

## GENERAL ANTHROPOGENY

### FIRST PART – BASIS

# Chapter 11 – THE ARTICULATION OF THE HOMINID SPECIMEN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 11 - The articulation of the hominid specimen.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>11A. The hominid specimen as downstream and upstream.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>11B. Corporal schemes .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>11C. The own body.....</b>	<b>6</b>
11C1. The own body thematized by the caress .....	6
11C2. The own body thematized by the reserve .....	7
<b>11D. Fantasmatic endotropic corporal representations ("images of the body").....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>11E. A heterogeneous system in search of unity.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>11F. Rhythmic demultiplication: nodes, envelopes, resonances and interfaces.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>11G. The hierarchisation of fantasies .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>11H. Stances: (1) The gesture.....</b>	<b>11</b>
11H1. Gesticulation and slow motion.....	11
11H2. The gestural rhetoric of the worn clothing .....	12
11H3. The inter-gesture The daily theatre .....	12
11H4. The thematization of the gesture: dance .....	13
<b>11I. Stances: (2) The work (oeuvre).....</b>	<b>14</b>
11I1. Techno-semiotic works .....	15
11I2. Purely semiotic works. The monument .....	15
11I3. Works stated as works. The subject of work: pictorial subject, architectural subject, musical subject, etc. Compliant and extreme works. ....	16
11I4. The work as sedimentation, articulation and hotbed of initiative .....	17
<b>11J. Stances: (3) Characters, styles, manners.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>11K. The X-same .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>11L. The communion of X-same(s).....</b>	<b>20</b>
11L1. Provocation, interpellation, apostrophe, altercation .....	20

11L2. Love .....	20
11L3. Hatred.....	22
<b>11M. The vagations of the X-same.....</b>	<b>22</b>
11M1. Shamanism and voodoo. Yoga, rapt and appearance.....	22
11M2. Hallucinations .....	23
11M3. Dementias.....	24
11M4. Initiations and conversions .....	24
<b>11N. The temporal limitations of hominid specimens.....</b>	<b>25</b>
11N1. Death.....	25
11N2. Birth.....	26
<b>11O. The hominid specimen as complicated and complex system .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## GENERAL ANTHROPOGENY

### FIRST PART – BASIS

## Chapter 11 - The articulation of the hominid specimen

To designate the singular hominid living, the anthropogeny avoids the word **individual**, which only appeared in the seventeenth century in the very specific circumstances of bourgeois rationalism and that classical Latin and medieval Latin did not know with that sense of "living indivis". Individuality (dividere, in- negative) supposes an ultimate or principial indivision that, announced through the personal status of Latin-Christian "conscientia" <8A>, was thematically postulated by the "thought" in the Cartesian sense; a Japanese, always very contextual, could not be "individual" in this sense. The anthropogeny will also avoid the word **subject**, which, after its psychiatric sense (the "subject" of presentations of ill persons), will only take on its current general sense in 1950.

Although it is heavy to handle, the term **hominid specimen** has the advantage that it does not pose a problem of indivision or division, and, on the other hand, it usefully recalls that "everyone" (every one), "someone" (some one) the "some one", "quidam" or still the "we" (hom<inem>) and the "particular" (partem, incul- diminutive) in question belongs to a species, and that it is not intelligible without the other specimens of this species and without the constant evolution of its species, the specificities of which are only a local and transitory manifestation, as state-moment of Universe. "Species" is then understood in the usual sense of a population of organisms capable of reproducing amongst themselves during an appreciable period of time, to the exclusion of others, of which we say that they do not belong to the same species. The fact that in botanic, the notion of species is sometimes more subtle should not concern us here, where it relates to an animal species.

The present chapter will approach the system that a Hominid specimen is. It will attempt at perceiving its great articulations, with their disparate, and thus also with the means that they have to ensure enough systemic unity amongst them.

## 11A. The hominid specimen as downstream and upstream

For the anthropogeny, what is most striking in the hominid specimen as a system is the distinction that is perceived and practised between an upstream and a downstream.

In former chapters, we have seen that everyone-someone has a stature, that he completes manipulations, angularization, transversalization, that he collaborates with his fellow men in an intense intercerebrality in the encounter, that he undergoes and provokes field effects, produces images, music and languages. These are so many ostensible interfaces between his interior milieu and exterior milieu, which comprises his fellows and a common environment.

But at the same time, we noticed that each one was also (a) possibilizing, (b) a lot more endotropic than other animals, (c) presential to the extent of being often presentive, i.e. thematizing presence-absence as such. The semiotic distanciation often seemed to double the technical distance. In such a way that, all put together, hominid operations often seem to be productions from a certain **below** of their acting-suffering. We shall metaphorically designate this productions as a downstream and designate their below as an upstream. The advantage of the downstream/upstream couple is that a downstream always signals a certain upstream from which it proceeds, as the upstream signals a certain downstream, which is its outcome.

**The downstream** of the hominid specimen has already been well illustrated in the ten preceding chapters on the occasion of manipulation, walk, technical production, semiotic production of images, music and languages. On the other hand, its **upstream** has not yet been envisaged in other ways than by allusion. We must thence start by going over its three main aspects: (a) corporal schemes, (b) the own body, (c) endotropic corporal representations. The second part of the chapter will then try to see how the hominid specimens strive to sufficiently ensure the unity of the disparate system that they are.

## 11B. Corporal schemes

The French language allows distinguishing schemas from schemes [though patterns]. **Schemas** designate the simplified elements that are more or less stereotyped, of a physical performance, and particularly its image. **Schemes** [though patterns] rather designate, below specific performances, an open potentiality, a virtuality, a faculty, a play area from which possibilizing Homo's performance proceeds more or less ostensibly. In a scheme, there is at least as much imagination - and sometimes imaginary <7J>, as there is perception and effective motivity. And more upstream than downstream. Aristotle would have said: more power than act.

Strictly speaking, animals also activate-passivate schemes, - *the* leap in such a leap, *the* catch in such a catch, - but for them, the virtualities of execution are so constrained by execution schemas that they are hardly distinct; this is, moreover, what makes the leap of the panther infallible, and even more so the almost instantaneous coupling of the arm and the eye of the preying mantis. On the other hand, in Homo, we are struck, upon any movement, by the degrees of liberty that surround him, tend him, decompress him, by the play that inhabits him, and from which it seems to stem. This is a consequence of the technical distance and semiotic distancing <4A> that surge from hominid stature, transversalization and manipulation. It is also a result of the cognitive neutralisation and emotional smoothing of Homo's brain <2B>.

