**Anthropology of Time**

Dr. Gonzalo Iparraguirre

October 2021

## Course Preview

For sure you have ever thought about time or faced the challenge to understand how time shapes personal and social dynamics.

In your work, your home, your daily life, every action is connected with the passage of time, and all our thoughts about time, what I call temporalities, are framed by our culture; that is, by the mixture of discourses, imaginaries and practices that perform any culture.

So why is relevant to take a course of time with an intercultural perspective?

Depending on your job, the contents would be useful for teaching classes, organizing events, designing contents, composing music, performing art and many other activities that requires an articulation among different temporalities, that is, different ideas about time.

The contents are organized to offer a comparative perspective that conciliates the theoretical and empirical frame of anthropology with the challenges of interpret time and culture in daily life.

Do you want to learn about one of the core problems of any science and any activity?

Join with me in this adventure, I'm an anthropologist specialized in time studies, with more than 20 years of experience in the theoretical discussions and in their different applications in everyday life.

## Modul 1
## Time and temporality

Hi, welcome to the course "Anthropology of Time". Let´s start with Modul 1 called "Time and Temporality".

Modul 1 summarizes the main reference works on the problem of time in philosophy, science and anthropology. Diverse temporalities of the world are distinguished to exemplify the hegemonic character of the scientific notions of time and their implications when analyzing social dynamics and everyday life. This theoretical framework enables the construction of an anthropological theory of time required to perform an ontological analysis of concepts such us: development, agendas, accelerated societies, political and economic rhythms, progress, politics of chronology, capitalism, Anthropocene era, among others.

In order to clarify the possible meanings of frequently used concepts in science, such as temporality and time, it is necessary to set up a thorough distinction between both of them. These notions have been indistinctly used in western thinking since the 16th century, period in which there is a rise of philosophical and scientific works focusing on the problems of their definitions and implications in the understanding of the phenomenon (Kant, 1996; Newton, 2004).

I define *temporality* as the apprehension of becoming, which every human being accomplishes through his cognitive system in a cultural context; and *time*, as the phenomenon of becoming in itself, which the human being is capable of apprehend as temporality.
The sand clock is a useful object to express both concepts. Becoming, time in itself, is the sand falling, the phenomenon of particles and gravity without any human intervention. The interpretation of this falling becoming, temporality, is the "passage" of particles from past to future, or from future to past, that the glasses encapsulates.

The importance of distinguishing these concepts arises initially from the reading of *Being and Time*, by the philosopher Martin Heidegger, in which the author presents a definition of temporality different than the *vulgar conception of time*, as he terms the notion of time

conceived as a succession of homogeneous instants. Heidegger suggests that 'the existential and ontological constitution of the totality of the Da-sein is grounded in temporality' (Heidegger, 1996: 398) and relates this concept to the *being-toward-death* and the daily nature. This ontology defines in Heidegger the comprehension of all relative to the meaning of the being and his existence, terms that are not much often used in Anthropology, but are present in constructs such as *human-being*, *social being*, or *being-in-the-world* (Wright, 2008: 34).

Now considering the definition of time, this resumes on one hand the famous ideas of the philosopher Immanuel Kant, who clearly and concisely systematised conceptualisations on time and space, arriving at a metaphysical limit, which none of the thinkers who followed him reached. In his Critique of Pure Reason, immense work written in 1781, Kant says:

> Time is not an empirical concept that has been derived from any experience …
> Time is a necessary representation that grounds all intuitions … Time is therefore
> given *a priori* … Time does not inhere in objects, but merely in the subject who
> intuits them (Kant, 1996: 47-50).

On the other hand, I resume the meaning of the term phenomenon formulated in *Being and Time*, to assert that time *is* a phenomenon. Heidegger says: 'The confusing multiplicity of 'phenomena' designated by the terms phenomenon, semblance, appearance, mere appearance, can be unravelled only if the concept phenomenon is understood from the very beginning as the self-showing in itself' (Heidegger, 1996: 27). Therefore, the idea of *time as phenomenon of becoming in itself* rises from the set of formulations made by both thinkers.

I resume initially the aprioristic definition of time to argue that whenever temporality is mentioned, it is referred to a cultural construction, thus derived from a subject's experience, hence not an *a priori* intuition. Time, then as phenomenon, is intrinsic to every human being; on the other hand, temporality, besides being intrinsic to every human being, acquires instead a cultural character since it depends on an experience in context, thus constituting an interpretation.

This is why the analysis of temporalities through rhythms and rhythmics -as we will see In another class-  allows carrying out cross-cultural studies since it is possible to understand universal as well as particular aspects at the same moment. For this reason, I propose to refer here to temporality, but not to time when alluding to *notions of time* of a socio-cultural group. Notions of time, as conceptualisations on the *time phenomenon* placed in a socio-historical context, are temporalities. The distinction is useful for not to reduce the phenomenon (time) to only one interpretation (temporality).

This is precisely what happens with the hegemonic temporality and what this course proposes to be reconsidered. The indistinct use of time and temporality in the knowledge provided by official education at all levels, and the socioeconomic context of the capitalist mode of production, contribute to naturalise an equal meaning for both, therefore naturalising the hegemonic temporality as the *only* possible way of thinking the time phenomenon.

This happens every day in our society and in particular, in the scientific praxis of any discipline (Iparraguirre and Ardenghi, 2011). It is naturalised that time can be a measure, a duration, a period, an epoch, an age, a season, the hour, a distance, a division, the calendar and several other interpretations, without a necessary connection between them. To distinguish *temporality* from *time* seeks to denaturalise this univocal logic, to be able to understand cultural diversity from multiple significations.

