

Incest and Double Registration

Aboubacar Barry*

Clinical Psychologist, Professor at the Department of Psychology of Norbert Zongo University, Koudougou, Burkina Faso

***Corresponding Author:** Aboubacar Barry, Clinical Psychologist, Professor at the Department of Psychology of Norbert Zongo University, Koudougou, Burkina Faso.

Received: August 17, 2021; **Published:** October 29, 2021

“Peoples, apparently ignorant and savage, have been able to invent extraordinarily subtle codes which sometimes require, in order to understand their functioning and their effects, the effort of the best logicians and mathematicians” [1].

Abstract

This reflection aims to bring together the rules prohibiting incest and the fear of a reduction in the effects of an incestuous act. She wants to put into perspective practices as heterogeneous as the myths about twins collected by Griaule from the Dogon (God of water), the Amerindian beliefs about twins gathered by Claude Lévi-Strauss in *Histoire de lynx*, The myth of the birth of the hero of one of the first psychoanalysts, Otto Rank, the almost universal practices of burial of placentas, considered as the twins of children who have just been born, the future of twins in the Bible and in Roman myths and finally the considerations developed in *The elementary structures of kinship* by Claude Lévi-Strauss.

Keywords: *Incest; Reproduction of the Same; Fear of Twins; Placentas; Anthropology; Psychoanalysis*

Incest and double inscription

This reflection aims at gathering the rules banning incest and the fear of the replication of the products of an incestuous act again. It wants to view the practices of heterogeneous as the myths on twins among Dogon people (*Dieu d'eau*) collected by Marcel Griaule, the amerindian belief gathered by Claude Lévi-Strauss in *Histoire de lynx*, *Le mythe de la naissance du héros* of one of the firsts psychoanalysts, Otto Rank, the almost universal of burial of the placenta, considered as the twin new born babies, the future of the twins in the bible and in roman myths and finally the considerations developed in *Les structures elementaries de la parent* by Claude Lévi-Strauss.

Introduction

I had the opportunity to devote a writing to incest that I concluded as follows: «The present reflection had no other purpose than to restore its full place to this defeat of the symbolic to which the incest made leads. The confusion it introduces into the categories through which humans find themselves in the world is not unrelated to the motives that explain social prohibition, as can be found in the margins of anthropological theories». It is this reflection, in a way «peripheral», [2] that I would like to continue here. What I tried to show then was that a simple clinical reading of the authors' materials made it possible to open other perspectives, closer to what we encounter in the clinic in working with incestuous families and subjects victims of incest. I also explained that other types of sexual or matrimonial prohibitions should be dissociated from incest, even when they were placed in the same category. For example, these prohibitions set out in the Sura [3]

on women in the Qur'an (Sura 4, verses 22 and 23) do not all re-emerge from the register of incestuous acts: «And do not marry the women whom your fathers have married [...]. It is a turpitude, an abomination and what mishandle! Your mothers, daughters, sisters, paternal aunts and maternal aunts, daughters of a brother and daughters of a sister, mothers who have breastfed you, milk sisters, mothers of your wives, daughters-in-law under your tutelage and of women with whom you have consummated the marriage are prohibited; if the marriage has not been consummated, this is not a sin on your part; the wives of your sons born of your loins; as well as two sisters together.

We find, in the mythology studied by anthropologists and in the writings of Claude Lévi-Strauss, elements that suggest that incest participates in the establishment of this defeat of the symbolic, and that the matrimonial rules are animated by the concern to avoid the double inscription of the same in time or space.

In American myths, for example, there is a decree which makes nothing more dissimilar than strictly identical things, real twins for example. Each of them, which is the exact replica of the other, is presented as being rather its most perfect opposite. When one is the «sun», the other is the «moon», if one is «aggressive», the other is «peaceful», when one is «strong», the other is «weak», if he is «intelligent and skillful», the other is «stupid, clumsy or dizzy», etc. «Twins occupy a prominent place in Native American mythology. There is, however, only an appearance here, for the reason for their importance, and the role that myths assign to them, lies precisely in the fact that they are not twins; or their incompatible temperaments contradict their supposed condition. The fateful sentence . . . ultimately boils down to the implicit assertion that every unit contains a duality, and that when it is actualized, whatever one desires and whatever one does, there can be no true equality between the two halves. The universality of this ideology suggests that twins play an important role in representation systems [4]. Two formulas must be distinguished in this mythology: 1) Twins of opposite sexes are represented as being destined to commit incest; from this incestuous union, equally incestuous children will be born from whom the first humanity will be born. This formula is an attempt to answer the following question: «How can duality (that of the sexes and the subsequent duality implied by the marriage alliance) be produced from unity, or more precisely from a rather ambiguous image of unity so that we can conceive that diversity emerges from it?» 2) Same-sex twins make it possible to deal with the other question: «Can duality be absorbed in the approximate image of the unity by which it is represented, or does it offer an irreversible character, to such an extent that the minimum gap between its terms must inevitably widen?» [5].

One can also refer to what Marcel Griaule says about the Dogon myth of creation. God makes a mistake by assigning a clitoris (termite mound) to the woman (earth); when he seeks to unite with her, the termite mound will set itself up to block her access to the sex (anthill) of the earth. The first sexual intercourse is therefore defective. God excises the woman and thus puts an end to the disorder. The jackal is born from this first failed attempt. God then normally unites with the woman and gives birth to the geniuses (Nommo) who are a couple of twins. The jackal will also try to mate with his mother, causing her to appear menstruation. God then turns away from the woman who has become impure by this incestuous act and directly creates human beings: a man and a woman. «It was then that nommo's couple came into the scene: he foresaw that the fundamental rule of double births was going to be abolished and that it could result in faults comparable to that of the jackal, born alone. For it was because of his loneliness that the first son of God had done so. [...] The genius drew on the ground two silhouettes, two souls, one of which was male and the other female. The man lay over these two shadows and took them both. The same was done for the woman. Since then, human beings are no longer born in duplicate, but each being is double; he has a male soul and a female soul. Circumcision and excision make it possible to fix a single sexual destiny for each one. However, real twins are still being born; very similar, they are also so different, so symmetrical that only they are good traders because the natural principle of equivalence is in them; between two things of different natures, they immediately know how to find the right balance. Thus, one is a seller and the other a buyer [6].

