

The authoritative version of the article is to be found in:  
Chiara Bassetti, Emanuele Bottazzi, The power of rhythm. From dance rehearsals to adult-newborn interaction, in "Etnografia e ricerca qualitativa" 3/2015, pp. 453-480, doi: 10.3240/81725  
<https://www.rivisteweb.it/doi/10.3240/81725>

# The Power of Rhythm

## From Dance Rehearsals to Adult-Newborn Interaction<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

This is a theoretical and empirical contribution on rhythm in social interaction, meant to enlighten its role in the situated interactional “management” of power relations, in both ordinary situations and culturally-specific contexts. To this aim, we adapt the Weberian notion of charisma to the realm of micro-interaction, and we connect it to the dialectics between conceptual and nonconceptual aspects of interaction and rhythm. We further characterize charisma as that capability to set the rhythm in interaction, changing others’ beliefs at the conceptual level. This happens by leveraging, on the one hand, on the pleasure of being together in common rhythms and, on the other, on the compelling character of the associative dimension of interaction. The contribution is based on two ethnographic researches: one on the Italian field of theatrical dance, the other on the everyday interaction among a newborn, her parents and other members of their intimate circle.

**Keywords:** Rhythm, Power relations, Charisma, Dance rehearsals, Adult-newborn interaction.

[R]hythm is a compulsion; it engenders an unconquerable desire to yield, to join in; not only the stride of the feet but also the soul itself gives in to the beat - probably also, one inferred, the souls of the gods! By means of rhythm one thus tried to compel them and to exercise a power over them: one cast poetry around them like a magical snare.

(Nietzsche, *The gay science*, p. 84)

### 1. Introduction: pervasiveness of rhythm

Rhythm is intrinsic to human and social life (*e.g.*, Lefebvre, 1992) and constitutes a very good example of how much the “wordless” and nonconceptual aspects of everyday interaction matter (*cf.* also Liberman, 2013, p. 42). Indeed, such aspects are among the tools we use to order the world and to make sense of our experience of it —our *experiencing* it.

---

<sup>1</sup> The article is the result of a fully collective research endeavor by the authors. However, should sections be attributed, section 2 has been written by Emanuele Bottazzi; sections 3 and 4 by Chiara Bassetti; section 1 and 5 by both.

This dimension, basically, is institutionalized in the case of theatrical dance, that is one of the two empirical examples considered by this article. In dance, the meaning of a piece of choreography (and its meaning as an artwork) is primarily communicated to the public *via* “association” (Suppes, 2009), dependent on “intentional rhythmical movement” (Hanna, 1979), also defined as “abstract movement” (Merleau-Ponty, 1945)<sup>2</sup>. In dance, performers exploit rhythm for mutual coordination, eurhythmicization and to share the experience of the universe of meaning of the dance (cf. Bassetti, 2014a). In dance, choreographers use specific micro-techniques, such as rhythmic and evocative talk, to conceptually convey the properties of rhythmical movement.

Yet, rhythm is fundamental also in less sophisticated human activities, such as adult-newborn interaction, that is the second empirical case we take into consideration. We can see this case as a sort of “degree zero” of human communication, also called proto-conversation (Bateson, 1979). Being rhythm substantially connected to action and movement, and to the perception of both one’s own and others’ movement, it is part of the world the newborn experiences. It plays also a crucial role in the way adults make sense of their interaction with the baby —*i.e.*, the way they perceive, experience and (often tacitly) attribute meaning to the interaction.

Rhythm, furthermore, sheds light on the dialectics between the conceptual and nonconceptual dimensions of social life. On the one hand, we have the intersubjective *recognition of the experience of rhythm*, that is corporeal, sensorial and affective, “vibrational” (Henriques, 2010). On the other hand, we have the intersubjective *recognition of the conceptual meaning of rhythm*, which lays inside “the discourse of emotions or representation of feelings” (Henriques, 2010, p. 57), and can be defined as rhythm *objectivated* (cf. Liberman, 2012). We will see that the nonconceptual sharing of a rhythmical pattern at the bodily and kinesthetic level gets more easily accomplished than the sharing of a rhythmical pattern at the conceptual, discursive level. For instance, we will see how the nonconceptual sharing of rhythm in adult-newborn interaction, or among dancing dancers, is easier than the conceptual sharing of a choreographer struggling to communicate what s/he wants<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this article, we shall not discuss in detail dancers-audience interaction, yet it is worth noticing that a recent study showed that movement rhythms influence the affect of participants and their attitudes, and *moderate the influence of movement shape on attitude formation* (Koch, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> Something similar has been noticed by Pagis (2010, esp. p. 313) with respect to the difficulty of —and resistance to— translating “to a verbal realm” the experiences of meditation she was researching. Bassetti found such a resistance also among choreographers, when asked for instance “Which is the message you wanted to send?”, or “Which is the meaning of this choreography?”.

Within the framework of this dialectics and the question about social sharing that it raises, we can consider rhythm as a perspicuous research object to study pleasure and desire, with the underling power issues they bring in. Dancers' aim, in the end, consists in *captivating* the audience by arousing its aesthetic pleasure (*via* dancers' own kinesthetic pleasure). The same holds for adult-newborn interaction, where the ability to attract and sustain baby's attention is paramount (cf. *e.g.*, Gratier, Trevarthen, 2008). The analysis of rhythm in social interaction, therefore, is a good path—we believe—to answer questions such as the following: How does desire spread? How to empirically study affect and, more specifically, pleasure? How desire, pleasure and power intertwine in and through interpersonal interaction? How to define seduction? What is charisma?

In this paper we will address some of these very challenging questions in two ways, that is, by means both of an empirical, ethnography-based research and by a theoretical, philosophically founded one. This philosophical and empirical endeavor has as its ultimate purpose to be a contribution in social theory. Our specific research inquiries are two. The first one is about the intertwining among rhythm and the above mentioned conceptual-nonconceptual dialectics. Strictly related to the former, the second inquiry is about understanding the role of rhythm in a micro-analysis of charisma in interaction. It has to be noticed that this is not, strictly speaking, a research *on* power. We want more to present a promising research field. This is the reason why we aim at showing *how* power is at work in everyday interaction, and the reason why our notion of power is underspecified, so to allow for different approaches to tackle this research field.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present a philosophical development of our research questions. We start by highlighting the importance of rhythm in social interaction. Then we consider the Weberian notion of charisma and adapt it to the specific context of micro-interaction. We then see how the charismatic authority in micro-interaction leverages on the pleasure of being together in common rhythms. Further, we provide a philosophical clarification on the distinction between the conceptual and the nonconceptual domains in interaction. The main point here is that the conceptual aspect of interaction seems to be more fragile and prone to error than the nonconceptual one. This is important to understand how rhythm works in social interaction, being rhythm both conceptual and nonconceptual. We then see how the nonconceptual, rhythmic dimension of interaction gives a compelling sense of sharedness that might be misleading at the conceptual level. With this, we can characterize charismatic authority in micro-interaction. That is, to exercise a micro-interactional, charismatic power is to set the rhythm of the interaction to the extent to affect others' beliefs at the conceptual level. Section 3 and 4 are dedicated to the empirical analysis of the two considered cases, respectively, dance rehearsals and adult-newborn interaction. The empirical material comes from two ethnographic researches

conducted by one of the authors, both employing an ensemble of techniques including participant observation, qualitative interviews and video-analysis. One has been conducted on the field of theatrical dance, in companies as well as dance schools (2006-2009). The other one consists in a case study that has followed the everyday interaction and caring activities among a newborn, her parents and other members of the intimate circle, from birth to the first birthday (2010-2011)<sup>4</sup>. Finally, in Section 5, we draw some more general reflections on the impact of our research on the problem of intersubjectivity and on the relationship between bureaucratic and charismatic authority at the micro-level of situated interaction.

