

## Use of Artifacts in Communication in Tiv

Alagh Emmanuel Iorhemba

Benue State University, Makurdi –Nigeria

talk2ealagh@gmail.com

### Abstract

The paper is an exploration of the nonverbal form of communication referred to as artifactual communication. This is an act of using artifacts for communicational purpose. Often, across cultures, people use different forms of nonverbal communication such as facial expressions, gestures, postures, and the use of these objects in peculiar ways which distinguish them from other groups. Although some of these aspects cut across many cultures, the ways in which they are used or what they stand for may differ. It is on this basis that the paper examines the role of artifacts in communication among the Tiv ethnic group. Towards this direction, the study selects some artifacts such as *indyer/filyu*, *korough*, and *ikyôôr* which have so much communicational value in Tiv for its analysis. Using Peirce's theory of sign, the paper explains how these artifacts are used in peculiar manner to communicate messages in Tiv. Also, based on the response from the oral interview held with some Tiv elders, the work interprets the rhythmic sounds from some of these artifacts, precisely *indyer and korough*. Explaining the effects of the use of these artifacts, the paper concludes that meaning in artifactual communication is culture-specific; it is dependent on the general world-view of a people. Thus, artifactual communication in Tiv is largely dependent on their world-view. The achievement of this paper therefore is its ability to have lucidly shown how artifacts are used in various ways to pass across messages in Tiv. It, indeed, illuminates and promotes artifactual communication in Tiv. At large, the paper contributes to the study and understanding of non-verbal communication.

**Keywords:** *Artifacts, Artifactual Communication, Sign, Object, Referent, and Interpretant*

### Introduction

Humans as social beings have constant interactions in order to foster development and progress in their society as well as promote good relationship. This is done by sharing of ideas, thoughts, emotions or feelings, among other things. And this process takes various forms of communication which include linguistic and nonlinguistic signs or signals. The linguistic signs include the use of oral or written words, while the nonlinguistic signs involve facial expressions, gestures, body contact, symbolic display of objects, and the like. All of these are succinctly categorised as verbal and nonverbal communications. Thus, verbal communication uses words to express ideas, thoughts, and feelings, while the nonverbal aspect does not use words but other signals.

This paper, however, is concerned with the nonverbal aspect. It specifically focuses on the use of artifacts as a form of communication. The work thus limits its scope to the Tiv cultural artifacts. The aim of doing this is to examine how these artifacts are used in peculiar manners in Tiv to communicate messages. This is borne from the fact that every society is marked by specific features that distinguish it from other groups. As such, it is not an overstatement that in the traditional Africa society certain aspects of life are unique and peculiar to Africa, distinguishing them from the western cultures. In this perspective, the paper finds the Tiv cultural artifacts as veritable objects of discourse. It explores the several ways by which these artifacts (such as the ones sampled in this study - *korough*, *indyer* and *ikyôôr*) are used in various communicative parlances in Tiv.

### Conceptual Clarification

The key point which draws ones attention in this study is "artifactual communication". What then refers to artifactual communication? To clarify this concept, we shall first draw insight into what communication means. Communication has been defined by many as the means or process by which humans share ideas, thoughts, experience, et cetera. In other words, it is an aspect of human social life by which ideas, thought or feelings are expressed. The aspect of engaging in arguments, sharing of ideas and experiences, impacting of knowledge, and so on are all regarded as communication. West and Turner (2010) contend that communication is a social process in which symbols are employed to establish and interpret meaning. To Chapell and Real (1984), communication is any means by which thought is transferred from one person to another. These definitions imply that communication does not only mean the production or use of speech to express thoughts or ideas, but it includes wordless signals. It is worthy of note that communication in general involves all signs signaling meaning.