We can deduce from these myths the existence of a conception of human identity, almost universal, constructed from a biological representation of man. The human being is conceived as being composed of two sexually different parts, animated by a double principle. (In The Bible, the primitive Adan is a dual being: both man and woman - Adan and Eve). Each of the two fragments of identity is brought by one of the parents and therefore bears the sex of the latter. Incest (union with the too close) causes the appearance of principles not double (different) but twin. The union with the too distant causes bad alloys, gives rise to incompatible principles, to halves that cannot coexist. This is the reason why not only incest, but also what could be called the «ex-cestes», are prohibited [7].

The question of the double

In many non-Western societies, the placenta, considered to be twice as large as the child, must be kept out of the presence of the child, somehow expelled, turned away so that the child can be kept alive. Many societies [8] also give special treatment to twin children, whom in Africa, some ethnic groups consider as little geniuses of the bush: the Mossi (kinkirsi), the Dogon (nommo), the Gourmantché (pola), etc. give them the same name as to these little geniuses, symbols of the wild and indomitable nature. In his book on *The Ritual Phenomenon*, Victor Turner devotes a chapter to twins in the introduction of which he summarizes quite precisely the conception that human societies have of them in general. Among the Ndembu, there are two main types [9] of rituals associated with procreation: a ritual for default that is performed for women who lose their children or who cannot conceive, and a ritual for excesses for those who give birth to «too much» (twins). «Having twins is seen simultaneously as a blessing and a misfortune. In many societies, the birth of twins disconcerts the social order: «Where kinship is structurally significant and provides a framework for formed relationships and social status, the birth of twins is a source of classificatory embarrassment. For it is widely believed, in Africa and elsewhere, that children born during a single parturition are, in a supernatural way, identical. However, according to the unwritten rules associated with kinship systems, there is only one position for them that they can occupy in the structure of the family or the solidary group of kinship. [...] The order of birth is also an important factor [...]. Now, gemellity presents this paradox that what is physically double is structurally unique and that what is supernatural one is empirically two. In many societies, twins have a mediating function between animality and divinity; they are therefore considered to be both more than human and less than human.

According to Alessandra Piontelli, this special character of the twins, which explains the fascination they have exercised since the dawn of time, comes not only from «their obvious and often disturbing resemblance», but also from the fact that they shared the maternal womb together for nine months: «In myths and legends, as in folklore, this shared stay in the mysterious lair of the matrix seems to carry important and often indelible consequences, especially in two very different or even opposite directions. On the one hand, in mythology and in the Bible, we see twins, like Romulus and Remus, or like Esau and Jacob, devoured by a jealousy so violent and so murderous that the protagonists can survive and find any comfort only after the murder and annihilation of the hated rival. On the other hand, twins like Castor and Pollux seem to merge to such an extent that neither can imagine that he can survive in the absence of his companion. In the intrauterine life that we imagine for them, two attitudes are lent to them: either they engage in terrible fights, or they «stimulate each other». «The belief of an almost inevitable incest between brothers and sisters, and already at work in the confined space of the matrix is also widespread». In general, they are attributed a greater maturity than children born unique, as if companionship favored the precocity of becoming an adult. «Tales, legends and myths often seemed [...] confirmed by reality. Indeed, jealousy, emotional involvement and, sometimes, the total closure of this twin couple to the outside world are common facts of everyday life and these phenomena were considered mainly as the result of something deeply intrinsic to the couple [10]».

Marie-Christine Sourzat, based on a work by Raymond Kuntzmann [11], writes the characters of twins in *The Bible*: «The biblical twins are subjected to exile each in turn, and it is from this separation that everyone finds his way. R. Kuntzmann emphasizes the essential role of Rebekah: it is she, the mother of the twins, who introduces the operation of dispossession and attribution. It is she who is at the junction of the two narrative programs and at the heart of the tension that leads the subjects to identification [...]. Rébecca is a mother only to the extent that she allows the differentiation of the twins, their affirmed diversity, while constantly founding their inalienable identity [12]».

This «strangely disturbing» character of the double has been highlighted by many European writers: Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (*The Double*), Guy de Maupassant (*The Horla*), Oscar Wilde (*The Portrait of Dorian Gray*), etc.: «Who? Me? Me, probably? It could only be me? So, I was sleepwalking, I lived unknowingly of this mysterious double life that makes doubt if there are two beings in us, or if a foreign being, unknowable and invisible, animates, at times, when our soul is numb, our captive body that obeys this other, as to ourselves, more than to ourselves. (Guy de Maupassant, *Le Horla*). The phenomena of personality duplication in certain mental pathologies continue to fascinate psychiatrists. (The case of Billy Milligan has been the subject of judicial treatment and psychiatric care finely reported by Daniel Keyes) [13]. «In all cultures, the feeling of losing one's identity and suddenly finding oneself controlled or cornered by an entity alien to oneself is

recognized as one of the strongest experiences that a human being can experience. In most non-Western cultures, the method traditionally used to alleviate the distress of those who experience this experience is to admit intruders into the interactive world of human affairs. «The most singular aspect of the [14] multi-personality movement is that, by rehabilitating incarnate personalities, the lay priests of American psychotherapy have brought back the demons of their own cultural past». Since [15] its origins, the psychoanalysis has constantly looked at these phenomena [16]. (Jean Laplanche even proposes that «the unconscious, once constituted by refoulement, is indeed a that, a second nature that acts us [17]»).