## 2. For a theory of rhythm and charisma in interaction

It is no mystery that human social interaction is accompanied by rhythms. Ancient philosophers seemed to be well aware of that<sup>5</sup>. In Plato's *Laws* the *sense (aísthesis)* of rhythm (*rythmós*) is a gift of the gods to the human kind; they have granted (*dedōkotas*) us the pleasurable perception of rhythm in a collective, social dimension, as in dances and games (II, 653<sub>b</sub>-654<sub>a</sub>). If it is not mysterious that rhythm accompanies social interaction, it is more complicated to individuate its specific role in this. Randall Collins (2008) uses the notion of rhythm in the context of the human propensity to read off the micro-interactional moves. According to him, humans “are hard-wired to get caught in a mutual focus of intersubjective attention, and to resonate emotions from one body to another in common rhythms” (p. 26). Besides sociology, as we have already pointed out (Bassetti *et al.*, 2013), systematic studies are nowadays conducted on rhythm in interaction, for instance, in music psychology, psycholinguistics, social psychology, cognitive sciences, and neuroscience. Some studies (Gill, 2012) focus on an embodied account of rhythmic entrainment that shows how in interpersonal and situated interaction humans are connected via rhythmic events, ranging from moment-by-moment timed syllables to bodily movements in locked-in phase. Bispham (2006, cit. in Gill, 2012, p. 116) individuates a continuum “ranging from a ‘loose subconscious use of pulse as a framework for interpersonal/turn-taking interactions as in mother-infant talk and linguistic interactions’ to a more strict adherence to pulse (groove) in group behavior and synchronicity of output, to maintain temporal stability and group coordination, in music and dance”. That is, it seems that being entrained does not only

---

<sup>4</sup> More information about data and methods of the two ethnographies can be found in Bassetti (2014a) and Bassetti (2014b), respectively.

<sup>5</sup> Contemporary philosophy seems not so interested in rhythm. Few exceptions are, in phenomenology, Schutz (2013) and, in analytical philosophy, Hamilton (2011), Scruton (2008) and Suppes (2009).

give a sense of well being among interactants (as in Plato), but also a sense of *sharedness* and belonging, as Durkheim noted with the notion of collective effervescence (Durkheim, 1912/1995). Rhythmic entrainment is then central in the understanding of the sense of being in accordance with others (Chartrand Bargh, 1999; Oullier *et al.*, 2008; Richardson *et al.*, 2005; Lakens, Stel, 2011).

In this work we choose to focus on a specific role of rhythm in social interaction, taking into consideration power relations. We choose to tackle this issue from a Weberian standpoint, by leveraging on the notion of charisma (from the greek *chárisma*, “gift”). As noted by Stephen Turner (2003), there is a lack of scholarly attention on the *empirical character* of charisma. Furthermore, it has been recently highlighted (Immergut, Kosut, 2014) that there are few studies considering the notion of charisma in *micro-interaction*. But there are none investigating *the role of rhythm in understanding how power is built-up by charisma in micro-interaction*. Again, Collins is one of the few aware of the importance of this, even if, strange as it may appear, he seems unaware of how much this theme is Weberian:

When the optimal number of people are working out in the gym—somewhere between about 6 and 15—there is a palpable feeling of being in the same rhythm. Everyone is pumped up, mutually focused, bodily entrained, energized. These are revealing micro-details. [...] Return to the Durkheimian model of interaction rituals. The group assembly that achieves rhythmic coordination and collective effervescence gives emotional energy and feelings of membership to everyone taking part. But some persons put themselves more in the center of attention, while others are at the outskirts, or even excluded. Those at the center increase their skills at dominating the group; they not only feel themselves in possession of the skills, but also feel emboldened, quicker to action, seizing the initiative and setting the rhythm. Those who are shunted aside, dominated or excluded lose a degree of their skills-in-interactional-use; they lose energy, initiative, their own sense of rhythm falters. (Collins, 2015, pp. 16-17, *passim*)

Collins’ point is to overcome the Durkheimian model of interaction, which is well suited to describe the sense of pleasure and sharedness related to collective entrainment. Nevertheless, more work needs to be done to give an account of the authority of those who “set the rhythm” in interaction. For this purpose, the notion of charisma needs be *adapted* in order to account for “a sociology of interacting bodies, motivated by a flux of emotions and succeeding or failing by the rhythms it sets up or washes out” (*ivi*, p. 17). We need to adapt the notion of charisma since this very notion was not meant to cover “matters of everyday life”, dominated by patriarchy and bureaucracy (Weber, 1968, p. 1111). Instead, charisma seems to *transcend* the everyday dimension, to hold for exceptional people in exceptional moments. We believe this exceptionalism of the charisma holds at the macro- and the meso-level of social life, the level where it makes sense, for example, to talk of the subjects of the charismatic authority as “followers” or

“disciples”, or to talk of the enemies of the charismatic leadership as bureaucratic agencies or permanent institutions. But if we look at the micro-level of everyday situated interaction, we can then see that there are always *those who are at the center*. This holds for the most basic activities of everyday life such as engaging people by telling a story, fascinating a class during a lecture, or dominating the gym floor.

Many of the elements highlighted by Weber seem to be adaptable to an idea of charisma in micro-interaction. We cannot analyze extensively all the features of charisma singled out by Weber. We will limit ourselves to a brief discussion of three of them. (1) “Charisma is self-determined and sets its own limits” (Weber, 1968, p. 1112). As in the gym example, the one leading is not appointed by any formal authority. The authority is given by proof, in the sense that setting the rhythm of the gym gives power in the interaction at stake. (2) “Charismatic authority is naturally unstable” (Weber, 1968, p. 1114). To have charisma in micro-interaction is not an intrinsic, necessary property of the person who exercises it. It is a necessary property of the *role* of charismatic leader. This means that whomever overcomes the leaders of the gym, by setting the entire gym to her/his own rhythm, becomes the leader up until some other person is able to do better. (3) “[C]harisma, if it has any specific effects at all, manifests its revolutionary power from within, from a central *metanoia* [change] of the followers’ attitudes” (Weber, 1968, p. 1114). Charisma has a clear effect on the beliefs of the people under its effects. The one who has the leadership, who sets the rhythm, gains a *status*, which is not simply at the level of bodily interaction. The change happens instead at the social level, that is dependent on intentional states (Weber, 1968). For example, the gain of status gives accorded *rights*, like a faster access to exercise machines, or a better place in the dressing room. This shows how Collins’ brief excerpt quoted above fits with this micro-interactionist adaptation of the notion of charisma. At the same time, it shows how this research direction is true to the spirit of the Weberian analysis.

