibility of taking the right moment and not losing the potential of *Kairos*.

As it follows from the above presented definitions, *καιρός* has no negative features or weak points at all. It seems that if *Kairos* is used properly i.e. at the suitable instant, the success is then secured, because *καιρός* provides superiority which is difficult to overcome. But besides the crucial for *καιρός* relation between time-risk and profit, the other two categories, place and qualities, show their great importance too. The first of them indicate that *Kairos* can be considered not only in terms of time location, but also in reference to dimension of space as designation for particular and proper position, for example within a specific cultural-linguistic context. If something has a certain and right placement, it keeps its form and remains in harmony with its surroundings, and is necessary for proper functioning of the whole entity. In this way *καιρός* started to be applicable to parts of a human body, especially those vital ones. Furthermore, being harmonious and being in proportion are the qualities of *καιρός* which represent not only its relation to the categories of time and place, but also its self-nature. If one was supposed to describe *καιρός* itself and features that he attributes to other things, one would use such adjectives like: well measured, fit, advantageous, fruitful, proportional, principal. In this way, something that seems to be fit or advantageous can be seen as *Kairos*. But still, according to the ancient point of view, the necessary condition for *καιρός* to exist was to appear in a proper moment of time or in a proper position of space, or in proper points of both dimensions simultaneously.

Finally, the boundaries between the categories are not strict and changes among them are possible. Some of the uses of *καιρός* may apply to more than one category as it is with types of activities e.g. *καιριολεκτέω* which is connected with verbal communication and means “to use a word appropriately”. It may lend itself not only to time category (time suitable for particular behavior or action; in this case propriety of saying something), but to space category (something situated at the right place that for verbal communication denotes putting words into the right context) and qualitative category as well (being advantageous and effective in communication process by using an advantageous and effective mean of communication). Thus, all the meanings and uses of *καιρός* analyzed so far has proven its complexity. It was rhetoric that became one of the most important fields, where the concept of *καιρός* was strongly present. It is then an essential matter to see in what way the idea of *καιρός* affected the ancient theory of rhetoric.

3. Suspended time and persuasive medium: the main features of rhetoric?

A statement that the ancient theory of rhetoric was based on *καιρός* is much more than just a hypothesis. Such observation can be confirmed in two ways.

Firstly, by the nature of rhetoric itself. Its main goal is to gain advantage over an interlocutor or interlocutors, or over an audience and profit from such advantage by persuading them to one’s own point of view. The success is firmly connected with being active and taking the chances of exploiting the opportune circumstances. A fear of failure has to be overcome, otherwise the proper time for achieving one’s goal, that is anyway difficult to discern, will disappear. The risk of action in the wrong moment and losing everything that has been achieved so far or some part of it remains very high, but it is condition *sine qua non* of Kairos. The particular time, that has been chosen for an action, can be called a suspended one, because when it occurs, a linear, non purpose circulation of time in rhetoric has been stopped. Since that moment, time in rhetoric acquires new value and new meaning. We keep waiting for the positive results of our performance and we are prepared for receiving some tentative profit. If it does not happen, it means that the persuasive medium that we have used, was unsuitable, but it does not necessarily mean that we have lost our chances completely. If the circumstances allow for this, we

may wait until another suspended time and try then to take advantage of another medium. Unfortunately, the favorable results of Kairos cannot be seen at instant, but only from retrospection, when all we can do, is only to examine them.

However, it has been only rhetoric that provides us with the possibility of using Kairos. In dialectics or eristic we do not have *καιρός* at our disposal (at least not to such extent as in rhetoric). It is so, because neither dialectics or eristic aims at effective communication. The purpose of dialectics, starting from the Socratic tradition, is to reveal the false point of view and get as close as possible to the truth by refuting the reasoning of one of the interlocutors. It is done by the other interlocutor who takes a position of being closer to the truth. He stays active and questions the one that is passive in order to guide him to truth and to the negation of his point of view. There were two methods of doing this according to the Socratic tradition. First of them is known as maieutics (this term is connected with verb *μαieύομαι* – to serve as a midwife or the adjective *μαieυτικός* – practiced in midwifery). In accordance to this technique, the passive interlocutor was supposed to reach truth on his own by way of contradicting his own point of view, while answering the questions asked by the active interlocutor. The second method called elenctic (*ἐλεγκτικός* – of a person fond of cross-questioning or examining; *ἐλεγχος* – an argument of disproof or refutation) was much more aggressive and assumed that it was the role of the active interlocutor to prove ostensibly fallacies in his interlocutor's reasoning. Considering both these methods, it seems that none of them really needed *καιρός* to function well. They did, however, include the act of gaining the advantage and superiority over an opponent during the discourse by using the appropriate means for it, but already at the beginning of the dialectic discourse one of the interlocutors was favored and put in the superior position. The roles were assigned and one of the interlocutors had to lose. The results were set and it was only the active interlocutor's choice which method he would decide to use. There was hardly any risk of failure and there was nothing unexpected that could have happened. The similar situation was with eristic. Also here *καιρός* did not apply fully. Eristic was an artificial state designed for the purpose of training. The interlocutors were competitors, who were trying to test in practice their speech abilities and figures of speech they have learned so far. Their aim was not to persuade each other, so there was no risk of losing the right time for it.