Therefore, in every hominid specimen there is, apart from each operation, an upstream of this operation, both for him and for others. Upstream of an upright position, *the* rising. Upstream of a leap, *the* leap. Upstream of a grasp, *the* possession. Upstream of a rest, *the* gift or *the* abandon. All these added upstreams grant Homo's actions and passions an aura thematized by the dancers, but also by the speaker, whose gesture and tone are eloquent (*loqui*, *ex*). This *aura*, which is sometimes perceived as a sum, sometimes as a source, has led, according to the cultures, to speak of will, desire, etc., and when it is question of a chief, to speak of *authority*, understood like a certain surplus of acts (*auctoritas*, *augere*, *augment*).

We can then ask ourselves if corporal schemes [tough patterns] are stable, like the Platonist ideas, which were historically their hypostasis. On the scale of the Universe perhaps, if it is true that the Universe is only capable of a certain number of basic formations, like the seven elementary catastrophes theory would lead to think (the fold, the cusp, etc.) <24B5>. But not at the scale of the hominid specimens, which, like all living things, are local and transitory compatibilizations of heterogeneous biological series <21G3>. There is thus a becoming of hominid corporal schemes according to Homo's continuous constitution, i.e. throughout the anthropogeny.

This becoming of schemes realised itself through the anatomical-physiological evolution: thus, the case of Bipedalism after quadrupedalism. But also through the suite of technical objects and assuredly artistic processes, which are all reified schemes, - visible, audible, tangible, palpable. This was the case in the changeover from the split stone to the cut stone, then from the simple machines to energy machines, then to information machines. To the extent that one of the senses of Homo's technical and artistic development lies in his impulse to realise, to incarnate some of these corporal schemes, both somatic and nervous. Sometimes to objectify them, in technique and in everyday art. Sometimes to rekindle them, or extend them, for example in extreme art <11I3, 27D1>.

Schemes must also be considered to understand indexations. In addition to its physical (anatomical, physiological) and semiotic charge, any index (an indexating movement) is charged with the virtualities of schemes that are below it, and that allow to understand its power, in the potency, in the imperative language, in the sacralization of the scapegoat, in the consecration of the virgin, in the presentation (awakening of presence) of the presents (awakener of presence), and daily in the inter-gesture of collaboration, companionship, community, society <5G6>. Similarly, the theory of usual corporal schemes (charged) and the theory of pure indexations (discharged) that mathematics is <19>, overlap each other for a large part.

Finally, the consideration of corporal schemes also enlightens the indiciality of indicia. The anthropogeny has seen enough in indicia the role of causality, similitude, contiguity <4B1-2>.

where the substructure of anatomic and muscular schemes is patent, but also the nervous and cerebral schemes of the indicating specimen. In sum, it is the neuronics schemes in their generality, with their limited coding, <2A2a> which allow us to base the specific edifications of indicium and index that are, in the endotropic cerebral circulations, what are called the concepts, diversely charged (of affect or imaginary) or discharged (purified).

## 11C. The own body

Given an organism, the term own body was invented to designate what French existentialism called the *body-for-oneself*, by opposition to the *body-for-other*, which is encountered by the operating surgeon, by the medication and the poison that modify chemically, by the means of transport that convey.

The anthropogeny will recognise two essential aspects in an own body. (a) It is a living organism insofar as it is accompanied by presence-absence. (b) It is a living organism insofar as it is a point of view *of* Universe, and not only a viewpoint *over* the Universe; i.e. it is a state-moment during which the Universe enters in functional and presential resonance with itself; resonance that is more or less vast and more or less intense depending on the cases. Under these two aspects, the own body is not representable, not determinable, nor situated in a spatial-temporal manner, and finally indescribable. Indeed, presence-absence from which it is indissociable does not belong to the order of functionings, the only ones to be describable <8A>. And on the other hand, a point of view *of* Universe escapes the situability, the *situs*, that viewpoints *over* the Universe enjoy.

The own body with its two aspects belongs to all upper animals, but once again it is only thematized in Homo, whose endotropizing, possibilizing, distancing brain can reveal, underline, prolong what, in other living beings, is only a fleeting component between the object of the performance and the performance itself, or its virtuality. Hence, Homo's own body, thematizable as such, introduced in the Universe an event both singular, primary, ultimate, original. So much so that it is not possible to say any more than what has been said. Unless we linger on two experiences where it awakes intensely. That is the caress, already widely sketched in upper animals. And the reserve, which seems unique to Homo.

### 11C1. The own body thematized by the caress

Firstly, the caress is the strongest experience of the own body of the other. Or of the other as own body. In opposition with grasp and rubbing, it uses the fusional resources of the superficial and deep tactile endings of hominid tact <1C3> to dissolve the peculiarities of the stroked body and to only retain, whilst awakening it to itself, effectively or hypothetically, the party *of* universe and the presence-absence that it is to itself. In other words, it exploits the resources of the *tender* (soft) , which expresses a stretching and a thinning that is both ductile and intrusive (at least according to the etymology that makes it derive from *tendere*, *teinein*). It is all the more deep that

it seems to move on the surface, and that it is accompanied with presence-absence through the functioning depth. It is under the caress that "the deepest is the flesh".

Doing so, the caress addresses the textures and even the growths more than the structures. It moves in enjoyment more than in pleasure or pleasures <6D1>. It fully conveys the eight properties of the rhythm: alternation, interstability, (fleeting) accentuation, tempo, self-engendering, convection, strophism, the distribution by nodes, envelopes, resonances, interfaces <1A5>. By all that, the caressed is simultaneously laid and solubilized, thematized as Other and Self, or other-self, self-other, delimited and infinitized, extended and balled up (put in a ball) in a location and a duration, or rather as a location and a duration that are not referable to coordinates. However the caress cannot be constructed analytically. It is learned convectively, not by rules. It finds its maximal accomplishments around sexual stimuli-signs <7H> that in turn it confirms in their status.

In the proximity and the self-sufficiency that it creates (itself) of the own body of the caressed, the caress ordinarily awakens the proximity and self-sufficiency of the own body of the caresser. Then a reduplicative return of two presence(s)-absence(s) <8A> installs, as well as a conclusive circularity of two viewpoints *of* Universe (vs on the Universe) abolishing the rest. In such a way that two own bodies make up one single inter-systemic reality where, like folk wisdom says "lovers are alone in the world". The caress induces the humanity of the infant, since the embrace of the nursemaid. As one day it will induce the second birth of the lover, which is the coupling, where the exchange with the own body of the loved one takes place. These two aspects first shape up in the animal.

Given the scope and flexibilities of possibilization <6A> for Homo, a singular behaviour also happens: the hominid caress is voluntarily trans-specific (taking place between several species) and often concerns pets, *pet dog* and *pet cat*, where *pet* seems to signify *pet*<y>, little, capable of being wrapped into a ball. The pet animal is then perceived in its precisely animal sensitivity, with the interest of entering in an original exchange of presence-absence and of viewpoint *of* Universe going beyond the frontier of species and also with the comfort of not having to confront the surprises that happen when the caressed is itself a possibilizing hominid specimen.