Even if not everyone is able to set the rhythm, everyone has the sense, the *aisthesis* of rhythm. In this regard, it is interesting to see how charisma is intended as *gift*. *Chárisma* is a greek word that has a strong christian connotation (for example in 1 Cor 1:7), to such an extent that Weber emphasizes that his use of it is “completely free-valued” (Econ & Soc p 1112). *Chárisma*, as biblical scholars have insisted (Ong, 2014), comes from *charízomai* —to give, to show somebody favor— and not, as sometimes thought, from *cháris* —grace. Often translated as “*spiritual gift*”, in the roman age in which Paul was writing *chárisma* more simply meant *gift* (Ong, 2014), but a sort of gift of *favor* not given to anyone. If we go back to Plato, we now have an interesting view on the issue. According to Plato, the sense of rhythm is granted (*dedōkótas*) to humans by gods. In classical Greek, *dídomi* is mainly associated to gods. It is something that

Gods give in the sense that they *assign* something to mortals. Here we can isolate a contrast between the sense of giving as something granted to all humans (used by Plato for rhythm), *versus* something given by the divinity as a favor (viz. charisma). With this, we now have the means to phrase more precisely the relation between rhythm and charisma: there can be a charismatic authority of some people on other people *because* all of us humans share a common sense of rhythm.

But what's the import of this kind of sharing? To understand this we have to further investigate the notion of rhythm from a theoretical standpoint, introducing the distinction between conceptual and nonconceptual meaning<sup>6</sup>. Understanding what is a concept, or what it means to *posses* a concept, is far from being an easy task. Let us just say that, for some philosophers (*e.g.*, Peacocke, 1992), possessing a concept X is not simply the ability to recognize that something is an instance of X. This further has to be done by means of a reflexive process. For others, to possess X also means to be able to *justify* why an individual is classified as falling under the concept X (McDowell, 1994). Starting from such views, nonconceptual content can be defined as a kind of content that does not need to be structured according to reflexive processes or to justification. Gareth Evans (1982) was the first to introduce this notion for the content of perceptual experience and somatic proprioception. Adina Roskies (2008) gives a poignant example of this difference. Imagine you attend your first wine tasting with a friend who is a wine expert. It is very easy to imagine that what you find to be a fantastic complex red wine, is, for you friend, who possesses sophisticated wine-concepts that you miss, a full-bodied jammy Bordeaux with moderate glycerin content and so on and so forth. Here we could say that you and your friend might have a similar experience, but for sure different concepts to characterize it. Not only this, but for some parts of this very experience, with respect to your oenophile friend, you lack any conceptual grasp and have only nonconceptual perceptions.

Going back to the experience of rhythm, it shows even more strikingly the importance of the nonconceptual realm. We gave a negative characterization of nonconceptual content, in opposition to what it means to possess a concept. But is it possible to offer some positive characterization of nonconceptual meaning? Patrick Suppes (2009) isolates three notions of meaning. The first notion of meaning is that one of formal definitions of mathematics, as in defining subtraction of two real numbers; the second one is the dictionary definition, the meaning a word that is to be looked up in a dictionary. These two senses of meaning are always conceptual, in both cases we can have a reflexive attitude or give rational justifications with respect to the application of

---

<sup>6</sup> For some overviews of the literature on nonconceptual content see Toribio (2007), and Bermudez and Cahen (2011).

a mathematical notion or of a word. But there is a third notion of meaning that is far less obvious to characterize:

If these two meanings sufficed in a simple way as a complete theory of meaning, a lot of philosophical and psychological literature on meaning would have to be regarded as superfluous and irrelevant. But this is not at all the case. I may say to a friend, in a disapproving voice, Is not the meaning of your action clear to you? In another conversation, I may remark, The meaning of that music never got through to me before. (Suppes, 2009, p. 160)

The meaning that we are conveying in this third case is *associative*, which implies an activity that is, as Suppes call it, “utterly promiscuous”. In associating images, perceptions and memories, we are driven by emotional and contingent activities, in a process that is neither reflexive nor justificatory. The domain of associations, beside being affect-laden, is also, often, action generating (Gendler, 2008). In interaction, the rhythm is constituted by the way one’s action associatively resonates with another one’s. In this sense, the experience of rhythm has an associative nonconceptual meaning. In rhythm, the associative dimension and the action generation go strictly together. Rhythm, indeed, implies movement not just because rhythm is a feature of some movements, but also because, as Plato says (*cit.*), it is the pleasurable perception of rhythm, and, we could add, its associative, nonconceptual character, that causes us to move.

The experience of a rhythm is not fully nonconceptual either, and this holds because, for example, we can write poems (that read out loud are rhythmical), because we can write sheet music (that guides actual performances that are rhythmical too) and also because we can theorize and formalize, even if partially, rhythms<sup>7</sup>. This means that we can provide criteria to judge if a specific movement is classifiable under a certain kind of rhythm or not, and this activity is, as we said, conceptual. The conceptual aspect of rhythm could have two important consequences. The first one is related to the interaction. People in their interactions discuss and talk about rhythms, rhythms can be taught and transmitted in a quite formal way, and this leads us to the possibility of investigating the presence of bureaucratic authority in interactions which explicitly involve rhythm, such as dance rehearsals<sup>8</sup>. The second consequence is more epistemological and is that it appears to be possible to pursue significative research on rhythm, despite its seemingly elusive character due to its deep nonconceptual aspect. But if we consider the conceptual level of interaction, we find ourselves in a problem

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, there are in music many attempts to formalize rhythms. One of the first attempts explicitly focused on rhythm is given by Messiaen (1994), for a recent example of mathematical formalization of rhythm see Andreatta (2011). On the fact that rhythm is just partially formalizable see Hamilton (2011).

<sup>8</sup> Even if, as we shall see (Section 3.2), to effectively convey how to produce a rhythm is something that cannot be accomplished by conceptual means only.



that we could call Wittgensteinian, a problem that obviously does not invest simply the conceptual aspect of rhythm, but the conceptual level of interaction in general.

In a previous work (Bottazzi *et al.*, 2014), leveraging on Wittgenstein's (1953/2009) "rule following considerations", on their famous Kripkensteinian interpretation (Kripke, 1982) and on logical analysis, we cast doubt on the view that we interact in virtue of concept sharing. Instead, there is no easy way to assess that we share our concepts, even conceding that we are able to share the same perceptual content. Moreover, we argued that the fact that we have no means to assess that we share our concepts does not block the interaction. When we interact, we do not have the means to know what rule the others are exactly following, or what concept they are applying, or even if they are following any rule at all or applying any concept. We try to find a way to fit a situation with others by reading off others' *moves*, their actions and their reactions according to our moves. One identifies the behavior of others as following some certain rule and then behaves accordingly, by doing some interactional move. Suppose then that her/his move is accepted. This could give her/him the confidence that s/he is following the same rule as the others, but there is always the possibility of just a simple coincidence of behaviors, because "any course of action can be made out to accord with the rule" (Wittgenstein, 1953/2009, §201). There is always the possibility to end up in a systematic illusion of sharing rules, concepts and meanings. Even if we do not have the space to elaborate this issue, it has to be noticed that the problem of what is to share meaning is one of the points of departure of the phenomenology of social reality—that is, what is called the *problem of intersubjectivity*. Schutz's negation of the transcendental character of intersubjectivity (Schutz, 1966), and his view on social constructs as taken for granted until counter-evidence and of perpetual risk of misunderstanding (Schutz, 1962) are certainly close to our considerations. Our version of this "phenomenological illusion" is that concepts can be internally experienced by each interactant as actually shared, since they are based on "correct" (but just "up until now", before the other breaches them) predictions, on coordination of moves, and on mutual agreements. However, nothing prevents that we are just going on in the game of interaction by trials and errors, or better, by (implicit or explicit) acceptances and refusals, and no meaning is actually shared between us.