In line with the above analogy, it is pertinent to define artifactual communication as the use of artifacts (as signs) to signal meaning. Artifacts themselves are objects made or modified by human culture, individual or a group (*New World Encyclopedia*). Artifacts are indeed portraits and images of real things and are symbolic to particular persons, groups or a community. It is the symbolic signification that makes artifacts useful in communication. Thus, we can infer that artifactual communication is the signification of meaning through the use of artifacts. Since it does not use words to pass on message, it is classified under the nonverbal communication. The knowledge of artifactual communication aligns one's thought with the paramountcy of material things or objects in communication. The appearances, that is, the wear and makeup on one's body, portray one's personality, culture and ethnicity. Each adorning feature has a particular motive, impression or signification.

The link between signs or symbols and what they signify depends largely on a group's perception. West and Turner (2010) maintain that artifactual communication, like other forms, exists between the encoder and the decoder communicating based on particular communication episode; it expands in meaning as individuals continue to encounter more experience. In this line of thought, artifactual communication relies on the acceptable conventional meaning by people who share similar or the same experience. This is because artifacts are themselves manmade objects which form signaling system and which serve to give information, not for any means and ends, but for the existence of culturally defined communication code. As vague as the symbols which are conventionally agreed to represent something may appear to some people, there are some strong cultural communicative values in their various settings. That is to say, where these artifacts are used as symbols for communicational purpose, there is usually some attachment to cultural and experiential indices of such a group that uses them.

In respect to this, the Tiv people of central Nigeria (Middle Belt) are not in any way excluded from the tradition of the use of artifacts for communicational purpose. It is not a misstatement that Tiv would have gained prominence in their use of artifacts for communication, had it not been the effect of modern form of communication. Even at that, there is still evidence found among the people living in villages. The fact remains that the usage of these artifacts today is very minimal.

### **Theoretical Review**

A discourse on artifacts as a form of communication falls within the scope of semiotics, a field which deals with signs and their meaning. Many attempts have been made to define the concept, sign; as such, several theoretical explanations have been advanced for clarity. Some of these definitions are functional, while others are constituent-base. The functional categories concern the role which an object (something symbolising something else) performs in particular domain(s). Constituents refer to the elements that make up something. This section discusses some of these theoretical explanations.

Featured first is Ferdinand de Saussure's work. Saussure (a French Linguist) was concerned with the structural features of language. His writings explored the relationship between words and what they stood for. Saussure sees the Sign as having two-sided psychological entities which link a mental concept of a thing (signified) to a sound pattern (signifier). However, Saussure draws attention to the fact that the connection between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary, for nothing makes a phenomenon to actually mean what it means.

Supporting this view, Lyons (1981) says that given the form of a word, "it is impossible to predict the meaning and, given the meaning, it is impossible to predict the form." Also, there are differences in meaning perception across peoples of the world. Notwithstanding, there may be some constraints, depending on the type of signifier and the situation, which could render this idea of arbitrariness invalid (Hebert, L. cited in [www.signosemio.com/elements-of-semiotics.asp](http://www.signosemio.com/elements-of-semiotics.asp)). But to summarise Saussure's theory, Lyons (1981) contends that the sign is not a meaningful form: it is a composite entity resulting from the imposition of structure on two kinds of substance by combinatorial and contrastive relations of the language system. Meanings cannot exist in isolation of forms which they relate with, and vice versa (pp. 221-222).

Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914) offers that a sign consists of three elements; the object, its representation, and its meaning. In other words, a sign is the object, the referent and the interpretant. The referent is the mental image pointing to the object, while the interpretant is the connecting sense. This is what brings about Peirce's semiotic triangle. Peirce further describes three types of sign the icon, the index and the symbol.

The icon is a sign in which the representation resembles the object such that there is clearly recognisable image of the "real thing". Video recording, photos, drawing and painting are typical examples

of the icon. For index, the referent is the consequence of the object and meaning is not crucial to the relationship. Smoke, for instance, is an index of a burning object, without considering who is there to interpret the smoke (Schneider 2013). This is true in that the smoke already brings one the impression that something is burning - without a burning object no smoke will trail.

Lastly, the symbol is considered as having neither connection nor resemblance between sign and object. Symbol relates to the object arbitrarily. By this summation, it is evident that Peirce's view is bi-directional in that there is interplay between conventionality (arbitrariness) and constituent-base meaning. That is to say sign meaning could be arbitrary or based on elements that are associated with an idea, thought, or concept (that is the object).