Besides, by the distanciations of Homo, hominid caress knows other metamorphosis, such as focusing on inanimate caressed, such as plants, gems, wooden and amber rosaries, more or less imaginatively gifted with sensation or limited to the function of stimuli-signs. It can even, like a caressing sound or caressing breeze, move around a diffuse own body, creating an almost pure presence-absence devoid of determined support.

## **11C2. The own body thematized by the reserve**

The hominid own body is also thematized in the *reserve* (servare, re), a certain manner of keeping oneself in withdrawal, reduplicatively or intensively, in the presence of another or oneself, and that we find in all known cultures, and that we can therefore suppose to be rather archaic. Reserve can accompany the effusion of tenderness, but also *respect* (spicere, re) and *reverence* (vereri, re), right to reverential fear, produced in particular by the power and authority of indexes <5G2>.

Reserve does not generally target the body-for-others, which was almost everywhere impartially explored and spread out in its parts and functions in cases of accidents, illnesses or specific initiations, for example in circumcisions, excisions, infibulations, trepanations (Amerindian). Reserve precisely thematizes the body-for-oneself to the extent that its status of presence-absence and viewpoint *of* Universe dissuades treating it as a simple beam of functionings, downstream, but as an unanalyzable mix of functionings and absence-presence, upstream.

In the hominid body, reserve found enumerable varieties of cultural realisations. Depending on the more or less folded positions of the very angular hominid organism. According to the dissimulations allowed by the hands. According to the technical distances and semiotic distancing of approaches and making of contacts. According to the biases of the image, music and language produced. According to the transparencies of smoke, the screen of light, nasal or aspired voices, "frogs" in throats, lisp, the transparencies and opacities of the veils of clothing. According to the blushing, which Darwin wanted to be proper to Homo. So many means of semi-transparency.

## 11D. Fantasmatic endotropic corporal representations ("images of the body")

Finally, in addition to corporal schemes and own body, the upstream of hominid specimens, who are animals with a brain with highly endotropizing <2B> and fantasmaticizing <7I> circulation, comprises fantasmatic endotropic representations of the body.

On this subject, the usual term *body image* is easier to handle but has disadvantages. It gives to think that corporal scheme is mostly a case of visual images, whereas the similitude in question are equally auditory, olfactory, tactile, kinaesthetic, coenesthetic, discoursing. It does not sufficiently oppose imaginary to imagination <7J>. On the other hand, it does not sufficiently mark that these upstream images are not simply the exotropic images of the hominid body that offer sculpted and painted images (massive or detailed), musics (massive or detailed), languages (massive or detailed) but before all else they are endotropic and fantasmatic representations that are somewhat to exotropic representations what schemes are to exterior motor performances through their virtualities. Finally, "body image" is silent on the fact that the representations it concerns are in privileged circular causality with corporal schemes, and with the own body as caress and reserve.

We shall therefore speak of *fantasmatic endotropic representations of the body*, merging the body-for-others and the own-body. They fall into three main categories, physiological, anatomic, copulatory, that were diversely encouraged by cultures. (a) **Physiologically**, they valorised for instance the digesting, menstruating, pregnant, excreting body (Japan), farting body (China), body making an effort to walk or breathe (Andes), whereas elsewhere were retained only the flattening breathing, the imperative or active hand, or the eye (Greece). (b) **Anatomically**, they deployed the imaginary of a body that is parcelary, global, or total, or atomised or in archipelago, etc. (c) **Copulatorily**, they fantasised partitions-conjunctions that are more anatomic and/or more

orgastic, hierarchic or complementary, in adversity or in dialogue, etc. This copulatory panoply will be somewhat deployed in the last chapter of the *Anthropogeny*, on the galaxy of X-same <30>.

## 11E. A heterogeneous system in search of unity

We can see that the hominid specimen is surprisingly diverse. Its downstream comprises an organism that adjoins, in veritable prosthesis, panoplies and protocols that are both technical and semiotic and constantly rattled by possibilization, field effects and fantasies. Its upstream encompasses at least corporal schemes, an own body, fantasmatic endotropic corporal representations. Thus, the hominid specimen crosses realities belonging to heterogeneous genus (genos, Heteron, various genus) and even motley (klinein, Heteron, leaning on various sides), attracted as it is by contrary or contradictory attractors, determining highly-unstable basins of attraction, and thus innumerable field effects <7A-E>.

Yet a living being requires a minimum of unity to prove efficient and feel enough enjoyment or pleasure to act and reproduce. Hominid specimens as global systems then exploited various resources, which we will approach successively: under **11F**, the rhythmical demultiplication by nodes, envelopes, resonances, interfaces; under **11G**, the hierarchy of fantasies; under **11 H-I-J**, the stances of the gesture and inter-gesture, of the work, of the style-manner. By which these specimens are X-same <**11K**>, with their means of communion <**11L**> and vagation <**11M**>, their birth and their death <**11N**>.

## 11F. Rhythmic demultiplication: nodes, envelopes, resonances and interfaces

As soon as we consider the step of the walk, the anthropogeny signals that one of the eight aspects of the rhythm is the demultiplication by nodes [cores], envelopes, resonances, interfaces. And it is probably what Homo did, always and everywhere, by using the means of cleavages of its nervous system in general, especially cerebral, to establish some order in his motley and heterogeneous aspects.

Let us explain concretely. (1) Homo can put in protrusion such organs, such organic systems (digestive, respiratory, reproductive, motor, etc.), such verbs or names, such concepts, such emotions, such coenesthesia, etc. These are **nodes** [cores], points with their close entourage, which work by density and attraction, as organising attractors. (2) Correlatively, Homo can practice or at least imagine edges (internal or external contours) between such organs, systems, activities, emotions, universe of the discourse, etc., and such others. They are more or less closed or open **envelopes** (in the topological sense), impermeable or porous. (3) Conversely, it can

establish regulated phasing and dephasing between such organs or such actions of the system that it is. They are **resonances**, which comprise all forms of relation other than attraction and exclusion, such as homeomorphism, isotopes, synchronies, etc. (4) Finally, it could happen that a portion of itself should be or appear as a relay of conversion between two or several others. These are **interfaces**, whose transduction between the places of a system are rapid or slow, agile or difficult, wrenching or amusing, etc.

Assuredly, these nodes, cleavages, envelopments, phasing and transduction manage to create a certain systemic unity of the hominid specimen only by means of the seven other properties of the rhythm that are the periodic and metronomic alternation, the inter stability, the moving accentuation, the tempo, the self-engendering, convection, and strophism. We can guess from here how the hominid communities and societies will always estimate, under different forms, that the conservation of the rhythm and its loss are the ultimate criterion of health and illness, and of their degrees <26B2>.