Rhetoric, however, was not the sole discipline, where the idea of *καιρός* was used. In Pythagorean ethics *καιρός* stood for justice “defined as giving to each *according to merit*” (Kinneavy, 2002: 61), whereas in Platonic

ethics and aesthetics it meant the right measure and described the relation of the beautiful to the good (Kinneavy, 2002: 64). The traces of the notion of *καίρος* can be also found within the ancient Greek concept of education (Kinneavy, 2002: 65), which aimed at providing the society with the members prepared for public affairs and for this purpose trained in art of eloquence and persuasion, both indispensable for political career.

Thus *καίρος* played a significant role in the rhetoric which taught how to be persuasive in speech. The character of *καίρος* can be seen after examining the relations between the rhetorical means of persuasion and reliability as they were described by Aristotle who dedicated to rhetorical issues his one, entire work (*Ἡ Τέχνη Ῥητορική*). His main source of inspiration for dealing with the rhetorical studies was the discussion on rhetoric held by Plato in two of his dialogues, “Gorgias” and “The Phaedrus” (Aristotle, 1988: 26). Aristotle followed Plato’s guidelines in his idea of rhetoric. He based his rhetoric on dialectics, on the profound knowledge of hearer’s mental features and on the character of the speaker (Aristotle, 1988: 26). Aristotle distinguished three groups of the means of persuasion, respectively to these three foundations of his rhetoric: the logical means (*λόγος*) that came to rhetoric from dialectics, the ones related to an emotional condition of the audience (*πάθος*) and the ones connected with the character of the speaker (*ἥθος*). So how did Aristotle manage to apply *καίρος* to these elements?

The Kairos factor appears implicitly in Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric. According to the English quotation of this passage cited by Kinneavy, the function of rhetoric “is not so much to persuade as to find out in each case the existing means of persuasion” (Kinneavy, 2002: 66). Aristotle’s second definition of rhetoric quoted also by Kinneavy emphasizes the individuality of each situation in which the art of rhetoric is used (Kinneavy, 2002: 66–67). The individual and different character of each such case calls for an appropriate mean of persuasion. As Kinneavy pointed out: “Thus, the rhetorical act is situationally determined in both Plato and Aristotle. And both distinguish the general rules of the art of rhetoric from their situational application” (Kinneavy, 2002: 67). Besides using the idea of *καίρος* in reference to his own remarks as an indication that something should be discussed at further point or at the another and more suitable time later (Kinneavy, 2002: 67–68), Aristotle also presented *καίρος* in particular types of rhetoric, such as legal or political rhetoric. In Aristotle’s legal rhetoric the idea of *καίρος* was related to the notion of equity. The situational aspect of *καίρος* in issues connected with law and justice was distinct in Aristotle’s rhetoric and was expressed in “a kind of *kairic* law. It is law when it is ap-

plied in particular circumstances, at specific times, to specific situations not foreseen by the legislators” (Kinneavy, 2002: 68). Kinneavy further aptly stated that: “It is only in a particular case toward a particular individual at a particular time that true legal justice can be found-when *kairos* can truly occur” (Kinneavy, 2002: 68). Similarly, the *καιρός* idea in political rhetoric was defined as “related closely to the situational concept as applied to individual governments” (Kinneavy, 2002: 68).