ECO (1979) maintains that signs are of different types and they work differently. Eco sees that the relations between the signifier and the signified are often not at all arbitrary. Schneider (2013) supports this view by giving an instance of falling rain: one who is woken up from a deep sleep by the sound of some heavy rain against one's bedroom window need not be told that it is raining; without looking outside, the sound already tells one what is happening. Therefore, the sound here is not an arbitrary connection with the rain.

Eco defines sign in terms of denotation and connotation. That is to say that meaning is not got only from the literal perspective but in depth. Connotation is a semiotic relation (or sign-function) constituting another semiotic relation. Schneider (2013) makes clear Eco's argument that a sign-function is the correlation between an expression and a content based on a conventionally established code (a system of correlational rules). Eco's view thus suggests that there is always a code through which an idea (sign) is expressed, and this code determines the meaning.

It is imperative to understand that sign language provides the glee for every communication. And, as maintained from the foregoing arguments, though signs have universal indices, their meaning may be dependent on the understanding of a particular people.

### **Empirical studies**

This section looks at empirical works of some scholars, which serve as reference points to this discourse. Forwarded here, first, is Rebecca Holman's (1980) work. Holman worked on "Clothing as Communication." This reveals how clothing has meaning beyond aesthetic appearance. In this line of thought, Holman reasoned that the meaning of clothing use in one social system, situation and role could be explained in terms of attributions to a user. Citing Levy (1959), Holman explains, "People buy things not for what they [(item)] can do, but for what they mean." In related sense, Robertson (1970) remarks that products vary in the degree to which social-symbolic meaning is important. Cars and clothing are both products which are high in visual display and recognised in our society as "saying something" about a person (Cited in Holman, 1980).

Rudrow (2014) on "Artifactual Communication: A Modern Approach to Understanding Communication through Nonverbal Artifacts." This was aimed at exploring phenomenology as a method used in explaining the usages of contemporary artifacts as a by-product of cultural materialism in modern approach to artifactual communication. In that direction, Rudrow examines how materialism works with artifacts to play a role in nonverbal and interpersonal communication as well as physical attraction.

Using phenomenological approach (an aspect of qualitative methodology), Rudrow finds out that artifactual communication, as opposed to the notion of absolutism in decoding artifactual messages, is based on approximation of meaning (arbitrary decoding). To this end, Rudrow's conclusion is that generalisation in decoding of artifacts is not a reliant ideology (not absolute) since decoding is anchored on approximations. Perhaps, Rudrow maintains that individuals should be cautious in their generalisation.

It is important to understand that Holman's work focuses on studying just clothing and particularly a single product situation for one social system. The major assumption made in this study and which serves as a strong thesis statement is that clothing use is communicative. To prove this assumption, Holman identified six different clothing messages and investigated the meaning of those messages. Holman thus concludes by recommending that communicating through products (such as clothing) should be done not in isolation of other forms of communication but integrative - both verbal and nonverbal.

Yina (2011) wrote on "The Metaphysical in Tiv Visual Artifacts." He observes the spiritual significance of these artifacts in the Tiv society. Expressing this spiritual significance, Yina makes reference to the Tiv god, *Aôndo Abaverijua* (the great creator-god-ancestor of the weighted penis). And according to him, *Aôndo Abaverijua* is the patheon of Tiv gods whose affairs are superintended by *Mbatarev* (rulers of the world of *Adzov*, spirits). *Adzov* in turn have *Mbatsavas* their agents. *Mbatsav* then are symbolically

endowed with *Akombo* which are “not only protective, cleansing and curative but also vindictive and retributive (p.63). Yina concludes that the presence of *Akombo* is usually made manifest in objects and images in wooden and clay materials. He maintains that cultural artifacts are simply the product of creative imagination but they are essential in poetic description and representation of the supernatural forces and their potency (p. 64).