## 11G. The hierarchisation of fantasies

But the rhythm so defined could not sufficiently realise itself if a hominid specimen in quest of a certain operative and pleasurable unity did not enjoy perceptive-motor and logico-semiotic field effects that make that fantasies bathe him and cross him. In this regard, the compulsive fantasy, where field effects transform the "grasped" in a spiral, vertiginous hole that provokes stereotyped and recurrent actions, is of very little help. But we have seen on several occasions that Homo has these other resources, i.e. fantasies of things-performances, of \*woruld, sexual and generalised partition-conjunction, presence-absence, sacrifice, belief. All more or less re-grasped in a fundamental fantasy, hyper field that is both resulting and generating.

Let us recall that the **fundamental fantasy** <7I5> is the generative core of a destiny-choice of existence, i.e. it diffuses through the chosen-imposed topology, cybernetic, logico-semiotic, presentivity of each hominid specimen <8H>. The fundamental fantasy puts the Universe not in front of the specimen, but as coming back onto itself through it, so that, amongst all the components of Homo, the fundamental fantasy is the one that is more directly linked to the refusal or acceptance of birth and death. Almost all the extreme experiences that Homo has conceived - tch'an, satori, nirvana, beatific vision, - have attempted at a certain collectivisation at the same time as the passage at the frontier of the fundamental fantasy.

There are countless hierarchies of fantasies. Such one privileges compulsive fantasies, or fantasies of things-performance, or fantasies of \*woruld, or fantasies of partition-conjunction, or fantasies of presence-absence, or the fundamental fantasy. The chosen type of hierarchy is an essential aspect of a singular specimen's destiny-choice of existence. We shall not lose sight of the fact that here pleasure, pleasures are powerful mobilisers, and that they even take the insisting form of enjoyment <6D1>.

## 11H. Stances: (1) The gesture

Hominid specimens have such a fleeing unity that, in order to ensure this unity, in addition to the rhythm and the hierarchy of fantasies, which are floating unifying principles, they have developed principles simultaneously consistent and mobile, while being available to possibilization: the gesture, the work, the style-manner, that we shall call stances, from the indo-European \*st (stare, istèmi, stehen, staan, station, stance). The Italian *stanza* simultaneously marks resting, the place where one sojourns, as also a range of actions, exemplarily a stanza of verse or a suite of paintings that broaden this sojourn in the \*woruld. Raphael's stances at the Vatican are exemplary. We will start with the gesture.

### 11H1. Gesticulation and slow motion

To handle is to carry, but by taking charge of what is carried, i.e. by making it enter into a field of possibles, by possibilizing it. Therefore, the gesture, verbal substantive of *gérer* in French (gestus, us), does not only hold in the movements that Homo shares with prior animality, or even in the movements and other operations linked to the upright station. It supposes that an action-passion comes back onto itself, consists, insists, persists, quiveres with possibles, declares not only downstream functionings but corporal schemes, an own body, fantasized endotropic corporal images upstream. The gesture is the summary both perceived and motor of the unit of an hominid specimen, for him and for others.

Singular, the gesture also comprises a part of plural gestures still uncoordinated, confuse and almost insignificant; they are these "little gestures" (gesti-culi) etymologically implied by "gesticulation". "Gesticules" are gawky but at the same time full of a thousand possibles, even everything. The animal does not gesticulate, except for a little the chimpanzee, the most uncoordinated of apes and the closest to Homo. Whence the emotion linked to the spectacle of an infant agitating its limbs, showing just how well it is ill-adapted, but also has virtualities, potentialities, availabilities, latencies. Neonatal effervescence of the gestural stance often perpetuates in maturity, in Homo creator of theatre roles (Racine gesticulating *Britannicus* in the Jardin des Tuileries), of complex political or economic decisions, of only glimpsed mathematical or logical concepts.

In a body having hundreds of degrees of freedom (dimensions), the gesture has the characteristic of activating-passivating the opposites and even the contradictory ones, succeeding simultaneously to say yes and no, to come out or in, to go up or down, to go back and fro. Whence probably this French habit of speaking of the *geste* (gesture) in the singular, sometimes with a capital G in *Geste*. In English, *gesture* embraces the same profusion. Its gestures are perceived by Homo as signs per se, and languages by gestures are often called "sign languages", such as the American Sign Language (ASL). By all this the eight properties of the rhythm <1A5> are so characteristic to the gesture that we could almost say that the gesture is rhythm and the rhythm is

gesture. And it is because they are not rhythmic that we usually exclude from the gesture the compulsive (autistic) repetition, the divagation and immobilization of withdrawal (psychotic), the mental breakdown (neurotic), prostration (melancholy), agitation (maniac) <26B2>.

### 11H2. The gestural rhetoric of the worn clothing

Clothes enrich the stance that the gesture is, by spreading it outside and by gathering it inside. In particular they comfort the hominid upstream by their rhetoric of the reserve, sometimes of the caress, suggesting and maintaining so tangentially the own body and endotropic fantasizing representations of the body. In this function they have two resorts. (a) To dissimulate and discover, underline or blur some parts instead of others; thus, the bourgeois rationalist clothes of the seventeenth century uncovered the face and hands, both active and technician parts, and dissimulated the sections deemed too passive or too natural, including the feet. (b) To play around various densities of covering: full or transparent fabrics, simple or multiple veils (the seven veils of Salome or the seven skirts of the women of Nazadé) to reinforce the rates of stability and instability, of evidence and fleeing, of here and elsewhere.

If clothing is so capable at complexifying the stance of the gesture, it is because in its structure (cut, sewing, motifs, draping) and in its texture (thread, weaving, grain) it fatally triggers all the singularities of the seven elementary catastrophes: the fold, the cusp, the swallowtail, the butterfly, the hyperbolic umbilic, the elliptic umbilic, the parabolic umbilic. Sort of interform between forms, crossing donation and refusal.

### 11H3. The inter-gesture The daily theatre

But gestures and their clothes, whilst being stances, are themselves labile like the hominid specimens that they have the function to unify. And groups of Homo have cultivated homoeostatic and allostatic adjustments of the gestures of each one by the gestures of the others, around regulated averages with narrow ranges. In every community and society, an *inter gesture* thus institutes itself, in the same way as there is an *interlocution*, with the same function of reciprocal verification and stabilisation of the socius by the socii. The etymology of French **mode (fashion)**, which comes from Latin *modus* made feminine with the final "e" (*la mode*), indicates that this is a combination of measure and manner, of rhythmic arrangements.

Constantly practising the inter-gesture, hominid groups had to set up very soon a permanent social theatre, i.e. spontaneous *everyday theatre*, which later became formal theatre, and which has its own locations according to its own stages: single or multiple family homes of *filiation* and instances, houses of the association and clientèle, either artisanal or political. The fact that Polynesia had "men houses" and not "women houses" shows that both sexes often exert, in their permanent staging, variously localisable responsibilities.