The kinds of rhetoric art in reference to which Aristotle described the use of *καιρός* were based on the interaction between *λόγος*, *πάθος* and *ἦθος*. *Kairos* then seemed to be the most important feature for each and all of these types of argumentation. It was *καιρός* that linked them and enabled their proper exploit. In terms of *πάθος*, *Kairos* underlined the great value of emotions in rhetoric and showed how to detect, understand and take advantage of the emotional state of hearer or audience and use the right emotions at the right time. For *ἦθος* Aristotle stated that persuasion appears if orator’s speech is done in a manner that makes him worthy of confidence (Aristotle, 1925: 1356a5). For Aristotle this confidence depended on the orator’s speech directly, and so indirectly from the orator’s character. The Aristotle’s opinion on this matter revealed the significance of *καιρός* within the *ἦθος* argumentation: “(...) Aristotle’s idea that the confidence must be due to the speech itself is clearly an affirmation of the importance of the individual situation; that is, the *kairos* of the case” (Kinneavy, 2002: 71). Finally, for creating *λόγος*, which embraces the use of the maxims, the organization and style of the speech, Aristotle stressed the importance of timing and propriety, i.e. the knowing when for whom and in what situation is the right moment for using a particular expression (Kinneavy, 2002: 72).

For all described situations, in which different means of argumentation are involved, the notion of *καιρός* remains the most important. It is so, because following the principles of *καιρός* makes the speaker able to generate the most persuasive medium of communication in a particular set of time and spatial circumstances. Despite what kind of argumentation was used, an appropriate time, i.e. a suspended qualitative moment of time, that breaks the linear duration of time, and from which the advantage is taken by the speaker, was regarded by Aristotle’s rhetoric as a co-existing element of a persuasive medium and a preliminary condition for persuasive medium to happen. But an appropriate time could happen only if the right situational context had appeared. This relation determined the efficacy of the each used medium.

4. Kairos (= effective communication) in Intercultural Communication: Theory and Practice

Knowing the main attributes of the concept of *καιρός* and its use in the ancient rhetorical theory, in the following section we are going to consider how *καιρός* applies to specific conditions of intercultural communication regarded as one of the modern types of rhetoric. The issue to be examined is whether the basic features of Kairos' ancient rhetorical theory, still remain decisive for intercultural communication.

4.1. Theory of Kairos from a tautological point of view

In this section the logical relations between the features of *καιρός* are going to be investigated. Drawing such outline seems to be important for further considerations. It may provide us with solution to the problem what configuration of *καιρός* attributes gives us greater chances for effective communication. The obtained results will be afterwards interpreted in terms of intercultural communication.

As it has been already stated, there are three major attributes of the *καιρός* concept: time (T), place (P) and qualities (Q). Time (T) stands for an appropriate time for using an appropriate medium, place (P) stands for an appropriate context for using an appropriate medium in an appropriate time and qualities (Q) denote the positive value of *καιρός* that is an appropriate medium: it may be a single word or phrase, or a gesture suitable for reaching one's goals in communication. Before presenting propositional logic formulas for *καιρός* and verifying them, whether they are tautologies, so in other words whether they are true, we have to define the variables and determine what exactly is going to be measured.

To this particular case belong three above mentioned variables: T, P and Q. We are not going to consider other probable variables such as: personal abilities and skills (e.g. language ones), disposition for taking risk, stress resistance. T, P and Q variables are going to be connected with each other by the logical connectives in order to create propositional logic formulas. It is crucial to prepare such connections of variables after having carefully considered their character and their position within the problem of *καιρός*. Otherwise, the meanings that are going to be attached to them and to their connections may not be right and the evaluation of the whole formula may not be reliable.

It has been assumed for the purpose of the present study, that Q must exist, if effective communication is supposed to take place. So the cases where Q is marked as T (Truth) in a table of valuations for variables of

T, P and Q are the only ones that are considered. The situations, where Q is marked as F (False), will be the ones, which we are not especially interested in, because they indicate that there is no effective communication. The both other variables, T and P, do not have to appear necessarily for effective communication to take place. Thus, the author of the current paper claims that an appropriate set of time and spatial circumstances are not a basic features for effective communication. The character of the ancient art of rhetoric was adjusted to the specific needs of the Greek poleis. It were Athens with their direct- and micro-democracy as a political system, to profit greatly from their citizens being educated and trained according among others to the Aristotle's principles of rhetoric. These rules met the expectations and special requirements of the ancient societies, where the use of rhetoric was restricted by customs and procedures that would not be completely accepted nowadays. In this way the indications of Aristotle on rhetoric and Kairos that applied to the tradition of Greek private and public discourses can not be easily and fully transmitted to the modern theory and practice of communication, including intercultural communication. The proper use of different ways of argumentation, of course in a set of favorable circumstances, was prescribed by Aristotle as crucial for a medium to appear persuasive. However, such configuration, with an appropriate time or context, that was to obtain during the ancient Greek verbal communication, is difficult to be reached in the modern verbal communication. The regulations due to which modern conversations are held are not that predictable and much more susceptible to change than they were in formalized ancient Athenian society. The factor that the modern speaker can work on, dominate or rely on, is a chosen medium. So in other words, it is Q that plays the decisive role in modern communication.