If a notion of time is naturalised, it becomes naturally unique; then all knowledge built from that notion acquires a univocal epistemological character.

## Hegemonic and originary temporality

To continue, lets focus our attention in the difference among hegemonic and originary temporalities.

The review of the philosophical and scientific bibliography (Bergson, 1985, 2004; Bohm, 1998; Dilthey, 1944; Gunn, 1986; Hawking and Penrose, 1996; Husserl, 1959; Heidegger, 1996; Kant, 1996; Newton, 2004; Prigogine and Stengers, 1998), among others, enables us to understand that behind the notion of linear time imposed by the western knowledge, through different

hegemonic processes, a notion of *hegemonic temporality* was generated, and raised to the character of notion of official time for its homogenisation and imposition. This univocity and homogeneity is due to the official character that the western linear temporality has, originated and developed by different hegemonic processes during the past 2500 years (Table). Here we can observe three columns. At left side the name of principal thinkers and social groups identified with them. At the center, the ideas of time and at the right side, the constitutive temporalities of the hegemonic current temporality.

The term *hegemony* derives from the Greek *eghestai*, which means *to lead*, *to be the guide*, *to be the leader*. By hegemony, the ancient Greeks understood the supreme command of the Army, *egemone* was the conductor, the guide and also the chief of the Army. With regard to the relationship of this concept with the meaning given here to the term *official*, I consider the definition of the Dictionary of the Spanish Royal Academy: 'That which is by virtue of office, thus that has authenticity and emanates from the authority derived from the State, and not particular or private' (Real Academia Española, 2001). From this definition, I resume the absence of indication to the *historical moment* referred to that authenticity, therefore suggesting a *generic temporality*, an abstract present thought for any society, without any reference to a socio-historical context for the exercise of the State's authority. It is precisely this abstract and depersonalised character of the validity of a law or knowledge, what I seek to describe when using the term official attached to the concept of hegemony.

The concept of *hegemonic temporality* seeks to replace the concept of *western temporality* with which the notion of *linear time* is usually generalised in western societies and in the current scientific knowledge. Based on a historical overview, it is understood that this generalisation of the linear time hides inside the categorisations of temporality associated with processes of hegemonic character such as the temporality exerted and imposed by a unique calendar in the: Roman Empire; the Christian temporality imposed by the Catholic Church through its doctrine of eternal salvation; the ideals of time measurement from mechanical clocks in Modernity; the imposition of the monotheist and mercantilist logic in the colonisation of the Americas; the establishment of the capitalist mode of production; the industrialisation and the rise of nationalism.

The hegemonic temporality is thus defined as: the conceptualisation of the linear time conceived by western societies through different processes of officialization with the character of a univocal notion of time. Furthermore, a hegemonic temporality is that which imposed to others seeks to naturalise its conception as the only possible one. This process of homologation between what is naturally and univocally given, builds up the naturalisation of a notion, which, when massively imposed, is conceived as an official notion in the *habitus* (following Bourdieu, 2006).

The next concept is originary temporality.

The concept of *originary temporality* has its roots in the ethnographies carried out by anthropologists that include analysis of different notions of time. The study of cultural constructions of temporality has been a recurrent issue in Anthropology, although being explicitly written rarely. Reference to time conceived by the studied groups has been present from the first ethnographies, though always indirectly or subsumed in another subject. Several authors consider Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss the pioneers of the anthropological studies on time, known today as *Anthropology of Time* (Carbonell, 2004; Gell, 1992; Hodges, 2008, 2009, 2010; Iparraguirre, 2011; Munn, 1992; Terradas, 1998). Alfred Gell mentions that: 'anthropology of time can be traced in a well-known passage of *The Elemental Forms of Religious Life* where the social origin of the time category is presented' (Gell, 1992: 3).

The author suggests that Durkheim, in spite of the metaphysical confusions he opened when studying time from the social, was the first one to do it and influenced authors who followed him. He opened to Anthropology and Sociology the study of a problem always dealt by Philosophy (Gell, 1992: 3). In that sense, it may be said that Durkheim is the interphase between the philosophical thinking of time and the anthropological one, a change that made possible to begin to distinguish time from temporality, even though none of the authors who has followed in his footsteps, has explicitly written of the necessary distinction between the two concepts.

The choice of the term originary for describing this non-hegemonic temporality responds to the meaning of the definitions: 'originary (from Latin *originarĭus*) Adj. That which brings its origin from some place, person or thing' (Real Academia Española, 2001). Hence, *originary*

*temporality* is defined as: all notion of time built by a social group, which does not conceive it as a unique and univocal notion. It is not about formulating a temporality for each ethnic group by the mere fact of being able to distinguish them, since this would be an unreasonable relativism. It is about denaturalising the official notion reproduced by the State, as well as by the scientific thinking, and that therefore do not enable us to grasp other temporalities within the nation-state.

The *rhythmical otherness* is only possible to be understood if the hegemonic temporality is decentered from its unique and omnipresent position.

As a rhythmical concept, the *originary temporality* makes possible to understand the existence of different temporalities co-existing with the hegemonic temporality of a society (Table). The anthropological bibliography shows multiple cases of originary *temporality* mainly described by their distinction from the researcher's temporality, or from the scientific notion of the anthropological discourse (Bourdieu, 2006; Bouysse-Cassagne et al., 1987; Day, Papataxiarchis and Stewart, 1999; Evans-Pritchard, 1977; Fabian, 2002; Fischer, 2002; Geertz, 1990; Gell, 1992; Glenni and Thrift, 1996; Hall, 1983; Hallowell, 1955; Hubert, 1990; Leach, 1971; Lévi-Strauss, 1993; Malinowski, 1973; Mauss, 1979; 2007; Rigby, 1985).