#### **11H4. The thematization of the gesture: dance**

Homo not only practised the gesture and the intergesture, but he thematized them in an activity so necessary and so anthropological that it bears everywhere a name that declares it. In French, it is *dance*, from Middle English *dauncen*, to move or seem to move up and down or about in a quick or lively manner (Merriam-Webster). This thematization was made easier by the fact that the gesture and the intergesture were stances, thus comprising a first reduplication, reflection, reflexivity.

We can then almost cover the panoply and protocols of dance by deploying those of the gestures and intergestures

- (1) Of translation, rotation, scansion, retrocession.
- (2) Of application (map) and coaptation (intercourse, nesting)
- (3) Of domination (leadership) and submission
- (4) Of welcoming, expulsion, conviviality
- (5) Of consolation, enjoyment, pleasure
- (6) Of instances (of family) and roles (of clientele)
- (7) Of emotions and sentiments <2B5>
- (8) Of denying, affirming, interrogative indexation <5>
- (9) Of indexation of structure, texture, growth <7F>
- (10) Of indexing, indicial, conceptual mimes
- (11) Of accompaniment or support of dialect (phrase)
- (12) Of replacement of the dialect (semaphore, mute language)
- (13) Of real or mimed inscription <18I6>
- (14) Of performance and sacrament <17F6>
- (15) Of modes of existence <6B>
- (16) Of categorisation of the possibility <6C>
- (17) Of destinies-choices of existence <8H>
- (18) Of mobilisation of nodes, envelopes, resonances, interfaces <1A5>
- (19) Of horizontal and vertical temporalities <29B1>
- (20) Of presentive suspense of time <8B9>
- (21) Of complexion and look (looking good, making a long face)

Yet in its thematization, dance does more than going through and intersecting every type of gestures. It exalts their capacity to simultaneously practice contraries, and even contradictories. By which dance endlessly moves from the (regulated) intergesture to gesticulation (inchoative), and particularly insists on the manner in which the downstream of Homo proceeds from an upstream of corporal schemes, own body, fantasizing endotropic corporal representations, and is comptabilizing, tending, distending perceptive-motor and logico-semiotic field effects of the fantasy. This means that the eight aspects of the rhythm become a sort of theme in itself where, reciprocally and ostensibly, fertilise the alternation, interstability, accentuations, tempos, self-engendering, strophism, convection, gravitation by node, envelope, resonance, interface. Without counting that, through the intercerebrality and calculations of movement (motion) so intense in Homo <2B1>, dance insures at the same time the cohesion of the group and the distinction of each specimen inside the group.

All these functions are basal for specimens that are both homoeostatic and allostatic, and dance has been omnipresent in the anthropogeny, at the same time as music, which for a great part is its vocal or instrumental modality. During the Upper Palaeolithic, at the Cave des Trois Frères (Ariège), it is the ostensibly dancing body that is imaged as a rite of exchange with the prior animality, since its face is covered with an animal mask. Often, dance will remain the sole reason of living, defying the inanity and all cruelties of illness (today's contemporary Africa sometimes dances Aids), because it is the most native and almost sufficient accomplishment of fundamental fantasy and enjoyment. Throughout the primary empires, in Egypt and China, it was, with the armies, the supreme realisation of the social discipline, reflecting that of the cosmos. It took the corporal discomfort of manufacturing bourgeois rationalism from the seventeenth century, then the stoic industry of the nineteenth century, then finally the stereotype of the body of contemporary generalised engineering so that, without disappearing or becoming frankly discredited, dance becomes a speciality reserved to some times and places.

## 11I. Stances: (2) The work (oeuvre)

Along with the gesture, intergesture and dance, which are transitory, hominid specimens, because they are techno-semiotic and because tools and signs postulate duration, tend to assist their fragile unity by truly stable stances, in the form of lasting things-performances. The Greek named these productions (painting, sculpture, poetry, music, monument), whose time life often goes over that of their producer, **ergon**, by opposition of *ponos*, the daily maintenance work, the result of which is endlessly recommenced. On the same theme, the Latin speaks of **opus**, and the French speaks of **oeuvre (work)**. The anthropogeny will keep work, but take care to identify the varieties of this immense nebula.

### 11I1. Techno-semiotic works

Homo's most current works are habitats, furniture, tools, seats and beds, relic clothing where hominid specimens have, in a way, laid and reified their corporal schemes, their own bodies, their fantasised corporal endotropic representations, the destiny-choice of existence of their group and of themselves as singularities at the heart of this group. Works are technical, but sometimes widely semiotic. Very often, they were subject to ritual consecrations. Moreover, without even having targeted a proper consecration, works are, like the French say, consecrated by their use, their traces, their wears, the stains that their producers and users have imprinted on them, inserting them into their \*woruld, which enriched them of its systemic in turn.

This is what renders so moving and paradoxical the objects, particularly the clothes, that belonged to (*partem tenere ad*) a defunct, which by etymology, yet, is a relieved-of-function (*defunctus, fungi, fulfilling one's duties + de-*, marking the ending). The usage that the defunct made of his clothes and utensils inhabits them and they continue to be him after his disappearance; they are the narrowest incarnation of the usage, which is the strongest "manner of being", both from the Latin *habitus* (from which *habit* comes) and the Greek's *ekHein* (*having*) + *adverb*. And of all of this, Etruscan cities, which included a city of the dead as important as the city of living, were the daily declaration and their romantic ruins were their metaphysical thematization. The conception of the tumb (*tumere, swelling*) as the continued habitation is one of the red threads of the anthropogeny.

### 11I2. Purely semiotic works. The monument

In this line, distancing and possibilizing Homo was even led to conceive purely semiotic objects, such as sculptures, sacred places, shamanistic pictorial representations, etc.; this probably took place at the same time as it developed massive music and language, during the Middle Palaeolithic. This time, the work produced had the mission to comfort the unity of the producing and using specimens, inscribing them in systems of signs that communicate them their systemic unity.

The monument is the culmination of this process. As the double sense of *monere* says, **monumentum** has a double sense of warning, injunction (*monitio*), for the future, and of memory, reminiscence (*memoria, mind, mental*), for the past. It concerns the intergesture of the group and its social theatre. It is famous and makes famous (*celeber, frequented*). Often purely semiotic, like an arch of triumph, it can also be techno-semiotic, like a columbarium, or the favourite seat of a writer or an elder. To this we will add these houses that, built by a family, have built it and are its memory. Monumentality assuredly intervened in the Neolithic temples of Çatalhöyük, and perhaps already in the sculpted caves and banks of the Palaeolithic.

### **11I3. Works stated as works. The subject of work: pictorial subject, architectural subject, musical subject, etc. Compliant and extreme works.**

Finally, still as possibilizing, distancing and reflexive, Homo was induced to write in his works not only particular technical and semiotic destinations but destinies-choices of existence <8H>, and that no more in an adventitious manner but as an essential theme of the work, even as its major theme.