Akaan, Agbedo, and Onukawa (2013) worked on “Nonverbal Communication: The Semiotics of Face Expression in Tiv.” They look at the linguistic representation of facial expressions in Tiv, thereby provide semantic descriptions of certain facial expressions. They therefore observe that, in as much as there are general universal recognitions of meaning of facial expression, some of these are peculiar to the Tiv culture.

This paper tries to examine how artifacts are used for communicational purposes. The study discusses how these artifacts, each of the selected ones, are used in special ways in specific situations or occasions. Like other studies, this work sees the symbolic significance in artifacts as based on a people’s world-view - Tiv being the case study.

### Theoretical framework

Charles Sanders Peirce’s theory of sign (1868) is used here as the plumb-line through which the accuracy of the walls of this work is measured. This was first presented in 1867 in a paper titled “On a New List of Categories.” The theory purports that sign is encoded in three elements of the object, the referent and the interpretant. Peirce sees that anything that somebody upholds as representing something in some degree or specific situation is a sign. In other words, “a sign...is something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity” (Chandler, 2014). As Peirce further observes, the interpretant is central to the concept of sign in that it connects an object and its referent.

Stressing the connection between the object, referent and interpretant, Yina (2011) avers that the relationship determines the precise nature of the process of semiosis (that is, the individual signs and their significations). The individual signs are the *icon*, the *index*, and the *symbol*. Icon is a sign in which the representative has the resemblance of the object such that the image of the real thing is hardly not recognisable. Drawings, photographs, and the like are good examples of icon; for their semblance to the real thing they represent is always visible. Index is the consequence of the object to which meaning is referred. The human foot print, for instance, is an index of somebody’s presence in a particular place. Symbol is the sign that does not have any semblance of either the object or the referent; thus, it is experiential and conventional. Yina (2011) maintains that Peirce categorised the three elements into “trichotomics” based on the kind of sign, the kind of ground, and the kind of object or interpretant - ground being a reference to a sort of idea. The trichotomies include: the trichotomy of logical possibilities; the triadic relations of performance, and the trichotomy of thought relation.

- Trichotomy of logical possibilities: This concerns sub-categories such as “qualisign”, “sinsign”, and “legisign”. According to Yina, qualisign is a quality which acts as a sign once it is embodied (to take a bodily form). The embodiment, however, does not have connection with its character as a sign. Sinsign is the actual existent thing or event which is a sign. This could involve several qualisigns. A legisign is the law that is established by men as a sign. Every conventional sign is a legisign. It is not a single object but a general type which is agreed to be significant.

- Triadic relations of performance: In this category, a sign may be regarded as an icon, an index, or a symbol. By virtue of being affected by the object to which it refers, the index has some qualities with that object, and it is to this effect that the index refers to such object. As earlier mentioned, icons are the objects that a sign denotes by virtue of characters of its own. On the other hand, index is that sign which gives reference to the object, while symbol is the sign which refers to the object that it denotes by virtue of a law, usually an association of general ideas, which operates to cause the symbol to be interpreted as referring to that object ([www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/Peirce2.htm](http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/Peirce2.htm)).

Trichotomy of thought relation: This category may term sign as “a rheme”, “a dicisign or dicent”, or “an argument”. A rheme is a sign which, for its interpretant, is of qualitative possibility; it is understood as representing a kind of possible object. A dicent sign is the one which, for its interpretant, is a sign of actual existence, while argument is a sign which, for its interpretant, is a sign of law. It represents its object in its character as sign ([ww.marxist.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/peirce2.htm](http://www.marxist.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/peirce2.htm)).

Peirce’s theory can thus be summarised as having to do with the mental image of an object on one’s mind, not only the physical appearance or structure of the object. That is to say that, sign does not only have

a physical effect but mental as well. All of what has been said implies that an object does not signify anything, unless certain values are attached to it. It is meaningful to state that artifacts (which are mere objects without meaning) are made significant with the special values accorded them. So, the paper deems this theory fit to explain the significations or communicative values of the artifacts used for analysis.