In this sense, the concept of originary temporality seeks to identify every *temporality* through the rhythmics characterising the cultural practices of the group.

Having exposed these definitions, it is stressed the need for working with three simultaneous concepts in order to characterize and comprehend different notions of time: temporality, hegemonic temporalities and originary temporalities.

## Modul 2
## Social imaginaries, Temporalities, Development

Hi! Let's start modul 2 with the concept of "social imaginaries" and their utility to think different temporalities.

Social imaginaries are sets of symbolic representations on ways of thinking and acting of a social group in its daily life. These can be analyzed through matrices that organize these representations into inclusive hierarchical levels. This method was created from the need for achieving a standard of organization of the ethnographic material, allowing comparison of social groups and case studies with each other, in order to get a synchronic result out of them. This emerges epistemologically from the analysis and reinterpretation of authors such as Appadurai ( 2015), Bachelard ( 2011), Baczko ( 2005), Castoriadis ( 1989), Durand ( 2004), Ricoeur ( 2012), and Wright ( 2008).

If described in a simplified way, the method introduces three complementary levels of signification: constellation (the main imaginaries), component (the symbolic representations), and category (the discursive concepts). Matrices schematize the set of mapped representations to analyze the social dynamics of a single or several social groups. It is at the level of components, where discrepancies leading to divergent significations, of the same groupings of imaginaries that operate in the constellations, are expressed.

That is to say, for example, that for the same set of imaginaries, as the constellation "future", different interpretations can be found at the level of its components (such as temporality and prediction), and therefore they explain that the categories associated with these imaginaries differ to a lesser or greater degree (Table). Matrices of imaginaries provide a scheme of the symbolic field of the interlocutors arranged by the ethnographer, in order to systematize interview answers, conversations, and the analysis of the respective discourses. Likewise, an ethnographic approach to the imaginaries necessarily entails considering the interlocutors'

voice at the moment of designing the tool of analysis, and not necessarily this must measure and codify them for translating their logics, knowledges, and practices.

## Development as temporality

Next stage is introducing the concept of development as temporality. Why development, a core imaginary of capitalism and contemporary life, could de thought as temporality? As we will see now, Development is a rationalization of the apprehension of time that implies the three tensions of every temporality: past, present and future.

To visualize it, let´s consider the biological development of any living creature. The interpretation of the concept is always diachronic as current development is understood in comparison to a previous stage (how it developed) or to a future stage (how it will develop). Although the term is not directly used, there are multiple allusions to "the process of development" in daily life, as it often happens in family contexts: -*"look how big your kid is!"* or *"how fast you grew up!"* or *"the town took off; it developed"*. In other contexts –economics, politics or media- its use has often a negative connotation: "*underdeveloped or developing countries"* (those unable to balance their past with their present), or a positive one when mentioning: *"overdeveloped sectors"* (when their present is ahead of their future expected in later stages). Whatever expression is used, the semantic structure of the various definitions of "development" entails the three tensions of every temporality that has precise ontological characteristics: linear, projective, cumulative.

As stated in Modul 1, temporality is all human interpretation of becoming that sustains us in life; a becoming that has been assigned with multiple variations of what was historically called "time". The indistinguishable usage of time and temporality in everyday language, either in political, scientific, pedagogical or media discourses, contributes to naturalize a same meaning for both concepts, therefore naturalizing the hegemonic temporality as the *only* possible way of thinking the phenomenon of time. The hegemonic temporality, understood as the

conceptualization of Western linear time in various processes of officialization, is detected in the analysis of the imaginaries when considering the existence of *other temporalities* responding to other logics and attitudes facing becoming, and not conceived as unique and univocal.

Likewise, *development*, as a central concept of the hegemonic temporality, is naturalized as a unique notion of the sense of life –individual and collective-, when it is stated, for instance, among other similar expressions: -*"there is no progress without development"*. Interpreting development as temporality implies a notion that cannot be univocal, has a historical construction crossed by processes of officialization, and that by becoming hegemonic it imposes onto other notions, replacing, syncretizing or removing them.

The various notions of development are circumscribed to both the uses (daily practices) and the representations of the processes (temporality) and locations (spatiality) where the mentioned development occurs, is done and undone, is produced, managed and consumed. In Claude Lévi-Strauss's words: "A society is always a spatial-temporal given, and therefore subject to the impact of other societies and of earlier states of its own development" (cited in Mauss, 1979: 20).

The philosophical and scientific problematization of "development" withdraws in another horizon of problematics: that of the *cultural discontinuities* that goes back to the "discovery" of the New World with the 16th-century European colonialism (Lévi-Strauss, 1979: 294-303). As explained by the author, a *unitary vision of development* of mankind emerges from the context of that process, conceived as progression, regression or a combination of both. Lévi-Strauss highlights that those societies which today we call "underdeveloped" are not such through their own doing, and one would be wrong to conceive of them as exterior to Western development (hegemonic) or indifferent to it. In truth, they are the very societies whose direct

or indirect destruction between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries have made possible the *development of the Western world* (Lévi-Strauss, 1979: 296-297).