The double is thus, universally, often re-ed to the devil: «The fundamental principle, always unknown, is that the double and the monster are one. The myth, of course, highlights one of the two poles, usually the monstrous, to conceal the other. There is no monster that does not tend to split, there is no double that does not conceal a secret monstrosity [18]».

The hypothesis of bisexuality

Another idea that seems to possess a universal character is the hypothesis of the bisexuality of the human [19] being. Excision, circumcision, many rites of passage seem to owe their existence to this hypothesis. We also know that it is one of the strong ideas that Freud will «metabolize» the sometimes delirious theories of his friend Fliess [20].

According to Jean Cournut, «the idea that characteristics of each of the two sexes could coexist in the same unit concerns in general all beings, especially living beings, and in particular humans. This idea, on the other hand, is as old as the world; it is present in all mythologies, and in our culture it has strong scientific pretensions». We [21] also speak of psychobisexuality: «It is the ability of the human being - whatever his sex - to identify unconsciously, very early, in the long term but according to variable modalities, with people or with characteristics of one or the other sex. The word «capacity» being weak, it must be specified: it is the investment, by a psychic apparatus - even if it is still rudimentary or already evolved - of fantasies of unconscious identifications to sexual objects, whatever their sex, real or supposed, and more particularly to the representation of their psychosexuality». Sex and gender are in no way [22] necessarily linked. Robert J. Stoller writes: «The term gender identity refers to the mixture of masculinity and femininity in an individual, which implies that one finds both masculinity and femininity in each, but in different forms and to different degrees». And also: «It is not the same as the state of male and the state of female, which have a biological connotation; gender identity involves psychologically motivated behaviour [23]».

In the name of difference

Commenting on the work of Jean-Didier Vincent, Jean Cournut writes: «What about the difference that manufactures, not only of men and women, but that produces masculine and feminine in both?» «The symbolic brings together, while the diabolical opposes; but it is precisely the separation that allows the meeting; the (re)productive difference goes against the repetition of the same [24]».

«The difference,» he also explains, «is disturbing because it separates; but it is constructive precisely because it separates. It structures, it creates, it moves forward, it opens up the space necessary to think; it allows movement, it is the movement that breaks the repetitive and deadly monotony of the same, of the clone, of the always there forever, without change. This constructive difference breaks the repetition [25]».

I spoke above of «biological representation of man», of a symbolic biology therefore. François Roustang writes for example: «If the biology that makes the animal a machine cannot interest us, another biology could enlighten us on the present riches of our condition as human animals. For example, individuality, which seems so uncertain in the neurotic that we all are, is acquired to us as an animal. We know today that the cell membrane has a real stigma that makes everyone unique within the uniformity of the species [Jean-Didier Vincent]. Conversely, while autonomy is exalted and imitation is called upon to get out of it, we can notice that our animality creates bonds privileged by difference. Because the same biology has taught us that the rejection reactions of the embryo were favored by the similarity of the CHM of the fetus and

the mother, and that on the contrary the success of implantation in the maternal organism was a function of their degree of dissimilarity. As for the choice of sexual partners, at least in mice, it can be seen that difference is encouraged at the expense of similarity..." [26].

This need to distinguish humans from one another is clearly shown in The Bible as well: «Each of The three sons of Noah has many descendants, each named by a name of his own. Chapter 10, which precedes Babel, has more than seventy names of different men or clans. A formula comes up three times, almost identically, for each of the three major genealogical branches: «Here are the sons of Shem (or Japheth or Ham) for their clans, for their languages, in their lands, for their peoples». And the last verse of the chapter summarizes as follows: «Here are the clans of Noah for their gesture in their peoples: from them are divided the peoples on earth, after the flood».

We could not better evoke the diversity of beings, each having its own name, the diversity of peoples having spread on earth from the three sons. I do not listen to this text as a historical narrative in the sense in which it is usually understood, I listen to it in that the narrator or narrators make the multiplication of humans on earth a certain reading: diversification. There are more and more humans on earth, but each one is unique, never twice the same. [...] With unerring patience and precision, the biblical text tells us about the names of men, begotten by each other, over three, four, up to five generations. It is not written: Such a had 10 sons. The beings here are all named one by one, never simply counted as similar objects that could be confused into a single number. If Yoqtane has thirteen sons, the number thirteen does not appear; each son is presented, by the name of his own. At the end of the list, the narrator makes only this comment: all of them are sons of Yoqtane.

[...] The Bible speaks not only of God as unique, but also of each human being as unique, in the diversity of peoples, lands, languages. The son, the grandson, the great-grandson are no less important than the father, each brother is distinguished from another brother [27].

This rule of diversity is also invoked by Newton, suspected by Berkeley of wanting to exclude God from his system, as a proof of the existence of God and an emanation of his will: «Every man, as he is a feeling Being, is one and the same man throughout his life and in all the various organs of his senses. Thus, God is one and the same God everywhere and always. [...] The metaphysical necessity, which is always and everywhere the same, cannot produce any diversity; the diversity which reigns in all times and places can only come from the will and wisdom of a Being which necessarily exists [28]».