One more remark should be made before going into the logical investigation. The abbreviation EC which stands for "Effective Communication" is always designated as T (Truth). Otherwise it would not exist. The positive result of communication means that EC occurs, so $EC \Leftrightarrow \text{True} \Leftrightarrow T1$. Four possible variations of T, P and Q, which are being put into examination, have been collected in the Table 1.

First condition of Kairos. This principle shows $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in its absolute form, when all elements unconditionally occur as true. This condition is the strongest one, because the situation of such kind is very difficult to achieve. The ideal conjunction of all true elements (T, P and Q) must take place if the effective communication is to happen. So: If T and P and Q are all true then EC is also true ($T \wedge P \wedge Q \Rightarrow EC$). So: If T and P and Q are all true then EC is true if and only T and P and Q are all true ($T \wedge P \wedge Q \Leftrightarrow EC$).

Table 1

Q (appropriate medium)	P (appropriate context)	T (appropriate time)
T	T	T
T	F	F
T	F	T
T	T	F

Second condition of Kairos. This principle is the second strongest condition to be fulfilled if *καιρός* is supposed to appear. There is a greater possibility that *καιρός* will take place if this condition is preserved than if the first condition of Kairos would be maintained. As it has been just mentioned, the configuration for the first condition of Kairos is extremely difficult to obtain, because it happens only in one case out of four, whereas the second condition is obtainable in all four cases. It is based on disjunction of T, P and Q, of course with Q marked as True, since this has been pointed as an indispensable factor of effective communication. In this case, effective communication is obtainable even if Q is True, P and T are False. So: If Q is True, P and T are True or False then EC is always True ($T \vee P \vee Q \Rightarrow EC$). In our set of objects, this condition is maintained for all four cases. So it is a tautology. The second condition of Kairos works also for other configurations such as for example: $[(Q \vee T) \vee (Q \vee P)] \Rightarrow EC$ or $[(Q \vee T) \wedge (Q \vee P)] \Rightarrow EC$.

Third condition of Kairos: Q-True Obligation. It says that *καιρός* occurs (= is True) only if Q, which is an appropriate medium for reaching one's goals, occurs (= is True). This rule results from pragmatics of language usage. Without Q, effective communication does not exist, because there is no appropriate medium, that would lead to communication success. Hence, in terms of logical evaluation process and creating propositional formulas, a variable $\sim Q$ (a negation of Q) does not exist, because if it does, it means that there is a failure in communication.

Fourth condition of Kairos: This principle also refers to Q as an essential condition for *καιρός* to occur (see: *Third condition of Kairos*). It says that if an effective communication is supposed to be involved, all three components do not have to appear necessarily, but at least two of them. Among these two elements, there must be Q which is obligatory in every case of *καιρός*. So the second element can be either T or P. So Q is True and from T and P one element is True and the other one False.

Let us now consider the following propositional logic formula $Q \wedge (P \vee T)$. This formula is equivalent to $[(Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge T)]$, because the sentence $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow [(Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge T)]$ is tautology (= is True). Now we have to prove whether these both equivalent formulas, based on disjunction of two conjunctions of Q with P and Q with T , lead to effective communication. For our examination we are going to use the left-side formula $Q \wedge (P \vee T)$.

So $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$ formula is going to be examined. The results of this verification have been inserted into the table below, where all the possible valuations have been shown (Table 2). Only True valuations for variable Q have been analyzed, because only if Q exists (= is True), EC may occur. If EC exists, it is always true: $EC = \text{True} = 1$. We examine the situation where there is a success in communication, so the right side of the formula is $\Rightarrow \text{True}=1$, so we are verifying if $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow \text{True}$.