Considering the interpretation of development as temporality, the difference stated by Lévi-Strauss between *cumulative history*, associated with "progressive cultures", and *stationary history*, associated with "inert cultures", can be found in our context in the stigmatizations attributed to "market sectors" or groups of producers, which are not strictly functional to the serialized accumulation of capitalism. In fact, we can resignify those definitions to circumscribe at least two notions of development: the *cumulative development* associated to the hegemonic temporality of the Western capitalist mode of production and living, and the *stationary development* associated to originary temporalities with a different attitude towards becoming, lying far from the canon of accumulation and progress. Caution is required in this sense when "types" of development are remarked, as the author points out:

> At every occasion we are inclined to call a culture inert or stationary, we must therefore ask ourselves if that apparent immobility does not stem from our ignorance of its true interests, and if, with its own criteria –which are different from our own– that culture is not a victim of the same illusion with respect to us (Lévi-Strauss, 1979: 320).

Both notions of development, both temporalities, are neither diametrically polarized, nor impossible to find together in a same socio-territorial process; on the contrary, what we observe is a *coexistence* of modes of production, living, developing; in short, coexisting in the same territory. We are then able to visualize at the regional level what Lévi-Strauss clarified more than fifty years ago at the world level -what today we call global:

> No world civilization [aka globalization] can exist because civilization implies the coexistence of cultures offering among themselves the maximum of diversity and even

consists in this very coexistence. […] all cultural progress depends on a coalition of cultures (Lévi-Strauss, 1979: 336).

To sum up, development is a constellation of imaginaries rather than a specific practice; it is an interpretation of becoming and matter, and specifically, on *how* "things" unfold in the becoming. Development, as well as progress, is an imaginary of the becoming. We see a blooming plant and say: -*"it is developing, it evolved"*- or when comparing groups of similar plants or animals, it is usually said: -*"here we can clearly see how this species developed"*-, although obviating in this reasoning that the term "evolution" is a component of the imaginary "development", which then implies an *evolutionist* interpretation of biological change, as if there were no others (Iparraguirre, 2017; Lévi-Strauss, 1993).

## Modul 3
## Cultural Rhythmics

Hi, Modul 3 summarize the method to study rhythms, temporality and culture in daily life.

It is a theoretical-methodological assumption of this course that whenever problems concerning time or temporality are addressed, it is about rhythmics. The semantic use of the term rhythm replaces variants of the term time, such as temporal, temporals, a-temporals, temporalisation and others, which usually reduce meanings to other conventional or already naturalised uses. Facing the question of how to study the notion of time of a social group, its temporality, a correspondence between different definitions of *time* and *rhythms* was developed based on musical knowledge. In music, as well as in other arts, terms such as tempo, rhythmic, rhythm, or pulse are commonly used, all referred to the different appreciations on the *flux of becoming*, always present in every piece of music.

SUBIR

Etymologically, the Dictionary defines *rhythm* as: 'Timed order in the succession or occurrence of things' (Real Academia Española, 2001) deriving it from the Greek term ῥεῖν, which means to flow. Its musical meaning says: 'Proportion kept between the time of a movement and of another different one' (Real Academia Española, 2001). This last definition gets close to the notion proposed here. Rhythm is the conceptual element that brings us closer to the *apprehensible instant*, which is to my understanding where the transference of minimum information for humans to communicate is textured, the communicative syntax of every cultural system. This transference of information is made in this minimum differentiable rhythm, usually called *instant*, where it is given the only moment of continuity maintaining the cognitive present in connection to its past and to its continuous coming, the future.

In this sense, to study cultural rhythmics in becoming, in that instant in which the whole subjective and social past continuously recreates itself in connection to the group rhythmic in which it is lived, provide us essential information on the logic that operates in the assimilation and naturalisation of a certain temporality.

These reinterpreted concepts, relative to the study of ethnographies on temporality where social rhythms are described, make possible to address the problem by analysing the *collective life*

*rhythm* of a group, the rhythm transferred by its members during *daily collective activities*, and thus able to be apprehended in the participant observation. Therefore, the temporality of a society can be understood from the life rhythms constitutive of a social, economic and worldview organization, which articulate the daily nature and habits of their subjects (Table 3).

The articulation between rhythm and temporality was already present in the first sociological and anthropological studies on time. The main mentor of the social study of rhythm was the French ethnologist Marcel Mauss: "rhythms and symbols not only bring the aesthetic and imaginative faculties of man into play, but at the same time all his body and soul" (Mauss, 1979:284). Mauss already proposed in 1924 that rhythms contribute to articulate imaginaries and practices, and that Anthropology, as well as Sociology and Psychology should focus on the study of symbol and rhythm (Mauss, 1979:280). Prior to that, in 1905, Mauss had already emphazised the importance of focusing on the "social morphology" of the Inuit, when studying their rhythms of dispersal and concentration of individual and collective life, even arguing that "each social function has its own rhythm" (Mauss, 1979:429). In one of his conferences on Aesthetics at the Collège de France given in 1935-36, Mauss said: "Since the appearance of plastic arts, notions of equilibrium have emerged, thus notions of rhythm; and since the appearance of rhythmics, art emerged. Socially and individually, man is a rhythmic animal" (Mauss, 2007:147). When describing the aesthetic phenomenon, Mauss formulates an alternative definition based on rhythm reviving phsychologist Wilhelm Wundt and another pioneer of rhythms, ethnologist Franz Boas, who proposed to study rhythm in decorative arts, dance, music and literature of native North American societies (Boas, 1955). In Mauss' words:

> [Boas] connects all art to rhythm, for where there is rhythm, generally there is something aesthetic: where there are tones, variation in touch and intensity, generally there is something aesthetic. Prose is only beautiful when it is to some extent rhythmic and to some extent chanted. Differences in tone, touch and feeling –all this is rhythm and all this is art (Mauss, 2007:68).