The dual origin of the human being

Schopenhauer explains that the noises, the disorders, the fury, the disorders that love produces on the most solidly informed brains (those of ministers and philosophers), the «acting», the «unleashing», the «anguish», the «misery», etc. that accompany it show that it rests on powerful resources. «Every amorous inclination [...], however ethereal its appearances maybe, takes root solely in the sexual instinct, and is even only a sexual instinct more clearly determined, more specialized and, rigorously speaking, more individualized. «What is decided [in any love story] is indeed nothing less than the composition of the next generation. In the sexual instinct, there is already inscribed the nature (Existencia and Essentia) of the beings to whom the sexuality of this individual will have to give birth, as well as that of the object by which this goal can be achieved. This is because the sexual instinct in itself, not directed at someone of the other sex, is only the expression in the individual consciousness of the «will-to-live taken in itself and out of the phenomenon». When the sexual instinct is directed towards a specific individual, it is because the «will to live in the form of an exactly defined individual» is imposed.

The venerable purpose of any romance novel, which is not always openly confessed, but which explains the constraining nature of the feeling of love, is the procreation of such a «determined child», «the exact determination of the future generation». The difficulties and torments in which love leads us correspond well to this situation: they express the manifestation of «the will to live of the new individual» that the couple can and wants to generate, without his knowledge. The desire for love itself is only the desire to merge two beings into one, where «the hereditary qualities of one and the other» come together.

The reciprocal aversion, «decided and persistent», which arises spontaneously between two individuals of opposite sexes is explained by the fact that the being that ill could generate would be «badly organized, deprived of inner harmony, unhappy». So that in the end, what «attracts to each other two individuals of sex differ with so much force and so exclusively, it is the will-to-live present in the whole species, which realizes in anticipation an objectification of its being in accordance with its intentions, in the individual that these two beings can produce». To the formation of this new being, participate the qualities brought by the father (will or character, form) and those brought by your mother (intellect, greatness).

The sexual instinct - the will-to-live, nature - to achieve its ends, cunning with the individual consciousness, because it knows that selfish goals are the only ones to which the individual voluntarily submits. The rule of nature is that the good of the species prevails over the individual good; it inculcates in the individual an illusion that, by believing that he is serving his «own interest», he will only realize the program of natural necessity. For the individualized will-to-live to obey the natural law, it must therefore be deceived, deceived on the true nature of its emotion which, in fact, consists of the «directives of the beautiful, which usually governs the sexual instinct, and without which it descends to the level of a repugnant need». The idea of the being to be created is therefore already entirely present in the look that we put on the object of love. The «sense of the species» alone explains that we love the complementary object, that the blondes love the brunettes, that the little ones like the big ones, etc. and that the imperfections of the other, provided that they are opposed to ours, seem to us beautiful. Instinct can thus be defined as the force that guides any individual in a direction and action useful to the species, the manifestation of the sovereign will of nature. Through instinct, «truth takes the form of illusion, in order to act on the will». Man thus believes that he will obtain more enjoyment with that which was in any case designated to him by fate; this belief is the illusory supplement which strengthens instinct, for the individual who is to be born cannot be born of these parents [29].

Structures of thee-parent

«The system of marriage between cross-cousins appeared, in the light of our own ideas about prohibited degrees, to be profoundly irrational. Why establish barriers between cousins from collaterals of the same sex and those from collaterals of different sexes, when the proximity ratio is the same in both cases? [...] The distinction is incompatible with our biological criterion of incest; since no intrinsic reason emerges from the particular relationship of cross-cousins, it was concluded that the entire institution must be the indirect consequence of phenomena of another order [30]. My hypothesis is, I recall, that there is a symbolic biology on which kinship systems are based. («Any system of kinship is therefore brought to deal conceptually with the same elementary biological data that are universal. A system of kinship is not the translation of the pure biological facts of reproduction, but it necessarily takes into account basic biological data. What are they? [...] There are only two sexes. Their meeting is necessary to procreate and procreation leads to a succession of generations whose natural order cannot be reversed. An order of succession of births within the same generation has elders and cadets recognized within the siblings. In fact, all three of these natural relationships express the difference within the male/female relationship, parents/children, elders/cadets) [31]. Incest is a threat in that it produces the return of the same to the place of the other; incest is any sexual union that is not likely to produce the other, but only to give rise to already existing identities. It seems to me that Lévi-Strauss begins by giving himself the keys to access this symbolic biology, but that he abandons it in favor of the sociological theory of the exchange of women: «What can be the reason why, among dozens of different tribes of Africa, America, Asia, Oceania, one should not marry under any circumstances the daughter of the paternal uncle, since this would be equivalent to marrying a sister, while the best desirable wife is the daughter of the maternal uncle, that is to say, a relative just as close as the previous one from the biological point of view? [...] Since societies try to maintain their identity over time, there must first be a rule fixing the status of children in relation to that of their parents. In this respect the simplest and most frequent rule is that of unilinear descent: children have either the status of their father (patrilineal descent) or the status of their mother (matrilineal descent). It is possible to take into account both the status of the father and the status of the mother, and combine them together to define a third category in which the children will fall. For example, a child whose father is of status A, and the mother of status B, will himself be of status C; and the status will be D if it is the father who is B and the mother A. Then C and D will marry and produce children either A or B, depending on the

statutory membership of the father and mother, and so on. When I read these lines several years ago, I [32] wondered why they could not instead generate E's and F's. I had thought that it was necessary to admit that whatever the official ideology (the system of filiation in force), a child always comes under the statutes of both his parents. I had tried to follow this path to see if it would provide answers to the author's questions. It seemed to me at the time that marriage between relatives - for example, between a man and his matrilineal cross-cousin - did not require adherence to the theory of exchange in order to be understood. With Lévi-Strauss, this custom can only be explained by adopting the hypothesis that these peoples resort to [33] generalized exchange: group B always gives its daughters to group A, which means that the wives of father and sons A come from B (the wife of the son being preferably the daughter of his maternal uncle).