In this case we shall speak of **subject of work** to mark both the essential role that the subject has in the work, and the fact that only a work can accomplish it. And we shall more narrowly speak of *pictorial subject (of work)*, *sculptural subject*, *architectural subject*, *musical subject*, *choreography subject*, *photographic subject*, *cinematographic subject*, *video subject*, *cartoon subject*, *idiolect or textual subject*, whether the work in question is a painting, sculpture, architecture, photograph, cartoon, a text in prose or verses, etc. Thus, the **pictorial subject** of a painting is the destiny-choice of existence that it activates-passivates from the fact that it is a painting (traits, spots), and independently of the scenic subject it offers (such character, event, landscape, such object in a still life). The **photographic subject** of a photograph is the destiny-choice of existence that it activates-passivates as photograph (photonic *indicia* indexed by a frame, a choice of film, a depth of field, etc.), independently from its scenic subject. Etc.

We must note that a particular subject of work, that of a singular work, is usually or always an actualisation of a constant subject of work that we find in all the works of a same producer, and that holds on to its idiosyncrasy <26E>. If a specific subject of work is especially related to perceptive-motor and logico-semiotic *field effects*, we could say that the constant subject of work of a producer is a *hyper field*, according to a term that we have already used to define the fundamental fantasy of the hominid specimen <7I5>. Indeed, constant subject of work and fundamental fantasy overlap.

The anthropogeny then encounters several classifications of subjects of work. (1) They are differentiated depending whether they express (a) particularly a group, (b) particularly someone, (c) particularly a group + someone; we can call them *group subject*, *singular subject*, *group-singular subject*. (2) They also differ according to whether or not they combine with scenic subjects or not; *abstract subjects* in the second case, *figurative subjects* in the first. (3) The third distinction, the most fundamental, opposes (a) subjects of works that comfort the established codes and content with animating them, thus making Real enter Reality <8E1>, they are *compliant subjects of work* that give way to **compliant works**; (b) the subjects of works that rattle codes, opening gaps of Real in Reality using great field effects that are generally excited; they are the *extreme subjects of work*, resulting in **extreme works**.

Extreme works have the property of practising an intense and sometimes violent relation with the presence-absence and its ideation: eternity, simultaneity, ubiquity, in(de)finity, universality, spontaneity, freedom, nothingness <8D>, while compliant works are in the order of functionings, whether they are sufficient or virtuoso. So, and we must insist, compliant works and extreme works are not two degrees of a same intention, but two intentions with an opposite aim. They have in common that they are both rhythmical, the former comfortably, the latter violently.

#### **11I4. The work as sedimentation, articulation and hotbed of initiative**

It is true that works are the result, the product of these presentive bio-techno-semiotic systems, that hominid specimens are. But once released, issued, they accumulate layers of qualities coming from their producer and other producers, from their users, the environment, neighbouring works, all that is engendered by degradations, regradations, bifurcations of duration and weathering (Wetterung). And these qualities are not only added, but are disposed, they compose the works, stabilize, mobilise and constrain them to "sit together" in sedimentation (English gives a good rendition of sedimentum with settling). From anything works make "sections" of \*woruld, passive and active articulations of social group and they define, fill, gather, compose the hominid specimen that haunts them and that in turn they inhabit, to make him a someone and a singular each one.

In such a way that to see hominid specimens, on the one hand, and their habitats, their tools and machine, their products under elaboration, on the other, we must grasp the extent to which it is mainly the latter that give consistency and existence to the former, making them stick together, spooling and wrapping them endlessly <17F12>. It is mainly the author (auctor, increaser) that is thus constructed by the work, insofar as the work wants to be, feeding off the author sometimes to the point he is destroyed. Works consume hominid specimens at the same time as they keep them alive.

#### **11J. Stances: (3) Characters, styles, manners**

Assuredly, there are myriads of different gestures and works, according to the coincidences of the social or physical environments with organisms. However, like in all other phenomenon of the Universe, gestures and works also obey to conditions of quanta <21F6>, that is to say that all intermediaries are not possible, and that we find everywhere some great wholes, depending probably of the physical, technical and semiotic conditions of things-performances-in-situation-in-the-circumstance-over-a-horizon <1B3>, but depending also of available cleavages and commutations of hominid brains, or of the brain in general with its codes and codings <2A2a>. And this creates a new sort of stance for hominid specimens that both embarrass, limit them, but also confer on them some inertia, homoeostasis, and therefore definition and continuity.

These general stances are so important and ostensible that languages ordinarily have one word to designate them. The Greek spoke of **characters** to insist on their fixation and decision, by seeing there an engraving (kHarakter). Latin conceived **styles**, evoking the engraving or writing instrument in a similar metaphor. Many romantic languages have retained variations around **manners**, from manus, probably because it is in the gesture of plane hands in bilateral symmetry <1A1> that the cleavages of the interface between an exterior and interior milieu, i.e. characters and style, are manifested. These words seemed so fortunate and expressive that they were kept in Germanic languages in **Charakter, Stil, Manier**.

This is the occasion to come back on the opposition between intelligence and genius <2B2,4>, *intelligence* consisting in exploiting the virtualities of some characters, styles, manners, while *genius* signals itself by its aptitude to overlap and redistribute them. There was assuredly a "romantic" and "realistic" character, style, and manner, but attaching to Hugo the label of romantic and to Flaubert the label of realist does not enlighten them, and even distracts from their specificity. Moreover, without particular genius or intelligence, every hominid specimen is sufficiently singular to produce every time an original combination of cleavages and commutations that give it a *complexion* or *idiosyncrasy* <26E>.

## 11K. The X-same

In this way, we have just signalled the disparities and heterogeneities of the hominid specimen, and at the same time the few fundamental manners that allow this specimen to realise a sufficient operative unity to its survival, and finally to that of its species, what we could call its physical, but also technical and semiotic immunity system. When we considered the brain, we were already led to signal that in Homo the animal *self* <2A2C> takes a singular salience and pregnancy <2B10> due to the (stabilizing) segmentarization of the technical and semiotic environment (both gestural and language), and also due to the thematized present of the presence (presentiality) <2B10>.

The resulting unit, or *identity*, of a hominid specimen is then such that, in all the known dialects of us, we find the means of expressing a certain instance "I", or "my" or "mine" by opposition to other instances of "you-your-yours" and "he-his" with variants in the singular and plural forms: "us-our-ours", etc. It is without doubt that the hominid specimen notes that some actions-passions-states are "from him", i.e. are referable at the end to his own body as point of view *of* universe <11C> versus its surroundings, whether those surroundings are things-performances or other "I-my-mine".

This I/other cleavage results most of the time of the contrast of the synodies related to what depends of "our" motor and perceptive grasping with synodies relative to what resists it. But it seems that singular specimens often consider as also belonging to their "I-me-mine", the following synods: (a) Those that are simply *the most solid or persevering*; (b) those whose actions *have the furthest range*; (c) those that *best compatibilize (the least badly)* the whole of the organism; (d) those that have the *widest past*, forming habits; (e) those that *promise the widest future* to this past

through a present; (f) those that are *best identifiable by the milieu* (such as first names and family names); (g) *those that have the most impact on this milieu*; (i) *those that are better suited to the self-winding function of language* <17F10>.