Durkheim mentions the term rhythm to refer to the time category: 'The calendar expresses the rhythm of collective activities, while at the same time its function is to assure their regularity

[…] what the category of time expresses is the common time for the group, the social time' (Durkheim, 1982: 9). The concept of *rhythm* as *regulator of social activities* emphasises how rhythm is embedded in every temporality. Durkheim explains that religious life is structured in 'regularly repeated acts', which constitute collective rhythms and he uses them as an experimental proof of the belief in social events of religious character (1982: 8).

Evans-Pritchard is one of the first ethnographers to stress the concept of *rhythm* to think the temporality of the studied group. He refers to:

> three layers of rhythms: physical, ecological and social. The Nuer observe the movements of celestial bodies, other than the sun or the moon … but they do not regulate their activities in relation to them, nor they use them as points of reference for the account of the seasons … Cattle needs and variations on food supply are the ones that mainly translate the ecological rhythm into the social rhythm of the year, and the contrast between ways of life at the height of the rainy season, and of the dry season is that which provides the conceptual poles for the temporal account (Evans-Pritchard, 1977: 114-115).

These three layers enable us to understand how Nuer think time, in what Evans-Pritchard describes as *account*, although it is not a quantitative calculation. Chronology, for example, does not express itself through the *numbering* of years, but through the reference to the system of age groups (Evans-Pritchard, 1977: 122). It is surprising to think that it is not relevant to know *how many* years happened in an event recapitulation, something unconceivable to any person formed in the western temporality who orders his own life based on the account of his *birthdays* and what has been done *in between* and during them. The same happens with the location of a moment in the past and that depending on which time *of the year* is that about: 'The Nuer do not use names of the months for marking the time of an event … Time is a relation between activities … Time does not have the same value throughout the year' (Evans-Pritchard, 1977: 119-120).

This focus of Anthropology on the "rhythmic issues" is completed with the emergence of subsequent studies along the 20th-century, which unfortunately did not succeed in arousing new interests: in Malinowski (1927) when explaining the Trobriand islanders calendar in New Guinea ruled by agricultural and social rhythms; in Hall (1986) when studying rhythms implied in the synchronization processes between people and their different behaviors in monochronic and polychronic societies; in Turner (2005) when analysing the rhythm of music and dancing

in the different types of *ndembu* rituals in Zambia; in Descola (1996) when observing rhythms of hunting journeys and the rhythm of energy consumed among the *Achuar* in the jungle of Ecuador; in Durand (2004) who applies a generalised use of the term *rhythmical*, sometimes related to seasonal cycles and agricultural rhythmics, as well as to the recurrence of mythical cycles; in Bourdieu (2006) when analysing how capitalism is imposed on the life rhythms of Kabyle society in Algeria.

In addition to these works in Anthropology, there are outstanding studies addressing rhythmic issues such as Lefebvre (1974, 2007) on rhythmanalysis, in which the interaction between notions of time, production of space and comprehensions of everyday life is analysed. Similarly, Bachelard (2011) applied that from a philosophical perspective to the study of space, the imagination and body rhythms. Zerubavel (1985) suggested to address the rhythms hidden in the schedules and calendars of social life from the sociology of time. Both John Dewey and Susanne Langer studied the concept of "vital rhythm" in connection with the aesthetic experience of art and the existence of art forms (Kruse, 2007). Recently, Goodman (2010) applied rhythmanalysis to the study of sonic culture, the politics of frecuency and the ecology of fear.

 In brief, cultural rhythmics is proposed as methodology built for studying temporality among different social groups and inside them. Studying different rhythmic experiences integrated in the participant observation, enables us to interpret social facts that are implicit in the everyday practices of organization, in the economic-political relations, and in the group's worldviews. Recovering the phrase by Edward Hall, when he refers to the cultural patterns linking time and culture as 'the language of time' (Hall, 1983:3), it can be said that cultural rhythmics are the language of temporality. Rhythmics are in this sense, a theoretical and methodological language to carry out the purpose of criticising hegemonic temporalities and their practices.


To conclude this class, and considering definitions of modul 2 and 3: how is an imaginary distinguished from a rhythmic? Lets take as an example the category "progress" as an example commonly associated, in the hegemonic temporality, with the "future": is it a rhythmic or an imaginary? Progress is an imaginary and not a rhythmic because "progress" is not a specific practice; the action of progressing is not practiced since it is a cultural construction expressed in concrete practices such as sowing, harvesting, transporting, financing, or any other concrete action. A set of specific rhythms defining "progress" does not exist either. It can be conceived

instead as imaginary, as a set of representations that can be conceptualized as a component of a single or several imaginaries. For example, "progress" is a key component either of the imaginary development or the imaginary modernity, or actually these two are constellations of the imaginary capitalism. Besides, "progress" can be split into more precise categories: "wealth," "well-being," "comfort," and "good living," just to mention a few. Considering, for instance, the phrase "at the rate of progress," it is precisely an image that makes use of the imaginary of the concept "rate" to give support to symbolic components such as "change," "speed," or similar.

## Modul 4
## The Rhythmics of Social Life

The methodology of *cultural rhythmics* enables us to analyze development as temporality and its use on the analysis of daily practices that dynamize development. They are part of a set of theoretical and methodological precepts that defines and sets in motion a precise mode for researching and interpreting social phenomena, whose philosophical and scientific backgrounds, as we saw in the previous class, can be found in Boas (2010), Mauss (1979), Bachelard (2011), Durand (2004), Evans-Pritchard (1977), Lévi-Strauss (1993).