Table 2

Q	P	T	$P \vee T$	$Q \wedge (P \vee T)$	$Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$	$Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow EC$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	F	T	F
T	F	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	T	T	T

It has already been proven that formula $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$ is a tautology. So also the formula $[(Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge T)] \Rightarrow EC$ is a tautology, because $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow [(Q \wedge P) \vee (Q \wedge T)]$. It has been also verified that formula $Q \wedge (P \vee T)$ is not equivalent to EC, so $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow EC$ is not a tautology: the $Q \wedge (P \vee T)$ sentence is not the only possibility to reach communication success. But the $Q \wedge (P \vee T)$ sentence leads to EC in every of the examined cases:

1) If Q , P and T are True then $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$ and $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow EC$. $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow EC$ is not a tautology, because the results are positive in three out of four cases.

2) If Q is True, P and T are False then $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$, but $Q \wedge (P \vee T)$ is not equivalent to EC. This particular case shows significance of Q within $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$. Q is the only attribute of $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ that is completely dependent from the person who is performing the action. It is only Q that can be carefully chosen in order to receive a proper goal. The other two factors, P and T , are not completely dependent from the person who is

making the action. They are always fluent and subjected to changes. It is very often impossible to control them directly. But the importance of Q consists of its ability to become superior and influential over P and T and overcome their non-existence so that this negative value of P and T does not interfere with the outcome of communication. Instead of this, Q alone, with no proper time and no proper context, leads to success in communication. This rule may be called *Q-Alone Paradox*.

3) If Q is True, P is False and T is True then $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$ and $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow EC$. The combination of two true elements, from which one is Q and the other one is T, even if P is False, leads to effective communication.

4) If Q is True, P is True and T is False then $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Rightarrow EC$ and $Q \wedge (P \vee T) \Leftrightarrow EC$. The combination of two true elements, from which one is Q and the other one is P, even if T is false, leads to effective communication.

The example above has proven the *Fourth condition of Kairos* and superior position of Q in a successful communication act.

4.1.1. Results

The obtained results can be summarized as follows:

1) The most difficult situation for effective communication to appear is when all three elements, which are appropriate medium, appropriate context and appropriate time, take place. This is the most complete and ideal example of effective communication. But reaching success in communication by co-existence of all these elements is the hardest configuration to achieve (First condition of Kairos).

2) Q-Factor means that an appropriate medium is the essential factor for effective communication. Appropriate medium must appear if effective communication is to happen (Third condition of Kairos: Q-True Obligation).

3) If an appropriate medium appears, appropriate time or context may also appear, but they do not have to (Second condition of Kairos).

4) If an effective communication is supposed to be involved, all three components do not have to appear necessarily, but at least two of them. Among those two elements, there must be Q which is obligatory in every case of *καιρός*. So the second element can be either T or P. So Q is True and from T and P one element is True and the other one is False (Fourth condition of Kairos).

5) Q-Alone Paradox shows the importance of Q that consists of its ability to become superior and influential over P and T, and to overcome their non-existence so that this negative value of P and T does not interfere

with the outcome of communication (it is also confirmed by the Second condition of Kairos).

The above stated conclusions show that the most important feature of effective communication is Q=appropriate medium. Q is involved in all of the configurations that lead to achieving success. Its occurrence ensures the positive outcome of communication process. If an appropriate medium is used, there can be no failure. Relying on an appropriate medium, if the appropriate time and context are not provided, means taking one's chances. However it rewards us with success. Examination of other factors that can have impact on communication has not been a part of this discussion. However, verifying the relations between medium, time and place (which are the attributes of effective communication itself) resulted in information which one of these factors has the decisive influence on communication and whose choice and application we should have in regard. Now we are going to investigate what the effect of these results on the practical aspect of the intercultural communication may be.

4.2. Practical aspect of Kairos in Intercultural Communication (IC)

The primary goal of any kind of communication, including IC, has been always efficacy in transmitting of thoughts, ideas or emotions. In most of the cases the communication process is based on verbal interaction, that of course does not exclude body language or proper intonation. However, non-verbal factors belong to the secondary supportive means, whereas a verbal medium is the most important and conclusive one. The efficacy of communication process, either intercultural or other kind, assumes that information will be transferred or agreement will be concluded in the shortest possible time, without any loss to the integrity of information conveyed in the right context and through the appropriate words. As it has been verified above, an appropriate medium plays the most important role in the act of communication. So how does it apply to particular conditions of IC?