According to Lévi-Strauss, men are not content to maintain good neighbourly relations, exchanging goods, words and women; at each level of the operation, they introduce ever-increasing difficulties. In dualist organization, for example, «whether the mode of filiation is matrilineal or patrilineal, the children of the father's brothers and those of the mother's sister are placed in the same half as the subject; while the children of the father's sister and those of the mother's brother always belong to the other half. In an exogamous system, they are therefore the first collaterals with whom marriage is possible. We are in the context of the restricted exchange where group A gives its [34] daughters to group B and receives its wives from the same group B. The children of father A's sister and those of mother B's brother all belong to group B. These cousins of the other group are considered to be the only cousins, while the children of the father's brothers, all A, are brothers and sisters of subject A, as well as the children of the mother's sisters, since they necessarily marry in group A will produce A's of the same generation as the subject. Parallel cousins are therefore referred to by a different term than the one used to call cross cousins. The father's brothers are called «fathers», and the mother's sisters are «mothers». The only uncle is the maternal uncle; he is the representative of the group of relatives of women married by the subject. In some societies, a term is used to designate it that also means «father-in-law», «father of the wife». The only aunt is also, for the same reasons, the paternal aunt. «Let be, for example, a system of matrilineal halves A and B; and a second division, this time patrilineal, between two groups, X and Y. Each individual will hold from his mother a status A or B, and from his father a status X or Y; each, therefore, will be defined by 2 indices: AX, AY, BY or BX. If the rule of marriage is that the possible spouses differ, at the same time, in terms of maternal and paternal index, it can easily be seen that only cross-cousins satisfy this double requirement, while uncles or aunts, nephews or parallel nieces, differ by one index only» [35].

Sometimes a distinction is introduced between the crossed cousins themselves, saying either that it is only the matrilineal cross-cousins who are the preferable wives for a male Ego, or that it is the patrilineal cross-cousins who constitute the suitable wives of Ego. But as a rule, it is the matrilineal cross cousin (the daughter of the maternal uncle) that societies designate as the preferable wife for a subject. This time, it is in the context of the generalized exchange that we must place ourselves to understand this practice. Group A gives its daughters to Group B, which gives its daughters to C, C to D, and finally D to A.

A gives to B, B gives to C, C gives to D, D gives to N, N gives to A. A subject from group B therefore always received his wife from group A. The maternal uncle is the guarantor of this law. «Bilateral marriage, like unilateral marriage with the daughter of the mother's brother, ensure the best solidarity of family groups allied by marriage; but, in addition, this solidarity extends to the whole social group, completing a structure: dualistic organization, matrimonial classes or systems of relations. On the contrary, marriage with the daughter of the father's sister, if it performs the first function, never satisfies the second [36]».

In another text, he explains that the «recurrence, in remote regions of the world and in profoundly different societies, of forms of kinship, rules of marriage, similarly prescribed attitudes between certain types of parents, etc. suggests that, in either case, observable phenomena result from the interplay of general but hidden laws» [37]. The importance of the maternal uncle has been misinterpreted as the survival of a primitive matriarchy. In fact, the phenomenon of kinship immediately involves 4 terms that constitute the «element of kinship» strictly speaking: brother, sister, father and son; these 4 terms are sufficient to define the 3 types of relationships that form the basis of any «kinship structure»: inbreeding and alliance/filiation. The universal prohibition of incest «is equivalent to saying that, in human society, a man can

only obtain a woman from another man, who gives her to him as a daughter or sister. We therefore do not need to explain how the maternal uncle makes his appearance in the structure of kinship: he does not appear there, he is immediately given there, he is the condition» [38].

The following observations by André Green had also aroused my interest, several years ago already, without me having been able to elaborate them in a constructed theoretical perspective: «If we consider the five schemes of the atom of kinship as Claude Lévi-Strauss formalizes them [...], a striking fact. The relationship between husband and wife, on the one hand, and father-son, on the other, can be of the same or opposite sign (positive and negative). Likewise, the relations between brother and sister and maternal uncle and nephew. But there can be no relationship [situation?] where the relationship between husband and wife and that between brother and sister can be of the same sign - positive and negative. It follows that the same is true in father-son and maternal uncle and nephew relationships. But if we consider things no longer on the side of exchange but on the side of the representation offered to the child, it is indeed a non-doubling of the relationship (husband-wife, brother-sister) that is sought by the system. [...] I then come to wonder . . . if the necessary antagonism of the relations between husband-wife, brother-sister, is not based, since it is the maternal uncle, to avoid around the mother a relationship of repetition. [It would be] a question of paring a representation of replication [...] [39]”.

I had been intrigued by the fact that it was only in the two positive cases that the difference of the sexes - when the subjects were of the mother generation (husband/wife; brother/sister) - and the difference of the generations - when the subjects were of the same sex (father/son; maternal uncle/nephew) - were respected. In both negative cases, when the difference in the sexes was taken into account, the subjects were of the same generation (husband/wife; brother-sister), and when it was the difference of the generations that was observed, they were of the same sex (brother/sister; maternal uncle/nephew).

Double registration

Every human being is born of a man (a) and a woman (b). We have also seen that the hypothesis of a bisexuality of the human being is very widespread in mythology. Every human being is therefore, in a way also, a bisexual being: both masculine (X) and feminine (Y). Den. Male Human by XY and Female Human by YX. If we start from the assumption that everyone inherits their feminine character from their mother and their masculine character from their father, the son from a father (a) and a mother (b), can be represented by XaYb, and the daughter of this couple by YaXb. If (a) is the status of the father, (b) the status of the mother, and (a¹) the status of their child, (a¹) will include both (a) and (b). What we call status therefore evolves irreversibly over the generations.