Lefebvre's *Rhythmanalysis* (2004) demonstrates a strong "mode of analysis of everyday life", to put it in his words, that runs in the same direction and constitutes a complementary method to the one presented here.


At a conceptual level, *cultural rhythmic* defines the set of life rhythms that enables us to characterize and interpret constitutive practices of the social dynamics of a group of people in its everydayness.


As method, *cultural rhythmics* constitute a tool for the understanding of the connection between life rhythms and processes of social dynamics, differentiating notions of time (temporality) and notions of space (spatiality).


It is here understood that, as well as a rhythm of life can characterize a person's way of living, the set of life rhythms of a social group can characterize it at the group's level, both *symbolically* and *materially*. This conceptual complement of rhythms and rhythmics enables us to address the articulation between imaginaries, discourses and practices by studying the *collective life rhythm* of the studied group; that is, the cultural rhythmics their members reveal in their practices, and therefore able to be grasped in the participant observation.

However, is there a feasible way to differentiate the sets of rhythmics that can be diagnosed and analyzed in a specific social dynamics?

According to the scheme proposed for the interpretation of the various rhythms which are tuned in to in the anthropological observation of social life, it is possible to group them under three operational categories:

1) rhythmics of the social organization

2) rhythmics of sustenance

3) rhythmics of the worldview

(Table). These groupings are neither watertight compartments of an abstraction, nor arbitrary cuts of a reality from which it is intended to discern a symbolic-material totality. Instead, they systematize life rhythms in three dimensions of the social dynamics in order to conceptually place them and make them operational as method of social research. This classification is not fixed and its denominations may be permeable to variations, which are, in their turn, likely to be fused.

The first group, rhythmics of the social organization, comprises daily and seasonal life rhythms, as well as communicative rhythms. Those certainly include every organization of a cultural nature; however, I am not using the term "cultural" in order not to create a confusion with the cultural rhythmics that give the name to the method. I insist that *cultural rhythmics* set up a methodology that requires to differentiate notions of time (temporalities) and notions of space (spatialities) within each systematization of rhythms. I must add that biorhythms are

intertwined in the shaping of rhythmics by generating the physiological dynamics that sets the homeostasis of every human body.

In his work *Time, the familiar stranger* (1987), Julius T. Fraser sketches out a close correlation between biorhythms, social cycles and various temporalities, which although not specifically treated, it opens up a broad field of study to explore. For example, when mentioning that "Time reckoning by bird migration is an ancient custom. It was still very much alive in the Europe of the 1930s … but began to disappear as industrial and commercial rhythms took over the task of timekeeping" (123); or when explaining that "social cycles are rhythmic schedules, cyclic variations in the amplitude or nature of one or another of the variables, such as work, of the social present" (190).

Daily life rhythms, at the temporality level, are constituted from the organization of the daily activities, and work and tasks schedules, and they define the attitudes (projective or futural) towards these life rhythms; at the spatiality level, daily rhythms are expressed in the uses of intimate or immediate spheres of life, either home, school, work, or at the local scale of individual or group movements. Edward Hall has extensively referred to these notions of space in his studies on proxemics, where he distinguishes "types of spaces" based on the analysis of various distance modalities (intimate, personal, social, public) (Hall 1999). An example of daily cultural rhythmic are the rhythmics that refer to everyday organizational processes, such as the work, family or the vial rhythmics -applicable to the analysis of the "empirical regularities" suggested by Wright for the analysis of the vial *habitus.*

Seasonal life rhythms, at the temporality level, are constituted from the apprehension of celestial phenomena (sunrises and sunsets, moon phases, solstices and equinoxes) and the

interaction with their manifestations (tides, seasons, annual sun path), as well as from the calendar organization present in "time counting" instruments, such as calendars, world time zones, historical and/or geological chronologies. At the spatiality level, these rhythms are apprehended in the seasonal use of territories, people's moves for work or holidays, strategic moves (as in goat grazing). An example of seasonal cultural rhythmic are the calendar rhythmics (days, weeks, months, years) and the tourism rhythmics. I remark that they should not be confused with the seasonal natural rhythmics, such as the rhythmics of the lunar cycle (the set of rhythms generated by moon phases).

Communicative life rhythms are revealed, at the temporality level, in the narrative rhythms of speech and of various literary genres, in the linearity or non-linearity of the discursive content, in the rhythms of artistic expressions, in the rhythms of nonverbal communication, in the rhythms of virtual life (length of digital processes) and in globalized rhythms (TV, radio, internet, phone). At the spatiality level, these rhythms are found either in the use of private as well as of social places, in the representation of symbolic and virtual spheres (Canevacci, 2013; García Canclini, 2008). Examples of communicative cultural rhythmics are the virtual rhythmics of online life, the gestural rhythmics of sign language, or the performative rhythmics (in dance, music, theatre, painting and others).

The second group, rhythmics of sustenance, gathers the economic and political rhythms. The term "sustenance" is used to unify the economic-political binomial into a further degree of systematization, which entails the criterion of sustenance of life in the economic and political practices.

Economic life rhythms operate at the temporality level in the rhythms of production and work, the rhythms of the tangible local market and the intangible global market, rhythms of

consumption, rhythms of the banking and financial systems; at the spatiality level, these rhythms are sustained in the notions of space implied in the transformation of raw material into product (production of goods, social relations of production), and in the representation of "production environments" (agricultural soil, mining mountain, fishing water). Examples of economic cultural rhythmics are the production, financial, tax, salary rhythmics. Even though these can be considered as everyday rhythmics, they may respond either to daily or seasonal practices, by which they are differentiated from both groups of rhythms.