Before investigating this matter, two remarks of crucial importance should be made. Both of them refer to the specific character of IC. First of all, IC assumes that verbal interaction takes place between the interlocutors of different national origins: a native speaker vs. a non-native speaker (foreigner) and a non-native speaker from country X vs. a non-native speaker from country Y (or in some cases between two non-native speakers of different origins living in country X). It may cause certain problems connected with distinct standards of behavior or problems related to different socio-cultural background and its relationship with a specific language, i.e. the ethnography of speaking (Duranti, 2005: 17). Although the different na-

tional status of interlocutors may vary, the biggest problem of IC remains identical: using the same language standard. It is not a case of having any knowledge of a certain language, but being able to use the same language correctly on a appropriate level of proficiency. This “communicative competence” as described by Hymes (Hymes, 1972: 277–278): “(...) is integral with attitudes, values, and motivations concerning language, its features and uses, and integral with competence for, and attitudes toward, the interrelation of language, with the other codes of communicative conduct”. If one’s “communicative competence” is high, the efficacy in communication, which consists not only of success in verbal understanding, but also enables social accommodation and proper functioning within a definite group, is more probable. According to Hymes: “participation, performance, and intersubjective knowledge are all essential features of the ability to ‘know a language’” (Duranti, 2005: 20). It is also worth mentioning that the relationship between culture and communication is mutual, because they both influence each other (Martin & Nakayama, 1997: 52–56).

The most popular global modern language, which is the most common medium for IC (both in private and official settings, e.g. political and business), is English denoted sometimes as “Lingua Franca” (Kowner & Rosenhouse, 2008: 5). According to Giles and Noels, the problems such as: negotiating how the participants of the conversation are willing to communicate, what language is going to be used or which linguistic code is the most preferable one, have strong behavioral background and pertain to the notion called Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles & Noels, 1998: 139). However, stereotypes, the problems “how individuals and social or cultural groups define themselves and others” (Yläne, 2008: 181), and “beliefs about the appropriate norms regarding language use” (Giles & Noels, 1998: 144) influence strategies of accommodation (“convergence” and “divergence”) and may have impact on different levels of accommodation, the use of particular language should be based on estimation of personal level of its knowledge. This knowledge ought to be as proficient as possible and can be exclusively obtained after some period of thorough learning, not only of the language structures, but also after becoming familiar with its *imponderabilia*, such as pragmatics or culture to which a specific language belongs. The version of language adjusted for learning should be a standardized form in all of its aspects, the same for everyone, for a native and for a non-native speaker as well.¹ It should be prepared af-

¹ For the discussion of the problem of accommodation between a native and a non-native speaker see: Janicki, 1986: 169.

ter considering all of the cultural discrepancies between the native territory and the territory to which learning of the specific language is going to be implemented. Only in this way, the probability of achieving communication success, whether one-sided or mutual, will be greater than ever due to the relevant cultural schemata that would be presumably shared (Žegarac, 2008: 65).

We are going to examine now in what way the conditions of effective communication derived from the tautological analysis of *καιρός* may be matched to the multinational aspect and one language standard of intercultural communication.

4.2.1. Time (T) and Context (P)

From the speaker's point of view, both of these features (T and P) are irrelevant for the effect of the communication process. "Being irrelevant" means in this case that the speaker is not able to influence them in order to exploit them for his own purpose. They are beyond his direct influence.

As it results from the practical aspects of communication examined in the tautological analysis of *καιρός*, an appropriate time is a feature which is very difficult to obtain. Success in communication cannot be based on T-existence, because it is almost impossible to say or predict with complete certainty when the right time is or when the right time for doing something will be. Expressions such as "taking the right time" are the perfect examples of wishful thinking. In a set of the three attributes of *καιρός*, T (time) and P (context) are the ones completely independent from the will of the speaker. All that one can do in order to reduce the possibility of occurrence of "a wrong time" is to search for premises, that would indicate the coming of "the right time". The results of this kind of action are very unstable, since discerning the premises of "the right time" raises many obstacles and even the general premises of "the right time" are hard to be pointed clearly. The probability of not taking the right time and being punished with failure in communication is very high and this risk cannot be eliminated.