We do not want simply to make a point on the limits of conceptual sharing, we want to use this to give an understanding of the specific role that this limit has on power relationships in rhythmic interaction. To understand this, we need to recap what we assessed in this section. We started our discussion by highlighting the importance of rhythm in social interaction, then we moved to sketch an adaptation of the notion of charisma in micro-interaction, establishing that the charismatic authority in micro-interaction leverages on the pleasure of being in common rhythms. We then highlighted

the importance of having a philosophical clarification on the distinction between the conceptual and the nonconceptual aspects of rhythm. We argued that what is shared *via* a nonconceptual interaction is not the same of what is shared in the conceptual one, partly because conceptual interaction is intrinsically prone to misunderstanding. Given all these observations, we can now explain the peculiar role of charisma at the micro-interactive level when we share a common rhythm. Being entrained in rhythm can always misguide us: sharing some rhythm at the nonconceptual level could make us think that we are also sharing the conceptual content of the interaction at hand. While we are interacting, there is always the possibility that we are sharing nothing but the physical, that we are, as Collins says, “interacting bodies”. The conceptual interaction we are experiencing is subjectively actual, but there is no easy and rationally justified way to determine that the content of this “conceptual experience” is actually shared among the interactants. We said before that Weber considers a change in beliefs as a clear effect of charisma<sup>9</sup>. But if this conceptual dimension is always exposed to the “phenomenological illusion”, then by manipulating rhythm we have a power effect, inducing an impression of sharedness at the conceptual level. The charismatic leader in a micro-interaction exerts her/his seduction (consciously or not) at the level of the nonconceptual, but given the other, conceptual face of rhythm (and the sense of sharedness it provides), this creates in the other interactants a sense of *objectivation*, a sense of sharing the very same conceptual meaning. This is what builds beliefs on what is the *status and the powers* of the participants<sup>10</sup>.

### 3. Dance rehearsals

Let us start with one of the most sophisticated usages of rhythm: the one involved in theatrical dance. Clearly, rhythm plays an important role in that bodily activity which is dancing: it is a part of the latter. It plays an even more crucial role in dancing together, where its entraining power is exploited to coordination and synchronization ends, and where sometimes it must even be resisted for the sake of “correct” enactment (Section 3.1). However, rhythm has a role also in conveying the specific and detailed properties of dancing when the latter is framed as artistic activity to be transmitted (*i.e.*, a bodily activity to be taught-to-be-performed). This allows to investigate the dialectics of

---

<sup>9</sup> We insist that this is due to the compelling effect of the nonconceptual, that is, to the action generation of its associative, emotional character. On the peculiar relationship among charisma, beliefs and unconscious associations, see also DuPertuis (1986).

<sup>10</sup> A change at this level of status and powers can have in time a more extended effect, that is, it could be the link between the situated level of micro-interaction and the macro- and the meso- levels where charisma is traditionally applied. Obviously, much more work needs to be done to support this thesis.

conceptual and nonconceptual means by which intentional rhythmical movement is passed on—that is, is shared in and through interaction (Section 3.2).

### 3.1. *Experiencing together rhythmical movement*

When the issue is *dancing together*, synchronization and, more generally, eurhythmicization are particularly relevant. Mostly, indeed, dancers do not only dance, they dance “together with”; they do not only have to embody their movement sequences, but also the whole collective performance as an interactional system, as a universe of meaning (cf. Bassetti, 2014a). This calls for coordination at the kinesthetic, rhythmical level of the lived body and its *aisthesis*.

The choreographer explains [...] “We must find the cadence by rehearsing over and over, we must feel it. We must feel one with each other and be together” (Fieldnotes, 3 March 2008)

The choreographer stops the music: “Manu, you simply cut it, whereas Paola makes it more breathed. It must be the same energy of her, try!” (Fieldnotes, 10 July 2008)

It is about to “find”, through repeated collective practice, and to “take”, to embody an isorhythmic coordination with fellow dancers. It is about to learn to feel them when co-inhabiting the same *aisthesis* with them. “They experience a common mood that builds up into the intense feeling of bodily-and-emotional coordination” (Collins, 2015, p. 15). As Albert (this volume) shows through a detailed example, the same holds for partner dances such as Lindy Hop.

On the other hand, if it is true, as we just saw, that rhythm can bring you *into* the dance—into its movement dynamic (cf. next section), mood, universe of meaning—, it is also true that rhythm can drift you away from correct enactment. Indeed, dancing together does not simply amount to be mutually coordinated and synchronized, to produce the same rhythmical movement; it also amounts to produce a specific, qualified rhythmical movement (*e.g.*, “simply cut” vs. “more breathed”)—even if, as we shall see in the next section, to conceptually describe what is the correct rhythm is not an easy task, and to share a conceptual description of rhythm is different than sharing the experience of rhythm. In the following example the choreographer opens a correction sequence—that shall last several minutes and shall involve also exemplar bodily demonstrations— by calling for dancers’ attention and *resistance* to the power of music and its rhythm. The latter, in fact, hold the power to “inspire choreography”, that is, the power to drag dancers into the universe of the musical rhythm and to make them “chanting” some movements rather than enacting them with a more regular and periodical rhythm that contrasts with the musical one.

The *cambré* are not chanted. You must pay attention, because you adapt the sequence to your own needs. In this case, it’s true that the music inspires choreography, but the- if I make you do this

sequence with a metronome, you should enact it as I told you. Therefore, from here it is [starts demonstrating] (Videorecordings, 7 May 2007)

All dancers make the same “mistake”. This is because the error is caused by the surrounding musical rhythm to which *each* dancer is exposed. Furthermore, being exposed *together* to the same rhythm, dancers tend to synchronize with each other, so that the error spreads, so to speak. As various scholars noticed (e.g., Gill, 2012, p. 119), indeed, rhythmical entrainment is very hard to resist. In other words, everybody make the same mistake since *each and every* dancer perceives the rhythm *and* perceives the effects of that rhythm on the fellow dancers. They do not only share the same experience, but the same experience together —they share a particular *aisthesis*. And this is fully nonconceptual.

### 3.2. *Teaching to perform rhythmical movement*

Dance is about *what* movements to perform, *when* to perform them, and *how*. “How” refers to the qualities of movement: that is, (a) to the minute kinesthetic details of each movement and (b) to the rhythm of movements (sequential and/or co-occurrent) enactment, *i.e.*, what dancers call the *movement dynamic*. How to convey all this? Besides exemplar practical demonstrations, how do teachers and choreographers explain what they want? And, more specifically, how rhythm(ical movement) can be conceptually described, objectivated and thus communicated? As we are about to see, in such an attempt, other nonconceptual aspects of human conduct —in particular of talk — fall into the picture anyway.

If “what” and “when” to perform *can* be conveyed by means of sentences with a semantic content that is conceptually structured, this does not completely hold for the movement dynamic. Knowing that “Plié is on seven, uh!” (Fieldnotes, 6 December 2007), for instance, does not suffice to properly perform a dance sequence; it just gives you *movement plus tempo*, you still have no clue about the *rhythm of moving*, for which something like “more breathed” (cf. above) or “more muffled” (cf. further) works better. Movement dynamic, indeed, is nonconceptual and, therefore, it is mainly conveyed through (a) the evocative, metaphorical —*i.e.*, associative— dimension of language (cf. also Bassetti, 2009, pp. 341-344) and (b) the prosodic features of speech (*i.e.*, the nonconceptual features of verbal conduct).

Starting from the latter, what we call the *rhythmic talk of dance teaching* is constituted by three main components:

- *counting the tempo*: e.g., «One two ↑an’ three ↑an’ four (.) fi- six ↑an’ seven ↑an’ eight» (numbers plus prosody);

- *saying the sequence*: e.g., «One two (.) three four (.) five flex tip change» (numbers and names/descriptors<sup>11</sup> plus prosody);
- *mimicking the rhythm*: e.g., «la:: pa:: stra pa (0.1) an' ta (.) an' ta (.) an' tim an' ba» (vocables plus prosody).