Let us go one step further. Suppose a sibling composed of two sons (X1a and X2a) and two daughters (Y^{1a} and Y^{2a})- (1) and (2) denoting the order of birth. None of these children can be confused with any other child of humans. If a father Xa has a child with a wife (Yc), the status of the latter will necessarily differ from that of his half-brother conceived with Yb: XaYc and no longer XaYb. Let’s go back to our 4 individuals: 2 boys Xa and 2 girls Ya. Suppose these 4 «original» subjects conceive children with other partners, one of the boys with a Yb girl and the other with a Yc girl, and the girls with Xd and Xe boys.

$$(Xa) * (Yb) = [(XaYb); (YbXa)]$$

$$(Xa) * (Yc) = [(XaYc); (YcXa)]$$

$$(Ya) * (Xd) = [(YaXd); (XdYa)]$$

$$(Ya) * (Xe) = [(YaXe); (XeYa)]$$

Now let’s look at the parent relationships between these different individuals:

X^{1a} is the frera of X^{2a}

Xa and Ya are brother and sister

Y^{1a} and Y^{2a} are mores

X^{1a} is the father of $XaYb$ and $YbXa$

X^{2a} is the father of $XaYc$ and $YcXa$

Y^{1a} is the mother of $XdYa$ and $YaXd$

Y^{2a} is the mother of $XeYa$ and $YaXe$

X^{1a} and X^{2a} are the maternal uncles of $XdYa$, $YaXd$ and $XeYa$ and $YaXe$

X^{1a} is the paternal uncle of $XaYc$ and $YcXa$

X^{2a} is the paternal uncle of $XaYb$ and $YbXa$

Y^a and Y^{2a} are the paternal aunts of $XaYb$, $YbXa$ et de $XaYe$, $YcXa$

Y^a is the maternal aunt of $XeYa$ and $YaXe$

Y^{2a} is the maternal aunt of $XdYa$ and $YaXd$

Are parallel cousins [$(XaYb)$; $(YbXa)$]

and [$(XaYc)$; $(YcXa)$] of the one part,

and on the other [$(XdYa)$; $(YaXd)$] and [$(XeYa)$; $(YaXe)$]

are crossed cousins: [$(XaYb, YbXa)$; $(XaYc, YcXa)$]

and [$(XdYa, YaXd)$; $(XeYa, YaXe)$].

Since we have said that any sexual union likely to produce the double registration of the same will be regarded as incestuous, we must now consider the status of the children that could result from a «generalized» sexual union between these individuals.

To have a complete view of it, we will only have to consider that of the children that can result from the crossing of a boy with his mother, of a girl with his father, then of $XaYb$ with each of the girls, and that $XdYa$ with each girl too:

1. $XdYa * Ya \rightarrow XdYaYa$ - union with mother
2. $YbXa * Xa \rightarrow YbXaXa$ - union with father
3. $XaYb * YbXa \rightarrow XaYbYbXa$ - brother/sister union
4. $XaYb * YcXa \rightarrow XaYbYcXa$ - union with the daughter of the paternal uncle - a patrilateral parallel cousin

5. $XaYb * YaXe \rightarrow XaYbYaXe$ - union with the daughter of the paternal aunt - a patrilateral cross cousin
6. $XdYa * YbXa \rightarrow XdYaYbXa$ - union with maternal uncle's daughter - a matrilateral cross cousin
7. $XdYa * YaXe \rightarrow XdYaYaXe$ - union with the daughter of the maternal aunt - a matrilateral parallel cousin.

We see that the only union that does not stumb on a situation of double registration (duplication of an already existing identity: Xa or Ya) is that between a man and his crossed cousin. However, we remember Lévi-Strauss writing on this subject: «Let us, for example, be a system of matrilineal halves A and B ; and a second division, this time patrilinear, between two groups, X and Y . Each individual will take from his mother a status A or B , and from his father a status X or Y ; each, therefore, will be defined by 2 indices: AX , AY , BY or BX . If the rule of marriage is that the possible spouses differ, both in terms of maternal and paternal index, it can easily be seen that only crossed cousins satisfy this double requirement, while uncles or aunts, nephews or parallel nieces, differ by one index only [40]. He also adds that in many cases, societies distinguish between cross-cousins and that most of them say that it is the daughter of the maternal uncle who is the preferable wife for a subject. Can we explain this preference with our diagram?

The union with the daughter of the paternal aunt, the cousin crossed patrilateral, does not lead to any already existing identity:

$XaYb * YaXe \rightarrow XaYbYaXe$; there is an entirely new status that appears.

Even the union with the maternal uncle's daughter, the matrilateral cross cousin, does it create a new status:

$XdYa * YbXa \rightarrow XdYaYbXa$.

Simply, the same identity index appears, in both cases, but reversed: 1) $XaYbYaXe$; 2) $XdYaYbXa$. The system of filiation observed by the vast majority of human societies is that of patrilineal descent. If we consider that the married daughter is brought back from the outside to be integrated into her [41] husband's group, we will understand why it is the marriage with the daughter of the maternal uncle that is considered to be the most dynamic in this movement of «displacement of identity». The patrilateral cross-cousin already possesses the identity (a); if she comes to her family (a) by marriage, it is as if this identity that we want to move into the social space comes back from the outside: the circle would quickly be closed. The daughter of the maternal uncle brings with her, in this «elsewhere» where she marries, the identity of her fathers (patrilineal societies): she strengthens, thus consolidates this process of «transfer of identity» begun with her paternal aunt. From the marriage with the patrilateral cross-cousin, there is no result of any existing person, there is no reproduction of members of the previous generation; only, in the family (a) still appears Xa and Ya . For this reason, marriage with the matrilateral cross cousin is preferred to him, because if here again Xa and Ya appear, it is in another family (d). The maternal uncle must be grateful to his sister's children because it is through them that the identity of his family is expanded «geographically».