The same situation is present in intercultural communication. If there is a native speaker and a non-native speaker, the first one has a sense of time (appropriateness of time) that is proper for culture and for language which currently is being used during the conversation, whereas the second one has the sense of time (appropriateness of time) that is proper for his native culture and language. In most of the cases non-native speakers are not trained how to profit "from time" within the frames of the specific foreign language and culture. Such inadequacy may cause many problems during the com-

munication process and prevents reaching successful communication. Misunderstanding is caused by different mental settings, “determined by culture specific knowledge” (Žegarac & Pennington, 2008: 142). As Žegarac & Pennington assume: “Misunderstandings of this sort involve the carryover of culture-specific knowledge from a situation of intracultural communication to a situation of intercultural communication” (Žegarac & Pennington, 2008: 142–143). The identical difficulty is when a non-native speaker is confronted with the other non-native speaker. This case is even worse, because neither of the speakers is provided with the suitable sense of time (appropriateness of time) for the specific foreign language. Intuition or time conviction, when exactly something should be done or said, developed for the purpose of the proper native language is not enough, if it comes to seizing the right moment within the foreign language discussion. Hence, focusing on time as on a decisive factor for reaching success in intercultural communication is pointless, if we are not able to determine clearly what moment of time is the right one for the effective action to be taken.

Everything that has been stated above applies not only to T, but to P as well. Putting words into the right context cannot be seen as an ultimately determining success in IC. Similarly to T, also P is a very unstable and prone to changes attribute of IC. The variety of elements, that have their influence on P, makes it difficult to estimate when the right context is going to happen. If the right context appears, it may lead to success in IC, but only within the special circumstances which are hard to be satisfied. For a specific culture and a specific language, which grants access to culture and its meanings, the appropriateness of context and the linkage of time and context differ from the ones typical for the other culture and language. Learning how to achieve the right context is almost impossible and sometimes even the native speakers have problems with doing it. It is so, because the moral and social conventions, motivation to use particular ways of speaking which result from the communicative behavior within a community (Hymes, 2005: 9) or the general standards of behavior typical for the cultural heritage,² whose reflection is language, generate the mixture that is full of nuances. These nuances are completely readable and under-

² This idea is included in Grice’s Co-operative Principle. As Žegarac described it: “Grice argued that human communication should be explained as a form of social interaction whose success depends on the interactants’ presumption that communicative behavior is driven by certain norms and rules” (Žegarac, 2008: 55). For discussion of other approaches to culture and communication see: Žegarac, V. (2008). *Culture and Communication*. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally Speaking. Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory* (48–70). Continuum International Publishing Group.

standable only for a select group, and only for those non-native speakers who have the most proficient and sophisticated knowledge of a given language within a given culture. For all the others, the risk of communication failure by choosing an inappropriate context remains at a very high level. That is why, the success in international communication cannot be based on the right context, i.e. “the relation between patterns of behavior, speech included, to their immediate as well as broader sociocultural context” (Duranti, 2005: 20), just as it cannot be dependent from the right time.

4.2.2. Medium (Q)

The only factor that can influence the other two elements, T (time) and P (context), and create the positive outcome of intercultural communication is an appropriate medium (Q). The choice of the most suitable Q is completely under the responsibility of the speaker. It is the speaker who decides what kind of medium seems to be the most suitable for him to obtain his goals. This practical aspect of Q makes this feature adjusted in the best possible way to the needs of the particular moment. As far as time is concerned, and to lesser degree also context, both these elements rely mostly on the propitious coincidence, which may or may not happen. Only using an appropriate medium provides one with the possibility of reaching success, as it has been shown in the results of the tautological analysis of *καιρός*.

Unfortunately, we are not able to see, whether the medium taken by us was a suitable one or not if only from the retrospection. Only then the outcome of the medium is clear. But still the choice belongs to the speaker. If the problem that is going to be solved has been well stated and the medium has been well selected, the chances of reaching success are very high. However the risk of making a bad decision remains and cannot be totally eliminated. But it should be underlined once again, that if the situation has been in advance carefully investigated and choosing an appropriate medium has been done with full recognition of the nature of the problem and the goals that a speaker is keen to obtain, communication profit, including the one in intercultural communication, is going to be reached.

In all the configurations of T, P and Q, Q is the last feature that remains the crucial one. Even if there is no right moment or context for a particular action, selecting the right medium is the key to success. An appropriate medium has an ability to overcome the obstacles, such as wrong time or context, because differently from these last two it refers directly to the problem itself. Whereas the appropriateness of time (opportunity to make an action) and appropriateness of place (understanding the problem from

the specific context) arise not from the nature of the discussed problem, but from their own cultural background. However, the perception of time and context during the discussion must be prone to some variations which are caused by the accommodation of interlocutors to each other. In this way, both time and context are seen in the specific currently given configuration. But the primary pattern of time and context remains always the same, closely connected with the specific culture. The only thing subject to changes is the problem itself and the selection of an appropriate medium.