And yet it all happens together:

Demi (.) a:nd (.) demi ke:ep >then grand plié, yes< seven-eight, towards ri:ght two-three-four >put the we:ight< .hhh ro:nde (.) fourth (0.3) demi (.) demi (.) port de bra::s-ta-ta, to the left two-three-four, †tendu (Videorecordings, 7 February 2007)

A further example helps us clarifying how, in conveying the rhythm of moving, what is crucial is prosody—that is, the rhythm and tempo of talk (cf. Auer *et al.*, 1999)—rather than the semantic content.

E (0.5) vum (.) vum (1.2) pa-. Together. (0.5) Pam (.) pam (1.2) vum. (Videorecordings, 7 March 2007)

Here the choreographer makes use of interchangeable vocables, but keeps pauses ratio unchanged: xxx (.) xxx (1.2) xxx. Rhythm (of movement) is what is to be conveyed (through rhythm of talk); all the relevant meaning is there, not in syllables. The rhythmic dynamic of speech mimics the rhythmic dynamic of movement in order to pass on the latter.

Moreover, as mentioned above, prosody often goes hand in hand with—and is actually part of—evocative talk:

[The choreographer asks] to show the difference between «the energy of the accent» and, instead, the «more muffled» movements between one accent and the other one, «otherwise one sees a whole general movement, whereas I want that one sees (0.5) spots! A lot of spots, pum (.) pum (.) pum». (Fieldnotes, 6 June 2007)

Finally, rhythm in both talk and bodily conduct (gesture, movement)—that is, the rhythmical aspects of verbal and nonverbal conduct—can be used also to convey other-than-rhythmical qualities of movement (the other half of “how” to perform, in a manner of speaking). For instance, rhythm can be exploited to put emphasis on a detail of a particular movement, such as how to move pelvis in performing a *tendu*, and to underline, make visible and thus recognizable the difference between “correct” and “incorrect” movement enactment (dichotomous differential demonstration). In the following excerpt, the teacher is correcting students after their execution of a *tendu* sequence; she does so by both talk and bodily exemplar demonstration.

It es:cape:d uh (0.5) either going or returning.

Instead [straight (.) straight (.) straight (.) straight (.) Strong-strong]

---

<sup>11</sup> Names of academic steps, that is, codified movements (e.g., “flex”), and situatedly meaningful descriptors of non-codified movements (e.g., “tip” for “lean the tip of the foot on the floor”).

[Enacts 5 correct tendus ----- ]  
 It is visible when you rest on this leg [...]  
 it's visible this (0.3) [doeing (.) doeing (0.3) doeing (.) doeing]  
 [Enacts 2 incorrect tendus-----]  
 Oke:y? [Down (.) up (0.3) down (.) up] >Instead no!< [Still-still (.) strong-strong]  
 [Enacts 2 incorrect tendus - - -] [Enacts 2 correct tendus- -]  
 (Videorecordings, 7 March 2007)

Whereas “doeing (.) doeing (0.3) doeing (.) doeing” and “down (.) up (0.3) down (.) up” accompany the incorrect demonstrations of the *tendu*, “straight (.) straight (.) straight (.) straight” and “still-still (.) strong-strong” accompany the correct ones. The rhythmical aspects of the teacher’s verbal conduct contribute to make recognizable the difference between correct and incorrect movement enactment, whereas the verbal content of her talk enlightens in what such a difference resides.

To conclude, even when engaged in an activity aimed at the objectivation of rhythmical movement, with the further purpose of transmission, communication—that is, when oriented to the conceptualization, formalization and, one could say, bureaucratization of rhythmical moving—some nonconceptual aspects of this bodily doing need nonconceptual means such as prosody (rhythmical talk) to be communicated, and perhaps also “semi-conceptual” means such as evocative talk, which bridges the conceptual and the nonconceptual by allowing associations.

#### 4. Adult-newborn interaction

Precisely thanks to its bodily-groundedness and nonconceptual aspects, rhythm holds a fundamental grasp on the emotional dimension of social interaction, and can be exploited more or less strategically for emotion work (*e.g.*, Hochschild, 1979). In an article on boat racing, for instance, Anthony King and Mark de Rond (2011, pp. 581-582 especially) analyze how designated members of the crew “actively sought to engender crew cohesion especially through their careful use of language and tone in a way Katz has observed in his work on emotions” (*ivi*, p. 581). This is regarded as a “subterranean repertoire of concrete micro-techniques and practices” (*ivi*, p. 583). Gill (2012) states that “our production and perception of sound, be it in music or language, are intrinsically bound with the physiological and motor system” (*ivi*, p. 117) and that “[e]ntrainment facilitates social bonding” (*ivi*, p. 118). Far from being exclusively characteristic of highly sophisticated concerted practices such as dancing or racing, the capability of being entrained is a basic “skill for being in flow and is evidently learned from birth, through ‘motherese’” (*ibid.*).—which can be considered as one of the micro-techniques mentioned by King and de Rond. Leveraging on Miall and Dissanayake (2003, cit. in Gill, 2012), she further explains how motherese serves both

in facilitating emotional attachment and in attracting and sustaining the baby’s attention —something that clearly resonates with seduction and charisma, if we just bother to disperse the moralistic fog that often clouds people’s mind when talking about children.

4.1. *Seduction: catching attention, gaining situated status*

We shall start with an example that illustrates the seductive power of rhythm, its pleasurability, and its strategic use by the adult. As we shall see, the baby responds to adult-generated rhythms as much as the adult responds to the newborn’s attentional dynamic as showed by gaze orientation and body movement.

The newborn sits on the table, with two women, one per side, keeping her back; in front of her, another woman, holding two glasses, starts beating them one against the other (Figure 1). The interactional sequence that follows is summarized in Table 1.

	Adult	Newborn
00.00	Beats glasses one against the other with regular <b>cadence</b> . Arms up and slowly moving from right to left.	<b>Follows</b> glasses with eyes. <b>Shakes</b> legs around.
	<b>Stops</b> beating glasses.	<b>Detaches</b> gaze from glasses (distracted by something on the table).
00.05	Lowers arms bringing elbows to the table. Starts smiling. Restarts beating glasses with regular <b>cadence</b> .	<b>Gaze back</b> on glasses. Hides faces behind the dress ( <b>gaze away</b> from glasses). <b>Gaze back</b> on glasses. Keeps manipulating her dress.
	<b>Stops</b> beating: “Pretty little face!” Starts beating with 3-beats-plus-pause <b>rhythm</b> (R#1). Sticks out tongue during first pause.	<b>Shakes</b> legs around.
00.10		Bites her dress but gaze stays on glasses.
	<b>Stops</b> beating glasses. Starts lowering forearms, thus <b>glasses towards</b> the table and the baby.	<b>Reaches out</b> with arms and hands for the glasses.
	Restarts beating with a more <b>complex rhythm</b> (R#2) and with <b>arms progressively raising</b> up.	Lowers arms for an instant, then extends and <b>raises</b> arms. <b>Blinks rhythmically</b> while raising chin and gaze.
00.15	Brings <b>elbows to the table</b> , <b>stops</b> beating and laughs: “hehehe” .	<b>Lowers</b> arms. <b>Gaze still</b> on glasses.
	Restarts beating glasses with 3-beats-plus-pause but <b>quicker rhythm</b> (R#1 bis).	<b>Shakes</b> arms and legs around.