Then, political life rhythms, at the temporality level, are those rhythms of the representation of facts and people on behalf of institutions, rhythms of mediation, bureaucracy, the rhythm in decision making (the "right now", "the urgent"). The notions of space involved are built in spheres of management (public and private), in state administration with no private "owners", in decision making environments (places with symbolic capitals of power, such as government "houses"). Examples of political cultural rhythmics are rhythmics of government, management, rhythmics of international organizations and lobbies, rhythmics of clientelism, electoral rhythmics, among others.

Finally, the rhythmics of the worldview comprise the ritual life rhythms. At the temporality level, we can differentiate the rhythms of religious practices (rhythms when praying, attending services, marrying, meditating), rhythms of celebrations, dances and every disruptive event of the stable social order, rhythms denoting philosophies of life or visions of the world. The notions of space involved in ritual rhythms are present around spheres of reflection and worship, places considered sacred (temples, churches). Examples of cultural rhythmics of the worldview are all those ritual rhythmics, religious in a broad sense, that in varied ways re-unite

the actor with the social group he identifies with (rhythmics of meditation, contemplation, daydreaming).

This rhythmical schematization of the social dynamics does not necessarily imply a "search" in the fieldwork for all the rhythms mentioned for explaining the dynamics of the studied group. It operates as a "catalogue" of "behaviors" likely to be found or deserving attention. Certainly, there are others not mentioned here that may generate another setting of rhythms, thus creating permutations, overlaps, broadenings or resignifications of rhythms and rhythmics, respectively.

## Modul 5
## Mocovi´s Temporality

To finalize this course of anthropology of time, I will present the example of an originary temporality studied with the cultural rhythmics method, based on my fieldwork research among indigenous mocovis people.

The ethnographic work among Mocoví communities was carried out between 2005 and 2006 having made three visits to the region of Chaco, Argentina (Map). The diverse families who identify themselves as Mocoví people live in different towns and rural areas of this region, forming a group of over 12.000 people for the mentioned period. With regard to public services, these settlements did not have electricity, natural gas or running water at the time of the fieldwork.

The fieldwork undertaken made possible an approach to the life rhythm of the indigenous interlocutors, in particular to the involvement in their everyday practices, which enabled me to experience a different rhythmic to that imposed by the hegemonic temporality. There was a profound inves- tigation upon five cultural rhythmics to comprehend mocovi temporality.

In the first group of analysed rhythmics, mainly connected to the every- day life rhythms, I was able to confirm Mocoví people's attention to immediate events, to the becoming, with no concerns for what may happen afterwards for planned actions.

At my first arrival at Marcos's house and after introducing ourselves, the community chief first said: 'I knew visitors were about to come, I heard a bird singing, who always sings when people comes'. He was weeding a cotton field and did not hesitate to stop working and invite us to come in for a mate (native drink made with hot water and herbs). When I told him it was not necessary for him to stop, he added 'there's no rush, how shouldn't we welcome our visitors?' This first experi- ence focused my attention on this Mocoví's life rhythm attribute of becom- ing, when paying attention to messages from the natural surroundings, such as a bird singing and not caring to interrupt a job to welcome us.

An attitude that reveals a spontaneous rhythmic thanks to which he is able to adapt to a change in his everyday life without appealing to postponements.

In the second group of rhythmics, I analysed a close connection between the interpretation of the rhythms of celestial bodies and climatic rhythms. For instance, the interpretation I found of the link between moon's position in the sky and its phases, and meteorological factors, such as rain or drought. Both astronomical and climatic rhythmics require a periodical observation of phenomena and a transmission of this knowledge through generations. Also, Mocoví people's history and mythology are narrated by the interlocutors through mythical characters represented in the night sky, and in particular, over the Milky Way, so called "nayic", the road. These attributes of the Mocoví temporality are clearly opposed to the hegemonic temporality which sets historical processes in calendar dates and thus setting them on a timeline. For science, stars are the past of the universe, moving away from present; for Mocoví people, instead, they are the present setting of its origin and its worldview.

In the third group, when analysing music, myths and everyday life's stories, I found a common pattern to all: the non-linear narratives. In various circumstances during the interviews, usually Marcos or his brother Francisco, when telling a real experience in their lives, they inserted onei- ric or mythological facts, or visions of the future. They told me for example that anyone's physical discomfort may be induced by a late ancestor or through a shaman's dreams, without requiring their presence. That is to say, that they sounded fictitious to me for not conceiving such discontinuity of facts that may be otherwise chronological thus logically ordered in measurable sequences, being hours, days or years. This discon- tinuity in the narrative of past facts with visions of the future or mytho- logical elements inserted, evidenced a construction of the past, different to the serial construction of a linear temporality, which necessarily must order a continuity of events in causal, accruable and unable to overlap terms.

In the fourth group of rhythmics, I analysed rhythms of politics and labour. In electoral periods, the search for indigenous voters by local polit- icians showed me another rhythmic, characteristic of the hegemonic tem- porality: visiting them periodically for bringing them food and making sure they will be voting for them.