However, conflicts of belonging arise, which are signalled by such formulations and gesticulations as: "I have to collect my thought", "I think I'm overreacting", Phaedra's "What have I said?", where it is betrayed that some synodies have, for a time, taken (too) much independence either relating to others more essential, or relating to the economy of the brain envisaged as a whole (which is almost the same thing). In general, after some hesitation, the "I-my-mine" can find himself again ("s'y retrouve", in French), from the fact that, between subordinate synodies and capital synodies (caput, chief), the demarcation is all the more stable that the cerebral system is cleaving, interconnected and commuting. We shall specify, however, that the "I-my-mine" of things-performances deeply varies according to cultures, for example whether they are non-scriptural, scriptural, intense scriptural, transparent scriptural, etc. <30>.

We still need to find a vocable that allows appreciating this tension of hominid specimens between identity and variety. Words such as "I" or "me" or "wo" or "yi" (Chinese "I") refer to specific cultures; thence, the French "Je" ("I") makes with the "Moi" ("Me") a couple that we do not find anywhere else. Latin "ipseitas" would do it if it did not strongly point to the inwardness of the Latin "ipse" <30D>. Closer to us, "individual" or "subject" are blended, the former into the seventeenth century <30H>, the second into recent western psychiatry, and besides, etymologically understood, they are false. We would think of the (English) "self" and (Sanskrit) "sva", but they also have cultural connotations, and we have already used "self" to cover what is common to Homo and the animal.

To avoid this bias, the present anthropogeny opted for **X-same**. Indeed, *same* marks rather well the unity with a prevalence of endotropy; the variable *x* marks the infinite variety of oneself which is then united; the dash between the *x* and the *same* signals the bipolar character of the theme targeted. So understood, an X-same is transitory and heterogeneous, but nevertheless poses itself as permanent, from the fact that its memories activate-passivate synodies considered as more essential and more accessory, more continuous or more episodic. An X-same is very plural, but is given as singular, seeing the familiarity between the interactive synodies that encounter there. It is always in labile constructions and reconstructions but tends to give itself as more or less preliminary to all its specific elaborations.

This kind of source, and sometimes of aim, that sends to nothing exterior or former, and that is moreover eminently presential-absential since it accompanies "consciences" <8A> of situations and particular objects, sometimes tends to place itself, according to the ideations of presence-absence <8D>, as absolute origin (solvere, ab) and strong freedom, independently from any particular link; this was the case in the West, especially from the sixteenth century. So, in a X-same, when the deliberation (livra, balance, from), where several synodies are under balance, finally produces a triggering, the synody that takes action seems to proceed not from the interactions of all synodies but from an instance that would fly over them, a sort of transcending X-same. This is because the trigger from which this synody proceeds widely results from quantum conditions <21F6>, either physiological or semiotic, and that these conditions are sufficiently elusive to give the sentiment that the ultimate determination proceeds from an elusive principle.

## 11L. The communion of X-same(s)

The fact that in hominid specimens there are not only functionings but also more or less thematized presence(s)/absence(s) already constrained us to foresee, apart from communications <8G3> where functionings embrace, other experiences known as communions <8G2> and participations <8G3> where presence-absence also or mainly circulates. The articulation of the hominid specimen downstream and upstream confirms this distinction, communications being particularly present in the downstream, communions applying mainly to the upstream, i.e. corporal schemes, own bodies, fantasmatic endotropic corporal representations, the X-same(s) in their singularity. Thus understood communions suppose two original behaviours. One is transitory, the interpellation-provocation. Two others are relatively stabilizing, love and hatred.

### 11L1. Provocation, interpellation, apostrophe, altercation

The simplest forms of communal relations are called in French (a) *provocation*, a call that makes come, mandates, defies (vocare, pro); (b) *interpellation*, an accusatory formal demand creating a between-two (pellere, inter); (c) *apostrophe*, a position by diversion (strephein, apo) ; (d) *altercation*, where the other-in-general (alius) is the-other-of-two (alter). The content of these relations, particularly because they are communal and aim at the upstream, are usually vague, massive, fleeing, and are particularly consisting in perceptive-motor and logico-semiotic field effects that are static, kinetic, dynamic and excited. We could think that they played a powerful initiatory role at the origin of massive dialects <10D>, and one day detailed dialects <16-17>.

### 11L2. Love

In contrast with transient and relatively violent communions, we find everywhere a hominid communion that Romance languages call amour, amore, amor and Germanic languages call Love, Liebe. It is an excited inter systemic state <7D, 7E> that is relatively strong between two hominid specimens mainly grasped in their upstream. This is why the structures take up less place there than textures and growths, where the caress and reserve <11C1-2>, that we have already encountered on the occasion of the own body, excel. Language that intervenes in this case is mostly presentive ("phatic") <17F3>.

Between two hominid systems, the amorous effect is the creation of a veritable **inter-system** whose marvels of intercerebrality <2A8,2B9> have often been noted and sung by a surprised Homo. This inter-system tends to abolish more or less what is around it, as the caress, reserve and presential language already do. Its exaltations are absolutizing (solvere, ab), spatially and temporally, and we frequently find in amorous effects the ideations of presence-absence, in experiences of eternity, ubiquity, spontaneity, "strong" freedom <8D>. The simultaneously excited

and durable phasing from which amorous effect results is so complex that love enriches itself cumulatively, but also declares itself in immediate evidence and accord, that can take, particularly for subjects affected by fixed-fixation <26E2> the appearance of a brisk shine or love at first sight. The energy and information provoked are usually very superior to the sum of energies and information of the two separate systems (the work of English poet Shelley is one of the most complete description of this exhalation).

The causes of such inter-systemic coaptations and resonances illustrate hominid possibilization <6> and are extremely varied: similarities, dissimilarities, complementarities, reorganising disparities, allostatic and homoeostatic disparities, quantum effects <21F6>. Their point of fixation and permeability are mainly the eyes, breathing, gait, complexion (texture, growth) and more generally the correspondence of rhythms and inflexions. Such a crossover of the Same and the Other, where each one intervenes as an upstream even more than as a downstream is eminently realising the universalised partition-conjunction <7H3>. Which often concentrates and intensifies in sexual partition-conjunction <7H2>, but not always; love that, in their full maturity, has conjugated the English German Jewish Lady Mountbatten and the Indian Pandit Nehru beyond oceans and governmental responsibilities was as unlimited as it was platonic.