**Table 1:** Synthesis of adult-newborn interactional sequence (September 19th, 2010: 15.03.20-38)

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

**Figure 1:** A snapshot from the video of September 19th, 2010

The production of a cadenced noise by the adult catches the newborn's attention (gaze following glasses, shaking limbs). The baby's momentary distraction (gaze on the table) makes the woman stop beating and lower glasses, thus bringing them nearer to the child. The latter's gaze, therefore, comes back on the glasses; the woman smiles; the baby, seemingly embarrassed by that, temporarily hides behind her own dress. The woman, then, starts again beating glasses with a regular cadence and, once the newborn's gaze is back on them, after a piece of talk that appears to acknowledge such a fact ("Pretty little face!"), she passes to a more "sustained" rhythm —a proper one, actually. The baby seems engaged: her legs moved and shaken, her eyes fixed on the glasses, even if/when she keeps manipulating/biting her dress. Such a state of affairs shall hold until the end of the sequence.

The woman, on her part, keeps producing rhythmical noise, except for a couple of interruptions (00.00.11 and 00.00.15) during which she brings glasses nearer to the child. Furthermore, she progressively increases the complexity of the produced rhythm and of her body movement as well. Indeed, she passes from

R#1: ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (0.3) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (.) ((beat))

to

R#2: ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (0.3) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (0.3) ((beat)) (.)  
((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (0.1) ((beat)) (0.1) ((beat))

The second rhythm is also accompanied by the movement of the arms that progressively raise up along a vertical line which is also a vector of distance with respect to the baby's body. Finally, she goes back to R#1 but makes it slightly quicker (R#1bis).

The newborn is more and more engaged in the activity, as showed by gaze orientation but also by her corporeal engagement. Indeed, she blinks rhythmically and extends her arms during the production of R#2; she shakes arms and legs during the quicker reproduction of R#1 (R#1bis); and she follows glasses movement not only with her eyes but also with her hands and arms, as we can see from the greater and greater coordination between the woman's and the child's arms movements (00.11-00.15, see red bold in Table 1).

Half a minute later in the interactional sequence (00.00.45), the newborn bodily engagement becomes "frenzied" in the face of an even more complex rhythmical performance by the woman. The latter, indeed, beats glasses one against the other with a



quick 3-beats-plus-pause rhythm which contains two variants, so to speak, with respect to the previously enacted one (R#1bis): during the pause, the woman (a) verbalizes “Ho:p!” and (b) raises glasses up, thus away from the baby<sup>12</sup>:

R#3:            ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (0.1) Ho:p! (0.3) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (.) ((beat)) (0.1)  
Ho:p!

The baby, gaze held on the glasses, shakes arms and legs altogether rather quickly.

The one who sets the rhythm is the charismatic leader of the interaction at stake, and, as we said, gains a situated status. In this sense, it is also worth noticing that nor the two women holding safely the baby, nor the others at the table ever tried to interfere in the above recounted adult-newborn interactional sequence. On the contrary, they behaved like an audience (similarly as the crowd attending Jesus’s “performances” —cf. Collins, McConnel, 2015)<sup>13</sup>.

Consider another example. The paternal grandmother, here the charismatic leader, is successfully entertaining and rhythmically entraining the infant. She does so by moving a toy and, at moments, talking with a soft voice (Figure 2). At some point, she tries to make the baby take the toy, but the newborn does not take it, stops moving rhythmically, looks away, and vocally complains about the interruption (Figure 3). It seems she was interested in movement and rhythm more than the toy *per se*. Grandmother then starts again moving the toy; the baby seems to respond, vocally as well as bodily.

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

**Figure 2:** Snapshot #1 from the video of July 6th, 2010

[Insert Figure 3 about here]

**Figure 3:** Snapshot #2 from the video of July 6th, 2010

Then the grandmother tries to have the mother entraining the baby in the same way. This is a sort of pedagogical sequence, where the former is not interested in keeping her power; she tries instead to share it with the baby’s mother, who was silently observing from a while (like a pupil in presence of her mentor). The mother, however, has not learned so well the lesson. She uses and moves the toy in a different way, a way that for the baby is not as much pleasurable as grandma’s way (Figure 4). The infant thus loses

---

<sup>12</sup> This means that the rhythmical pause is composed by an actual pause in conduct (beating, talking, moving), of 0.1 seconds, plus a pause in beating only, during which talk and movement take place.

<sup>13</sup> This is not so different than what happens when adult-animal interaction is at stake: you stop hopelessly trying to cuddle the cat when it is ignoring you and purring instead on someone else.

interest, as we can notice from the change in visual orientation: she is no more oriented to the toy but neither to the mother; even if the latter is talking to her whereas the grandmother shuts up at the moment, the newborn looks at the latter (Figure 5).

[Insert Figure 4 about here]

**Figure 4:** Snapshot #3 from the video of July 6th, 2010

[Insert Figure 5 about here]

**Figure 5:** Snapshot #4 from the video of July 6th, 2010

That of attracting and maintaining attention is a specific form of power, and a peculiarly *social* form of power. Competence, or skills, are crucial here. As recently noticed by Collins (2015), “bodily-emotional attunement and disattunement produce the successes and failures of social coordination” (p.17).

#### 4.2. *Power exercise: maintaining attention, defending situated status*

Let us consider one last example to better examine the issue of adult-adult interaction in the presence of simultaneous adult-newborn interaction, with charisma working in a sort of triangulated way. The example is taken from a video-recorded interactional sequence involving the newborn, her mother and the latter’s mother. As you can see in Figure 6, the two adults are respectively standing, the former, and sitting, the latter, aside the baby’s cradle. The mother both touches and talks to the baby, which responds to that kinesthetically (moves arms and legs) —that is, she is engaged, mother and daughter have reached a certain degree of mutual entrainment.

[Insert Figure 6 about here]

**Figure 6:** A snapshot from the video of June 29th, 2010

At some point, when the mother is about to leave the newborn with the maternal grandmother, the latter irritates her with a comment. In order not to loose entrainment with the baby, but wanting to reply to her own mother, the woman uses with the latter the content only of verbal communication, she does not change the rhythmical and prosodic aspect of speech when turning from talking to the baby to talking to the

grandma in the baby's presence; instead, she keeps talking with a soft voice in a lullaby-like manner (\*...\*)<sup>14</sup>.

Grandma: You go to eat and sleep. Go Go. (1.3) Shouldn't you //go? Eat something.  
Mother: // \*Bye, bye love. But you are playing with the grandma, since "I have a lot of fun with the grandma". Is that true? Is that true?\*

Baby: ((sneezes))  
Mother: Bless //you.  
Grandma: //Maybe she's cold.  
Mother: \*But go to hell, you moron, that it's summer and there are three thousands degrees.\*  
Grandma: Yeah, actually  
Mother: \*Bye love. We're here with the air conditioning, so\*

(Videorecordings, 29 June 2010)

On the other hand, the fact that the baby is positively responding to her mother — *i.e.*, mother's success in the rhythmical interaction with her daughter— makes the grandmother "surrender", so to speak, as she would have not done otherwise and she did not actually do in opposite situations. As the ethnographer witnessed, indeed, the maternal grandmother struggled many times to have her daughter doing as said with respect to caregiving. This happened either while keeping successfully interacting with her granddaughter, or as soon as the mother was not successful in engaging and pleasing the baby<sup>15</sup>. As we highlighted (Section 2), Weber reminds us that charismatic power is maintained through a performance that constitutes the *proof* of charisma. "It is precisely the degree of competence vis-à-vis incompetence that make up not only the larger division of the social world, but determine what happens in each micro-situation" (Collins, 2015, p. 16).