### Methodology

This work used a descriptive approach which takes a surveillant observation of the use of Tiv cultural artifacts as a form of communication. It however uses Peirce's theory of sign to support its discussion. In this instance, the researcher selected some artifacts and examined how they are used in various domains for different communicational purposes. To elicit information, in addition to the researcher's intuitive knowledge, some elderly persons (between the ages of 50 years and above) who had knowledge about these artifacts were consulted. These persons were either custodians of Tiv artifacts or close allies of the custodians and they were Kwende Gwaka and Patrick Yongoyar of Guma and Gwer Local Governments, respectively. For proper analysis and discussion, the recorded information (through phone recorder) was replayed for transcription and translation. The sampled objects – *korough*, *indyer/ilyu*, and *ikyôôr* were placed as plates, after which analysis was done against each of the plates. The work therefore discussed the individual objects based on how they are used in different instances for different communicational purposes. Also, the work interpreted some musical rhythms from two of these artifacts (*indyer/ilyu* and *ikyôôr*) in order to back up their communicational significance in Tiv. This was further represented in a "sign chart" and semiotic triangle.

### Data presentation and Analysis/Discussion

This section presents and discusses the selected artifacts; examines their uses or values especially in the aspect of communication. The items selected are *korough*, *indyer/ilyu* and *ikyôôr*.

#### 4 Korough (Horn)



In the traditional Tiv society, *korough* is an important object which serves one or two purposes, principally, communicational. *Korough* can be used for religious (fetishism) purpose where substances are concocted and stored in it for juju performance. However, some of these concoctions are helpful for treatment of ailments. In social milieu, *korough* could be used as a musical accompaniment to entertain. Since the ultimate concern of this paper is the communicative function of the objects selected, we shall place more emphasis on this aspect. But before any further explanation, it is worthy to draw attention to the types of *korough*. A personal interview with Gwaka Kwende (personal interview, Oct. 3, 2016) of Mbagwen, Guma Local Government of Benue State, Nigeria reveals that there are two types of *korough* – *koroughkumbatsav* (Mbatsav cult horn) and *koroughkunyamegh* or *kyôôrôugh* (luck horn). According to the informant, *koroughkumbatsav* is not a horn per se; it is a bottle field with concoction for ritual purpose. The second one is the horn got from animals like deer, antelope, cow, sheep, goat, and the like. It is this type that is used for war purpose, social gathering, music, communication, among other things.

In the light of the above, for communicational purpose, *korough* is used to summon people for emergencies of wars and social gathering, such as *kwagh-hir* masquerade and community meetings. Each of

these calls has peculiar sounds by which the people concerned differentiate their (sounds) meaning. The following throws more light to this discussion:

Clarion call for kwagh-hir

Rhythmic sound: u-ututu! u-ututu! u-ututuugh!

Transcription: ivacica! ivacica! ivacicaoo!

Translation: come all! come all! come all oo!

Clarion call for war

Rhythmic sound: uugh. . . ! uugh. . . ! uugh. . . ! (Many times)

Transcription: vi. . .ing! vi. . .ing! vi. . .ing!

Translation: si . . . lence! si . . . lence! si . . . lence!

From the above, it is interesting to see how the horn is used in different ways to convey certain information. In this case, the beats and the stress signal different messages. The typical Tiv person who hears this automatically knows for what purpose is the call. The call for *kwagh-hir* gives a frequently resounding rhythmic beats that signal peace and joy, “come all”. In terms of the call for war, the interpretation of the sound of the horn is that there is trouble in the land and silence everywhere; people should be aware of this and be at alert. According to Gwakaa, the Horner who signals such message stands on a tree to make sure the sound goes a long distance. And at the moment the people hear this sound they set for the point with alacrity, carrying their weapons. Thus, nobody in any Tiv community who has knowledge of these different sounds can mistake a particular call for another.