What does it mean for intercultural communication? The conviction what should be done or said in the specific situation is developed throughout the years of the specific cultural education. But this cultural background loses its significance if it comes to intercultural communication and to choosing an appropriate medium (yet, the cultural background stays conclusive for time and context within intercultural communication). In terms of intercultural communication, choosing a solution (a word, or a phrase, or a gesture) is an issue related to comprehensive knowledge of the problem or goals to achieve, and to the ability to define and clearly express one's thoughts or ideas. The second condition may only be sustained if a specific language is being used on a proficient level. Therefore, deciding to use an appropriate medium is completely dependent from the speaker and almost irrespective of time and context. In the situation when the act of intercultural communication takes place between a non-native speaker and a native speaker, the second one is generally privileged due to his language skills. If two non-native speakers are involved, the greater chances to be successful has the one with greater language skills.

5. Conclusions

The multidimensional idea of ancient *καιρός* can be applied to intercultural communication. There are three main attributes of *καιρός*: appropriate time (T), appropriate context (P) and appropriate medium (Q). There is no model that would indicate how *καιρός* should be used for the purpose of intercultural communication. But creating such formula would enable us to be more effective in communication process. The analysis of the relations between T, P and Q has shown that the last feature has been the most decisive one for reaching successful communication. If communication process is supposed to be a successful one, Q must unconditionally appear. An appropriate medium is the only feature that is completely dependent on the speaker, which means that it can be formulated to fit his needs and

goals. The other two factors, appropriate time or context, are beyond the direct impact of the speaker and cannot be relied on when trying to obtain communication goals. They are not predictable and thus impossible to be controlled. Hence, the ancient rhetorical idea of *καιρός* that considered an appropriate time as its primary feature cannot be fully transferred to modern intercultural communication.

The model of *καιρός* adapted for intercultural communication must satisfy its two basic features: one language standard and multinational character. Effective communication as a positive outcome of intercultural communication must be also involved. The practical aspect of intercultural communication and tautological analysis of the whole problem has shown that the use of Q (appropriate medium) is crucial if the result of intercultural communication is supposed to be effective. In specific configurations of elements, T or P (T and P) occur or not, but being able to exploit the right medium remains decisive. The ability of selecting an appropriate medium requires thorough knowledge of the discussed matter, awareness of why this issue was raised as a problem in intercultural communication, i.e. a mediated discourse approach to intercultural communication (Scollon & Wong Scollon, 2006: 545), and clear identification of the communication goals. The proficiency in using a particular language is also demanded. These qualifications are necessary to be fulfilled if we wish to take advantage of *καιρός* and gain efficacy within intercultural communication. Besides language skills, the other ones are rather impossible to be taught.

The most important profit for intercultural communication from using an appropriate medium is the considerable reduction of risk of making a bad decision. The reduction of risk means that one has greater opportunity for being successful and therefore for being superior over his interlocutor. In every kind of communication, including intercultural communication, knowing how to conduct a discussion and what means of persuasion should be used in order to accomplish one's plans, is of paramount importance. What is more, the rules of effective communication derived from *καιρός* seem not to have any weak points. It is impossible to eliminate the risk of failure from intercultural communication. However, the probability of taking an inappropriate medium, completely dependent on the choice of the speaker, is still much smaller than the probability of relying on an opportune time or context, both unpredictable and not under the control of the speaker. Investigating a particular problem and then taking a risk, and making a right decision leads to success, while not being able to take such responsibility results in failure.

S U M M A R Y

The paper focuses on the idea of Kairos, which is one of the most important features of ancient rhetoric, and applies it to modern intercultural communication. The author's main concern lies within the question whether the act of intercultural communication could be more effective if the rules of Kairos would be applied to it. The research on the possible implementation of the rules of Kairos into the act of intercultural communication begins with pointing out the main characteristics of the ancient idea of Kairos and their division into three categories of time (T), place (P) and qualities (Q) which, in terms of the act of communication, stand respectively for an appropriate time, an appropriate context and an appropriate medium. Then, the relations between these categories are examined by means of a tautological analysis. The obtained results, that indicate the significant position of Q (an appropriate medium) in the process of the effective communication, are furtherly investigated in the subsequent section concerning the practical aspect of Kairos in intercultural communication. In the final conclusions it has been stated that the ancient idea of Kairos must be reformulated for the specific needs of intercultural communication before being applied to it.