## 5. Conclusion: rhythm and charismatic micro-power

Our main contribution, as mentioned in the introduction, is chiefly regarding social theory. We showed how rhythm constitutes a resource in the situated interactional "management" of power relations, both in generating local hierarchies and, on the contrary, in evening them out for the purpose of coordinated action (*e.g.*, dancing together) . Beyond the two case studies here considered for illustrative purposes, we are more generally interested in the nonconceptual-conceptual dialectics as a force at play in social life and, more specifically, in power relations. On the basis of our contribution,

---

<sup>14</sup> On the relevance of voice quality with respect to participant roles see Sicoli (2010), Stross (2013). Recently, Marjorie Goodwin (2015) noticed how particular phonation modalities are used for the interactional construction of intimacy (*e.g.*, creaky voice leading to a hug).

<sup>15</sup> An example is reported in Bassetti (2014b, p. 812).

manifold research avenues can be explored, following different approaches to power. One could ask, for example, how rhythm impact on power relations at the level of social change (as traditionally conceived in terms of socio-historical processes). Here the question would be Foucaultian (1975) —about the genealogy of power— and the level of investigation would be Lefebvrian (1992) —the rhythms of social life. Fordist and post-Fordist work rhythms, for instance, differ dramatically (*e.g.*, Kumar 2004); military rhythms too significantly changed during history (*e.g.*, McNeill, 1995). Within the changes such transitions have brought about, power relations were always deeply involved as well. From this perspective, our analysis of rhythm and charisma in situated interaction could serve as an illustration of the micro-foundations of longer-term processes. Therefore, it could serve as a starting point to link the micro- to the meso- and macro- level.

Further, one could ask which is the role of social(ized) space in the situated interactional management of power relations. This is a question of context, with all the layers it entails (*cf. e.g.*, Duranti, Goodwin, 1992). Here, indeed, social space can be conceived as the broad socio-cultural context within which an interaction occurs (macro-level). It can also be regarded, in a Bourdieusian (*e.g.*, 1979) fashion more directly dealing with power relations, as the field of social positions (meso-level). Finally, following Goffman (1974), it can be thought as the “frame” that “keys” the interaction, and it could be employed for studying the dynamic relation between “social occasion” and “social situation” (micro-level). All these “contexts” affect, but also are affected by, the materiality of rhythm in its corporeal manifestation. The conceptual dimension preeminent in them influences, but also is influenced by, the nonconceptual dimension of rhythm in situated embodied interaction. The two dimensions are still to be better linked at the empirical level, but to do this we need to pursue further research at the theoretical level, and this is what we are going to do for the rest of this closing section.

For instance, we showed how considering rhythm in social interaction bring us to the problem of intersubjectivity. We did this *via* an analysis of the complex nexus between the conceptual and the nonconceptual dimension of interaction. In many occasion an interaction appears to be driven by solely conceptual purposes. Instead, we highlighted how much crucial the nonconceptual dimension is and how it affects the interaction at stake at its higher, conceptual level. Here to consider the problem of intersubjectivity from a phenomenological perspective is capital. We tried in fact to point out how the conceptual aspect of interaction is weak, since participants seem to be, so to speak, forced in taking for granted its objectivity, even if it is very difficult to asses an actual sharing of meaning among them. The weakness of conceptual sharing is, we could speculate, what makes the strength of the nonconceptual aspect of rhythm, its “magical

snare”. By means of rhythm it is possible to compel people and to exercise a power over them because the rhythmical coherence forces an analogy on the conceptual level of the interaction at stake, making the sense of objectivation stronger, but not for conceptual reasons, even if it could seem so. Liberman's (this volume) example of the deceptive use of rhythm in Tibetan philosophical debating perfectly illustrates our point:

The defender, innocent and trusting in the rhythm, accepts the proposition, but without skipping a beat the challenger asserts just the *opposite* proposition. This is experienced as a shock, which is all the more effective because the deceptively harmonious rhythm has not been broken. In most debates such a move might elicit a vigorous reaction from the defender.

The strength of rhythm is not simply due to its nonconceptual associative, action-laden, and emotional character, but to its *social* nonconceptual associative, action-laden, and emotional character. In interaction, through its various rhythms (surrounding music, pace of interaction, prosody, body movement, etc. etc.), each other's associations, emotions, and actions resonate and reinforce one another making each participant think and experience, subjectively, that what is going on is the reading that each is giving. The *sense of an interaction* is the byproduct of all this process.

Especially where there is no institutional authority, the charismatic leader is who defines the sense of an interaction. The charismatic leader is the one that compels the others, consciously or not, towards a particular reading. It is in virtue of this reading that this kind of figure gains a particular status (*e.g.*, “better caregiver”). The one who gets the power to lead an interaction is the one who, by that very same ongoing achievement, changes others' situated belief. Charisma is the product-in-being-produced<sup>16</sup> of social interaction, setting the rhythm of the latter equals seizing that micro-power. Examining the two empirical cases taken into consideration in this article, we should not forget to notice that there is a seeming lack of charismatic authority in the first group of examples provided. This is, we believe, non accidental. In the dance case we are considering a cooperative activity, that is, rehearsals, oriented to the preparation of a staged show, of an artwork. The most prominent authority here is bureaucratic, and, even if the nonconceptual dimension of power is anyway present, such an authority has an hold on the group at the conceptual level: it is the one institutionally knowing what counts as proper enactment. The emphasis here, moreover, is to use rhythm to achieve a better coordination, alongside its obvious role in dancing itself. In the case of the newborn, instead, we see that charisma plays a role. The newborn and the interaction with her are strongly based on nonconceptual means and who wins her attention and entrains with her has a dominance on the situation as a caregiver. Charisma, as we said, sets its own limits, this means that charisma could go against the formalized authority of “good

---

<sup>16</sup> On charisma as a dynamic process, see also Finlay (2002).

manners” in a restaurant or against the rules of how the interaction between parents and grandparents should be. In the very context of the charismatic interaction every, even if momentary, revolution is possible, everything is instead linked to obtaining the emotional, associative dominance of the situation. The interaction here gets competitive, as in the case of the gym we provided in Section 2. It is in virtue of such a competition that the link between charisma and rhythm becomes visible —and setting the rhythm is both the origin and the proof of such charismatic micro-power. In this, the eschatological, evangelic inheritance of power reveals itself, the charisma is that gift that allows people to gain, in micro-interaction, the kingdom of people.

### **Bibliographic references**

Andreatta, M.

2011 “Constructing and formalizing tiling rhythmic canons: A historical survey of a ‘mathemusal’ problem”, in *Perspectives in New Music*, 49, 2, pp. 33–64.

Auer, P., E. Couper-Kuhlen, F. Müller

1999 *Language in Time: The Rhythm and Tempo of Spoken Interaction*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Bassetti, C.,

2009 “Riflessività-in-azione. L'incorporamento dello sguardo spettatoriale come sapere pratico professionale nella danza”, in *Etnografia e Ricerca Qualitativa*, 2, 3, pp. 325-352.

2014a “The Knowing Body-in-Action in Performing Arts. Embodiment, experiential transformation and intersubjectivity”, in T. Zembylas (Ed.), *Artistic Practices. Social Interactions and Cultural Dynamics*, London, Routledge, pp. 91-111.