This dynamics is sustained on a basis of a sense of permanence, appropriation and projection of the becoming, all constitu- tive qualities of the present mechanics of politics in Argentina. Another clear example arose from the conversation I had with a farmer of European descent

who told me that when farmers look for indigenous workers, they have to deal with their lack of punctuality when starting the working journey, or at the time of being picked up from their homes:

> "it's incredible they are not interested in working longer or having a continuity in their jobs. You never know if they are going to be at home when picking them up or if they just left to pay a visit to a relative. It happened to me to find them sleeping in the middle of the field when the job supposed to have been finished by then; they follow their rhythm, they do it when it's fine for them. Anyway, they do the job finally. Or when you ask them about the amount of time to be spent on working in a field and they say half an hour. And after two hours you come back and they not even switched on the machine. They don't have any reference to the time passed".

This story clearly points out the tension between the farmer's hegemonic temporality, cadenced by market processes and the estimated schedules of the work routine, and the originary temporality marked by internal rhythms of the group (such as the will to work, a true need for money that very day, a visit to relatives) and by an absence of schedules to put in order its behaviour facing the fact of having to produce in order to eat.

In the last group, I acknowledged the presence of urban and virtual rhythmics. The former were evidenced in the discourse of the indigenous people who moved out to town and who after some years find contradic- tions in the irregular and unscheduled life of the non-urbanised indigenous people. It is odd for them to realise that prior to their move to town, they had life rhythms adapted to natural rhythms, like going to bed at sunset, now the Sun being replaced by electric light. Meanwhile, virtual rhythms filtered from mass media, such as the marking of the start of each hour on the radio in synchrony with the global time zones or the possibility to communicate at any time with mobile phones. The introduction of rhythms, external to the immediate context builds a notion of multi-temporality that contributes to conceive the multiplication of overlapped activities. This feature is typical of the multitask production of capitalism that aims to maximise profits disregarding the social and environmental sustainability of such economic purpose.

The result of this ethnographic process enables us to understand, as Table illustrates, that the social, economic and worldview organisation of the Mocoví groups may be interpreted from the different cultural rhythmics that make possible to acknowledge both temporalities. Furthermore, the ethnographic experiences enabled us to recognise in both contexts (Chaco region and Buenos Aires) that a coexistence of a Mocoví temporality and a hegemonic temporality is given.

For example, among the instances that made possible to identify these everyday situations in which this coexistence between both temporalities was given, it stands out:

(1) the lack of interest for routine and projective work, along with the involvement in rural works at the same time,

(2) the unconcern for the observance of municipal and bureaucratic procedures in general, along its use for personal purposes and the management of such rhythms,

(3) the attention to daily natural rhythms and the contemplation of their changes, even when they are involved in work activities marked by productive or virtual rhythms,

(4) the overlapping of historic and mythical narratives along with everyday personal experiences.

In the first and second examples, the coexistence is expressed in the inevitable condition of the hegemonic temporality as social ordering of production, and the Mocoví temporality from the disinterest and unconcern for progressively observing these rules of work. In the third example, the attention to sun, moon, animals and plants rhythms is always present, and these can be read in parallel to any other activity. In the fourth example, another temporality coexisting among the Mocoví people emerge the mythological temporality, that is, the one which expresses the internal logic of myths and that has a character of originary temporality, since it does not respond to the linear logic, typical of the hegemonic temporality, and it is possible to conceive the coexistence of past and present, simultaneously, in synchrony (Leʹvi-Strauss, 1984).

By being in the woods with the indigenous people, this coexistence of temporalities is understood when it is realised that their attention is focused on the instant they live but not in the process of working such continuous time for earning such money that the accumulative production presents to them, even though they reproduce it. Having said that, what does their attention to the instant but not to the process to the duration imply? This implies that their life rhythms are in connection with an experience of the everyday and immediate reality and not with an experience of appropriation and stopping of becoming for its control, as the western-capitalist life rhythm presents it and put it into practice.

There are temporalities, as the Mocoví one, that enable us to challenge and to reconsider the hegemonic temporality that rules the scientific thinking that generates the models on which the current knowledge of mankind is built. This indigenous temporality, as many others in the world, is an example that is possible to study the construction of temporalities within any social group. The importance of understanding cultural diversity in terms of temporality and rhythmics resides in the possibility to have access to the life rhythms of people and denaturalising an own temporality as the only possible one.

Mocoví people, for all what has been gathered in the field and in their rhythmics of life, are an example and a proof that the hegemonic temporality is not the only way for conceiving time, and besides, it enables us to postulate the existence of an originary temporality of the group, that characterises its way and rhythms of life. Therefore, this temporality is an intangible cultural resource for the consideration, constitution and protection of the Mocoví identity.

Concluding this course, I remark that Temporality and rhythmic are complementary concepts. As time and rhythm are inseparable for understanding one or the other, a notion of rhythmic that pretends to constitute a method of apprehension for the different rhythms that makes possible an access to a way of life, to a rhythmic of life.

The study of temporality in rhythmic terms enables us to grasp the cultural diversity and the coexistence between different human groups from their daily rhythms, their habits and customs, which all integrated constitute a cultural rhythmic. Furthermore, there has been an

attempt to understand the naturalisation of the linear logic at the encounter of the originary temporality and the hegemonic temporality.

The acknowledgement of the originary temporality of a social group demonstrates in this last sense, that the power to impose cultural rhythmics, exerted by the hegemonic temporality, is culturally and historically built, and therefore, it must not be imposed to other social groups as having a natural, universal and ahistorical character. The triple relation of the natural, the univocal and the official is dissociated as a formula of imposition of cultural rhythmics, if it is understood that its constitution may be reformulated from the distinction between the hegemonic temporality and the originary temporality within any social group.

Thank you very much for taking this course!