This «graphic» re-entry also makes it possible to understand the system of the most commonly observed designations:

1. A frera or a sister is someone with whom I share the same index of identity at the level of the X or - exclusive - at the level of the Y . So they are the children of the clean father, paternal uncles and maternal aunts.
2. A pera is someone of the previous generation who has the same identity index as me at the X level: so it is my father and his brothers and sisters. Women are distinguished by a word that is translated as «aunts».
3. A mera is someone of the previous generation who has the same clue as me at the Y level: the mother herself, her sisters and brothers. Men are distinguished by a word that is translated as «uncles».

4. A cousin is someone of the same generation with whom I share the same index of belonging but reversed in relation to sexual identity: someone who has the same index on Y as the one I have on X, and vice versa.

Finally, let us ask ourselves why socisummers set up as an external limit to exogamy, which means that, as a general rule, we do not marry someone from a social group that is too foreign, whose practices and representations are too far removed from our own? Why do they refuse «the careless union with [too] a strange stranger», that is to say, «the too advanced exogamy that threatens the social group from the outside»? [42]. One saw in fact that «in the elementary structures of kinship, marriage is preferred with this type of parent: neither the too close nor the too distant, nor the too similar nor the too different. In complex structures, we can reopen this concern for a certain «endogamy» (for example professional, cultural ...) which relativizes exogamy. Similarity and difference predate marriage. The marriage accomplished, it is anyway par excellence matrix of the «contradictory» since it unites (in a stable way) what is different [43]”.

Everything happens as if, in these cases, identities could no longer communicate with each other, as if we were changing languages and alphabets. Such unions could therefore only constitute bad alloys. Here again, the child who would be born would be in a real situation of «double inscription» since the absence of identity of [44] representations would result in the fact that in the space of belonging of his father, one could only speak to him in the language of the father, since one would not understand the other, and that one can only do exactly the opposite in the maternal space. The child would then be forced to be a double agent, forced to play double game, like Heinrich and Goetz of Sartre’s play. Heinrich, whom Goetz calls a traitor, replies: «A traitor? But yes, of course. They too, you know, they call me a traitor. But tell me, how can I manage to betray everyone at once? Et Goetz explains to him: «Let’s see, Priest, you are already a traitor: two parties clash and you claim to belong to both at the same time. So you play double game, so you think in two languages: the suffering of the poor, you call it trial in Church Latin and in German iniquity. [...] I am a double agent by birth: my mother gave herself to a crunch, and I am made of two halves that do not stick together: each of the two horrified the other” [45].

Conclusion

Asa «supposed child», Oedipus undertakes an investigation to find out his origins, but is very early diverted from this objective as soon as Pheobos reveals his destiny to him. The questions he did not ask himself: «What is a father? what is a mother? », might have opened his eyes - those eyes that, according to Tiresias’ almost biblical expression, he had not to see. Preoccupied with this question of fate, Oedipus becomes a decipherer of riddles, because he is himself one of the thickest mysteries, as Tiresias further explains. It is his own story that the Winged Virgin offers him in a pictorial form, but Oedipus believes that it is the common destiny of all humans. At birth, it is led among sheep from one country to another as a common four-legged animal. Then he straightened up as the greatest of Thebes. Then, having become blind, he is forced to find a third leg before he has aged. His eyes, which he unceremoniously disposed of, were of little use to him, for he did not even see that the filth which contaminated the land of Thebes came from what he was «from his own children brother and father, and from the one who gave birth to him son and husband,» from the way that his wife «had conceived in turn a husband of her husband and the children of her child” [46].

Social death is part of these duplications, this blurring of identities. Any sexual relationship likely to produce such impedimenta is judged and condemned as incestuous. Culture transforms, puts an end to common-law unions and binds them to a set of conditions that preserve them. What it aims to avoid above all is the double inscription of the same in time and space [47].

Bibliography

1. Lévi-Strauss Cl. “The family”. In R. Bellour, C. Clément (editions.), Claude Lévi-Strauss Paris, Gallimard (1979): 123.
2. Barry A. “The confusion of incest in theories and in reality”. *Journal of Anthropologists* (2019).
3. On this point To see Laplanche J. “The Sexual Crime”. *Adolescence* 21.1 (2003): 163-178.