2014b “Im/moralità delle emozioni. L'amore e il 'senso materno' come conquista”, in *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*, 55, 4, pp. 793-818.

Bassetti, C., E. Bottazzi, R. Ferrario

2013 “Fatal attraction. Interaction and crisis management in socio-technical systems”, 29th EGOS Colloquium (European Group for Organizational Studies), Montreal, July 4-6, 2013

Bottazzi, E., C. Masolo, D. Porello

2014 “Old and new riddles on concept sharing”, in A. Herzig, E. Lorini (Eds.), *ECSI2014 - European Conference on Social Intelligence 2014* (Barcelona, Spain, 3-5 November 2014), CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 1283, pp. 16 - 27.

Bateson, M.C.

- 1979 “The epigenesis of conversational interaction: A personal account of research and development”, in M. Bullowa (Ed.), *Before speech: The beginnings of human communication*, London, Cambridge University Press, pp. 63–77.
- Bermudez, J., A. Cahen
- 2011 “Nonconceptual mental content”, in E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/content-nonconceptual/>>.
- Bourdieu, P.
- 1979 *La Distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris, Les Editions de minuit.
- Chartrand, T.L., J.A. Bargh
- 1999 “The chameleon effect: the perception-behavior link and social interaction”, in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, pp. 893–910.
- Collins, R.
- 2008 *Violence: A Micro-sociological Theory*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- 2015 “Visual micro-sociology and the sociology of flesh and blood: Comment on Wacquant”, in *Qualitative Sociology*, 38, pp. 13–17.
- Collins, R., M. McConnel
- 2015 *Napoleon Never Slept: How Great Leaders Leverage Social Energy*, ebook.
- DuPertuis, L.
- 1986 “How People Recognize Charisma: The Case of Darshan in Radhasoami and Divine Light Mission”, in *Sociology of Religion*, 47, 2, pp. 111-124.
- Duranti, A., C. Goodwin
- 1992 “Rethinking context: an introduction”, in Idd. (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, Cambridge (UK), Cambridge University Press.
- Durkheim, E.
- 1995 *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1912), New York, Free Press.
- Evans, G., J. McDowell
- 1982 *The Varieties of Reference*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Finlay, B.
- 2002 “The origins of charisma as a process: A case study of Hildegard of Bingen”, in *Symbolic Interaction*, 25, 4, pp. 537-554.
- Foucault, M.
- 1975 *Surveiller et punir*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Gratier, M., C. Trevarthen
- 2008 “Musical Narrative and Motives for Culture in Mother–Infant Vocal Interaction”, in *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 15, 10–11, pp. 122–58.

- Gendler, T.S.  
 2008 “Alief in action (and reaction)”, in *Mind and Language*, 23, 5, pp. 552–585.
- Gill, S.P.  
 2012 “Rhythmic synchrony and mediated interaction: towards a framework of rhythm in embodied interaction”, in *AI and Society*, 27, 1, pp. 111–127.
- Goffman, E.  
 1974 *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, M.H.  
 2015 “Haptic Sociality: The Embodied Interactive Constitution of Intimacy through Touch”, Keynote lecture, *Revisiting Participation: Language and Bodies in Interaction*, 24-27 June 2015, University of Basel, Switzerland.
- Hamilton, A.  
 2011 “Rhythm and stasis: A major and almost entirely neglected philosophical problem”, in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 111, pp. 25–42.
- Hanna, J.L.  
 1979 *To dance is human: A theory of nonverbal communication*, Chicago, (IL), University of Chicago Press.
- Henriques, J.  
 2010 “The Vibrations of Affect and their Propagation on a Night Out on Kingston’s Dancehall Scene”, in *Body & Society*, 16, 1, pp. 57-89.
- Hochschild, A.R.  
 1979 “Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure”, in *American Journal of Sociology*, 85, 3, pp. 551-575.
- Immergut, M., M. Kosut, M.  
 2014 “Visualising charisma: representations of the charismatic touch”, in *Visual Studies*, 29, 3, pp. 272–284.
- King, A., M. de Rond  
 2011 “Boat race: rhythm and the possibility of collective performance”, in *The British Journal of Sociology*, 62, 4, pp. 565-585.
- Kumar, K.  
 2004 *From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society: New Theories of the Contemporary World*, Hoboken (NJ), Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lakens, D., M. Stel  
 2011 “If they move in sync, they must feel in sync: Movement synchrony leads to attributions of rapport and entitativity”, in *Social Cognition*, 29, 1, pp. 1–14.
- Lefebvre, H.



- 1992 *Éléments de rythmanalyse*, Paris, Syllepse.
- Liberman, K.
- 2012 “La fenomenologia dell'assaggio del caffè. Lezioni di oggettività pratica”, in *Etnografia e ricerca qualitativa*, 5, 1, pp. 35-58.
- McNeill, W.H.
- 1995 *Keeping together in time: Dance and drill in human history*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M.
- 1945 *Phénoménologie de la perception*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Messiaen, O.
- 1994 *Traité de Rythme, de Couleur, et d'Ornithologie (1949–1992): en sept tomes*, volume 2, Paris, Alphonse Leduc.
- Ong, H.T.
- 2014 “Is ‘spiritual gift(s)’ a linguistically fallacious term? A lexical study of *Chárisma*, *Pneumatikós*, and *Pneûmai*”, in *The Expository Times*, 125, 12, pp. 583–592.
- Oullier, O., G.C. de Guzman, K.J. Jantzen, J., Lagarde, J.A. Kelso
- 2008 “Social coordination dynamics: measuring human bonding”, in *Social Neuroscience*, 3, pp. 178–192.
- Pagis, M.
- 2010 “Embodied Self-reflexivity”, in *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 72, 3, pp. 265–283.
- Peacocke, C.
- 1992 *A Study of Concepts*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Richardson, M.J., K.L. Marsh, R.C. Schmidt
- 2005 “Effects of visual and verbal interaction on unintentional interpersonal coordination”, in *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 31, pp. 62–79.
- Roskies, A.L.
- 2008 “A new argument for nonconceptual content”, in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, LXXVI, 3, pp. 633–659.
- Schutz, A.
- 1966 “Common-sense and scientific interpretation of human action” (1962), in Id., *Collected Papers, I*, The Hague, Netherlands, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 3-15.
- Schutz, A.
- 1966 “The problem of transcendental intersubjectivity in Husserl” (1966), in *Collected Papers, III*, The Hague, Netherlands, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 51-84.

- Scruton, R.  
2008 “Thoughts on rhythm”, in K. Stock (Ed.), *Philosophers on Music: Experience, Meaning and Work*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Schutz, A.  
2013 “Fragment on the phenomenology of rhythm” (1944), in *Schutzian Research*, 5, pp. 11–22.
- Sicoli, M.A.  
2010 “Shifting voices with participant roles: Voice qualities and speech registers in Mesoamerica”, in *Language in Society*, 39, pp. 521–53.
- Stross, B.  
2013 “Falsetto voice and observational logic: Motivated mean”, in *Language in Society*, 42, pp. 139–162.
- Suppes, P.  
2009 “Rhythm and meaning in poetry”, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 33, 1, pp. 159–166.
- Toribio, J.  
2007 “Nonconceptual content”, in *Philosophy Compass*, 2/3, pp. 445–460.
- Turner, S.  
2003 “Charisma reconsidered”, in *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 3, 1, pp. 5–26.
- Weber, M.  
1968 *Economy and society; an outline of interpretive sociology* (1922), Bedminster Press, NYC.