Indyer/ilyu (hollow-drum)



*Indyer* is another object used in Tiv for communication purpose. *Ilyu* is the small hollow-drum which is used essentially for nuptial gathering. Yina (2011) says, in addition to the nuptial role, *ilyu* is also drummed to announce the occasion of war, during which an alarm is raised and the message transmitted accordingly. However, *indyer* which is the bigger hollow-drum is mostly known for this function. *Indyer* is also known for announcing of the death of a noble or a very elderly person (especially, titled men). Gwakaa again maintained that, in many decades ago, *indyer* was used to announce to farmers the new planting seasons. This was normally done after the first and second rainfall of the season. Once this was done, nobody was afraid of planting (usually, it was millet), for they believed that, since the message was coming from the elders of the land who were seen to have studied nature, as well as, consulted the gods, nothing would go wrong. Nevertheless, *indyer* was not easy to possess as it was associated with *tsav* cult. In that case, one who possessed it was seen as *shagbaor* (a noble man); thus, *indyer* was a symbol for *shagba* (dignity/nobility) (P. Yongoyar, personal interview, Oct.3, 2016). Giving the war function of *indyer*, Gwakaa averred us with the following interpretation of message:

Akpelaikyarer (3×)

Gbagede (3×)

Shileiyol (ingigh [3×])

Translation:

Something bad has happened (3×)

Seriously (3×)

It is (perplexing [3×])

As soon as this message gets to any typical Tiv person, he understands the message without asking anybody. Rather, everyone begins to think of the next action to take and where the problem is coming from. The beats and the pitch of the sound interpret the meaning of such a message. The repetition of words or phrases is for emphasis, signaling the urgency and seriousness of this message - that any delay could be dangerous.

Ikyôôr (snail) shell



*Ikyôôr* (shell), like other objects, plays some important roles in the Tiv culture. This object is specifically associated with matters of fertility/infertility or impotence. In the past when Tiv had much respect for their culture, a girl who had attained puberty tried to maintain her dignity of virginity; she would avoid having sex with any man before she was married. If a girl had a premarital sex and, in the long run, was said to have the problem of child bearing, she would be required to go for *ikyôôr* cleansing because she had defiled herself. This made young ladies to avoid having conjugal relationship in order not to be afflicted by the curse of *ikyôôr*. The process of the cleansing rites was done by asking the man who defiled the girl's virginity to provide the materials (usually, a hen or a she-goat) for the proper ritual. In case the man died before such requirements, any member of his family was asked to make the provision. Once this was done, she became fertile. As for the man who went against the dictates of *ikyôôr*, there was severe infliction of waist pain and/or impotency or weak erection/erectile dysfunction (P. Yongoyar, personal interview, Oct.3, 2016). Even today, some of these things happen. Since *ikyôôr* deals with cleansing rites relating to birth, it is only women who no longer have sex that handle such affairs, for she was seen as a virgin.

How does this mystery around *ikyôôr* then figure out communicational value? One of the uses of *ikyôôr* is for prevention and protection against theft or improper handling of an asset. So, when somebody projects or places *ikyôôr* (shell) on a valuable asset, especially on the farm, the person is saying 'keep off', "don't touch", "it is a danger". Anyone who sees such a projected sign does not make attempt to tamper with what is being protected. In a related sense, any woman seen performing the rites of *ikyôôr* cleansing, sends automatic signal that she is 'revirginated' (no longer has sex).

### Applying the Peirce's Theory of Sign

The application of this theory here anchors on the facts that sign is encoded in three elements: the object, the referent, and the interpretant. This paper tries to appropriate the properties of each of the selected objects to their corresponding element. As such, it uses what is regarded in this analysis as the "sign chart" and Peirce's semiotic triangle.