4. "The enormous importance of twin worship for development of the culture of humanity [...] and on the other hand the dualistic character of the great religious systems, allow us to look to find out if there is not a correlating between these two facts. [...] We believe that the cult of twins is a consequence of the belief in a double soul [...] and not conversely that the motives of the double are based on your somewhat peculiar phenomena of a twin birth. Consequently, we must see in the twin cult a mythical concretization of the motif of the Double. This motif emanated from the belief in a double soul, one mortal, the other immortal". (Rank O., 1914: *The Double* (1914), in *Don Juan and the Double* (1914 and (1922): 90.
5. Lévi Cl. "History of lynx". Paris, Plon (1991).
6. Griaule M. "God of water". Interviews with Ogotemmèli, Paris. Fayard (1966).
7. I agree with Marika Moisseeff on the fact that "they are not the regulations aimed at sexuality that are universal, but the point on the what are involved, i.e. generation" and that "the cultural concept incest is universally underpinned by representations of the procreation": "In traditional societies, at the ideological level, the emphasis is put on this inescapable link between sexuality and procreation, and on the disposal of the reproduced human action to the transcendent [...]. Therefore, if the joys of sex are not by no means neglected, the arrangement of sexual encounters cannot be reduced at the level alone it must be extended to the social sphere.". (Moisseeff M., 1987: "Between motherhood and procreation: incest", *Patio, Psychoanalysis*, numéro 7 (1987): 121-145.
8. Barry A. "The burial of placentas and its stakes in the African tradition". *Essaim, Revue de Psychoanalyse*, Number 39 (2017): 129-141.
9. Turner VW. "Les paradoxes des jumeaux dans les rituels ndembu". In *the ritual phenomenon. Structure and counter-structure*, Paris, PUF (1990).
10. Pionteili A. "Research on twins before and after birth". *Topical Revue Freudienne* 51 (1993): 89-111.
11. Kuntzmann R. "The mythology of twins in the ancient Near East". PhD thesis, University of Lille III (1982).
12. Sourzat MC. "Le motif du jumeau". In *Twins and doubles*, *Topical, Revue freudienne* 51 (1993): 43-62.
13. Keyes D. "The Thousand and One Lives of Billy Milligan". Paris, Calmann-Lévy (2007).
14. Mulhern Sh. "In search of lost trauma. Multiple personality disorder". In Assoun PL, Zafiroopoulos M. (dir.). *The social rule and its unconscious beyond. Psychoanalysis and social practices I*, Paris, Anthropos Economica (1994): 223-224.
15. Mulhern Sh., op. cite 250.
16. Cf From M'uzan M. "The paraphrenic twin or on the edges of identity". *Revue française de psychoanalyse*, LXIII, Number 4. Gagey J., 1993: "The MHi and the I", *Psychoanalysis at the university*, VIII, number 71. Green A., 1973: "Le double et l'absent", in *Unbinding. Psychoanalysis, anthropology and literature*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres. Lacan J., 1949: "The stage of the mirror as a trainer of the function of the I as it is revealed to us in psychoanalytic experience", in *Writings Paris, Le Seuil* 1 (1966).
17. Laplanche J. "La pulsion de mort dans la théorie de la pulsion sexuelle". In Neck. *The impulse of death*, Paris, PUF (1986): 16.
18. Girard R. "From mimetic desire to monstrous double". In *Violence and the sacred*, Paris, Grasset (1972): 213-248.
19. Pontalis JB. "Bisexuality and gender difference (1973)", Paris, Gallimard, coll. "Folio Essais", 2000. Plato, 1964: *The Banquet*. Phaedra Paris, Garnier/Flammarion (1964).

20. "At least two of these false theories will indeed find their continuation, their métabole in Freudian thought: bisexuality will remain in the background, as a kind of invariant to which Freud will always refer but that he theorize then on the side of the castration complex. Similarly, the periodicity goes also subsist in two ways: as invariant in the sense that the superstition of Freud regarding the periods will follow him all his life, and at the same time she will metabolize, develop in what we know as repetition and impulse of death". (Laplanche J., 1986: *Problems V. Le Baquet. Transcendence of transference*, Paris, PUF, collection "Quadrige" (1986): 282.
21. Cournut J. "What for men are afraid of women?". Paris, PUF (2001): 34.
22. Cournut J., on. cité 39.
23. Cited by Cournut J., *ibid.*40.
24. *Ibid.*,31.
25. *Ibid.*, 52.
26. Roustang F. *Influence*, Paris, Editions de Minuit (1990): 9-10.
27. Balmory M. "The Forbidden Sacrifice, Freud and the Bible, Paris, Grasset and Fasquelle" (1986): 77-78.
28. Koyré A. "From the closed world to the infinite universe". Paris, Gallimard (1973): 271-273.
29. Schopenhauer A. "Metaphysics of l'amour, metaphysics of death". Paris, UGE, collection 10/18 (1964).
30. Lévi-Strauss Cl. "The basic structures of kinship". Paris, Mouton and Co and Maison des sciences de l'homme (1967): 115.
31. Héritier F. "Male/female. The thought of difference". Paris, Odile Jacob (1996): 56-57.
32. Lévi-Strauss Cl. "The basic structures of kinship". On cite (1949): 124-126.
33. Barry A. "Nomenclature et racines de l'identité". In *Belief, its sources, its resources and their drying up. Ethnopsychanalytic essay on the making of the cultural link*, Doctoral thesis in Psychology, University of Picardie Jules Verne (1995): 444-546.
34. Lévi-Strauss Cl. "The basic structures of kinshipon". Cite (1949): 114.
35. *Ibid* 24.
36. *Ibid.*, 513-514.
37. Lévi-Strauss Cl. "L'analyse structurale en linguistique et en anthropologie". In *Structural Anthropology*, Paris, Plon (1958): 47.
38. Lévi-Strauss Cl. "L'analyse structurale en linguistique et en anthropologie". *op. cit.* cited (1945): 63.
39. Green A. "Atom of Kinship and Oedipal Relations". In Lévi-Strauss Cl., 1974-1975: *Identity*, Paris, Grasset (1977): 88-89.
40. Lévi-Strauss Cl. "The basic structures of kinshipon". Cite (1949): 24.
41. "This system of descent is mainly found in the Middle East (Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, etc.), in Africa (Maghreb, regions sub-Saharan), in most parts of India, East Asia (Japan, most of China, Indonesia, to Java, etc.)." (Lallemand S., 1997: "Enfances d'ailleurs, approche anthropologique", in M. Guidetti. S. Lallemand, M.-F. Morel *Childhoods from elsewhere, yesterday and today*, Paris, Armand Colin (1997): 7-57.

42. Pouillon J. "Table manners, bed manners, language manners". *New Journal of Psychoanalysis* 6 (1972): 9-25.
43. Chabal M. "The Name of the Mother". *MAUSS Review* 12 (1998): 226.
44. Cf Barry A. "The Double Registration of the Migrant, Swarm". *Review of Psychoanalysis* 8 (2001): 71-83.
45. Sartre JP. "The Devil and The Good God". Paris, Gallimard (1951).
46. Sophocles. "Oedipus Roi". In Complete theatre, Paris, Garnier/Flammarion (1964): 103-143.
47. Barry A. "The Double Registration. Anthropology and psychoanalysis: reflections". Paris, L'Harmattan (2003).

Volume 10 Issue 11 November 2021

©All rights reserved by Aboubacar Barry.