#### Sign

Object	Referent	Interpretant
Korough	Rhythmic sounds	War and social gathering (eg. Kwagh-hir)
Indyer/ilyu	Rhythmic sounds	War, nuptial rites, death, dignity, etc.
Ikyôôr (snail) shell	Ritual display, shell projection on assets	Purity/purification/cleansing (infertility/impotence), danger (protection and prevention)

From the above illustration, it is clear that each of the objects selected represents a particular thing for a particular purpose in a particular situation. The chart shows the elements of sign and their correspondent

properties, while the triangles reflect both the elements and the types of sign. It is evident therefore to explain that in “triangle “A” the rhythmic sounds are the index for trumpeting of *korough* (icon), which is a symbol of war or social gathering. In triangle “B”, the rhythmic sounds are the index for *indyer/ilyu*, which is a symbol of any of these: war, nuptial rites, death, dignity, etc. Triangle “C” has index of the snail visible in either rituals or a projected shell on assets, symbolising cleansing of infertility/impotence and, protection and prevention (danger)

### Findings of the Study

The outcome of this research reveals that, apart from the communicational value of artifacts in Tiv, there are moral indices associated with them. One of such indices is the fear of being inflicted with the curse of *ikyôôr*, for instance, which makes the victim infertile or impotent. Such moral lesson cautions against fornication. The work also discovers that each of the artifacts has peculiar form of use by which messages are conveyed; for the same communicational purpose, an artifact could be used in special forms to express a particular idea. For instance, there are special patterns by which *indyer/ilyu* could be drummed to signal war, nuptial rites, death of a noble person, and so on. It is worthy of note that meaning encoding in the use of each of these artifacts is determined by the peculiar use of such artifact.

### Conclusion

The paper discussed one aspect of nonverbal communication. It drew a closer look at how artifacts are used in Tiv for communicational purpose. By doing this, the paper explored certain facts about these artifacts which are culture-base. Although from the discourse these artifacts served other purposes, the communicational aspect was given more consideration. It is evident from the discussion that artifacts occupy great position in Tiv, since most of them have moral implications on the people. The interpretation of meaning of the use of artifact in Tiv is highly dependent on their belief system or world-view. In view of the above, this paper recommends that Tiv should by all means maintain these cultural values for posterity since there are moral standards in the practice and use of these artifacts. Moreover artifactual communication is an aspect of the nonverbal form which complements the verbal aspect.

### References

- Akaan, S.S., Agbedo, C.U., & Onukawa, M.C. (2013). “Nonverbal Communication: the Semiotics of Facial Expressions in Tiv”. In *Nsukka Working Papers in Language, Linguistics, and Literature*. Vol. 1.1&2. 153-163.
- Chandler, D. (2014). *Semiotics for Beginners*. Retrieved September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016, from <http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/documents/S4B/Sem01.html>
- Chappell, R.T & Read, W.L. (1984). *Business Communication*. London: Macdonald & Evans.
- Eco, U.(1979). *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hebert, L. (nd.). *Elements of Semiotics*. Retrieved September 20, 2016, from <http://www.signosemio.com/elements-of-semiotics.asp>
- Holman, R. H. (1980). Clothing as Communication: An Empirical Investigation. In *NA-Advances in Consumer Research* Vol. 7, eds. Jerry C. Olson, Ann Abor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, pp. 372-377.
- Levy, S.J. (1959). “Symbols for Sale.” *Harvard Business Review*, 37, 117-124.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peirce, C.S. (1886). “Question concerning Certain Faculties Claimed for man” *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 2.2, pp. 103-114. On thought in signs, pp.112 Aribé Eprint.
- Robertson, T.S. (1970). *Consumer Behavior* Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman & Co.
- Rudrow K.J. (2014). *Artifactual Communication; A Modern Approach to Understanding Communication through Nonverbal Artifacts*. Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences. Vol. 13.
- Saussure, F.D.(1983). *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Roy Harris. London: Duckworth.
- Schneider, F. (2013). *A Rough Guide to the Theory of Semiotics*. Retrieved September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016, from <http://www.politicseastasia.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/character-ma400x1276opt.jpg>.
- West, R.& Turner, L. (2008). *Introducing Communication Theory: Analysis and Applications*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Yina, G. (2011). *Semiotics of Tiv Oral Poetry*. Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.
- [http://www. Newworldencyclopedia.org/artifacts/archaeology](http://www.Newworldencyclopedia.org/artifacts/archaeology). Retrieved September 29, 2016.