This powerful inter-systemicity derives from the orchestrating performances allowed to the hominid brain <2B> by its globalizing anatomy, its neutralizing and generalizing centres, its affective and motor smoothing, its long-term memorations, its integrating neuromediators (neurotransmitters, hormones). It had to be selected by the species because of its reproductive and educative, and also technical and semiotic, accomplishments. This is why, in historical times, we find love almost everywhere, from the freshness of Egyptian lyrics to the retortions of Sappho and Apollinaire. *Amers* by Saint-John Perse proclaimed its archaism (in the sense of Confucius): "A great wave from Troy <...> In the highest seas far from us this breath was imprinted in yesteryear." But some amorous conditions were probably gathered since the time of detailed images, music and languages of the Upper Palaeolithic. Already *Homo Erectus* had perhaps enough cerebral orchestration and intercerebrality, enough massive images and languages, to feel and also select the accomplishments and the enjoyment of such inter-systems.

Like the caress, reserve and tender discourse, love, in substitutive possibilizing *Homo*, may target, besides another singular hominid, to hominid groups, to animals, to objects, to abstract ideas; the Romans even spoke of an *amor fati* (love of destiny) of which we will note that it penetrates perhaps any love. However, love has ordinarily reached its height in the Two of the hominid couple. And even ordinarily in the Two of the heterosexual couple where partition-conjunction finds its maximal distensions, thus its maximal internal resonances.

Along with political and religious beliefs, love is the experience that casts the brightest light on the notion of horizon <1B3>. Because what decides it, at the beginning and at the end, is neither things-performances, or situations, or circumstances, but the opening of the horizon, which is confirmed here as constituted (constitutive) of sense, even of the sense, independently from particular significations. However, love is in no way the belief, although the latter also concerns the horizon <7I8>. Belief, whether political or religious, comprises an affirmation of knowledge that love, inter systemic realisation and not inter systemic knowledge, does not postulate or comprises. The only common point between love and belief is rhythm. Which in belief is supposed to guarantee the validity of the content of knowledge, and in love the inter systemic success.

### 11L3. Hatred

For a French reader familiar with Racine's tragedies, love and hatred almost make a circle with two poles, in endless reversals of strength. It was there a moment of western conception of the "I" as a "person", that begins at the latest in Rome with Catullus ("Odi et amo") and of which Hegel declared the theory at the end of the western world, showing the Same as the Other and the Other as the Same. But the switching love/hate seems to draw its roots in a structure of Homo as such, and we think that we can read it already in an Egyptian poem of lost love, and even in the jolts of feelings of Ishatar in Gilgamesh's Sumer epic. Because the Same and the Other form the narrowest inter-system, thus the most fragile? Because the experience of the absolute integration is close to the vertigo of absolute disintegration? Because love and hatred play with absence-presence, and that the latter is worked by two contrary spirallings? Because love is the opening of a horizon and hatred shrinks the horizon into a fixed point, the odious object?

In any case, hatred is constructed, argumentative, detailing, thence more progressive. It can easily be shared by many. It defines as much as love in(de)finetizes. It finds a convenience, and perhaps its primary roots, in the manner in which animality constitutes its in-groups (we-groups) thanks to unconditional oppositions to out-groups; the absolute otherness that hatred attributes to the Other makes it the easiest, thus most widespread, strategy of the affirmation of the Same; it is more elementary to hate than to love. The most palpable distinction between love and hatred is that the latter comprises a knowledge, then knowledges, that love ignores. Hatred initiates itself at the moment when the horizon, unknowable, begins, for paranoid Homo <4F>, to monetize itself, to contract itself, into things-performances, situations, circumstances, *indicium*, indexes, supposedly knowable.

### 11M. The vagations of the X-same

We have just gone through enough articulations, rhythmic arrangements, distanciations of the hominid X-same to understand that the Same and the Other give place in Homo, by means of a very endotropizing and generalising, cleaving and commutating brain, to substitutions and overlapping. Into veritable vagations.

#### 11M1. Shamanism and voodoo. Yoga, rapt and appearance

Here are a few facets of vagations, illustrated by highly-summarized historical examples. (a) Either the Other has the attenuated form of an elsewhere, where portions of the Same emigrated or were taken; in this case the task of the **shaman**, specialist of passages (passes) between the here and the elsewhere, particularly the terrestrial, the celestial and the underground supposed to cross each other in certain points, is to realise the reintegration towards here of the lacking element that

emigrated elsewhere. (b) **Voodoo** is not far from shamanism, insofar as it calls a force (a God) from elsewhere toward here, force of which the Same becomes the mount, thus comforted by the otherness of this (divine) rider. (c) The eastern Same has sufficiently the form of a self (sva) for that the latter, once detached from the remains of what could be an “I”, should rise itself by a **yoga** (Indian, Chinese, Japanese) to a state where the duality of the Same and the Other is exceeded in nirvana, tch'an or satori. (d) As for the Same of Christianity, it is so much a Roman-Christian-Stoic-Neo-Platonic “I” that it conceives the Other-same like a certain My-Same, of which then, if it is good, this Christian Same expects that it should ravish itself using a mystical rapt, or of which, if it is evil, such as Satan or its henchmen, this Same is threatened of being inhabited by a (demonic) possession, from which it will only be delivered by an **exorcism**. (e) The Manichean Same, to which the archaic Hebraic Same participates, is usually intensely good **and** evil, or rather Same **and** Other, between talk **and** hubbub; Faust's Same did not forget this.

Besides these sliced encounters of the X-same and the Other, Homo has always and everywhere practised more economically innumerable vagations as simple *guises* (vx Germanic *wîsa*), or manners of being and *modes* (Arab *maqamat*), lending themselves to no less innumerable *imagos*, idealised images of others and of oneself.

## 11M2. Hallucinations

Usual definitions oppose (1) **perception**, as exotropic nervous circulation, that has the property of continuously exploring its object from the outside and the inside, of browsing it, of penetrating it; (2) **imagination**, as endotropic nervous circulation, that can rearrange its constructions differently, but does not explore them; (3) **hallucination**, as imagination that grasps its endotropic constructions exotropically, as though they came from outside reality, whilst being incapable of exploring them, because it is precisely this imagination which constructs them.

These brief definitions suffice to make us understand that, in Homo, the perceived, the imagined, the hallucinated gives way to endless recoverings and substitutions for an appreciable percentage of a population, sometimes for whole populations, into hallucinations of objects and voices, but also into hallucinations of ideas: the Neo-Platonic has hallucinated the "One" proceeding and receding in each blade of grass, Spinoza hallucinated the "Acquiescence", Sartre the "Freedom", like the Kanak hallucinated the initial older brother, Akhenaton hallucinated the the solar uniqueness and the Indian its myriad of Gods raining during the monsoon. These slippages or superimpositions result from the ambiguities of the Same and the Other; of the proliferation of technical and semiotic indicialities and indexations; of the work of the cleaving and commutative, neutralizing and abstractive hominid brain, with its fusion between imagination and imaginary, between remorisations and memorations, etc. And they also result from this particular world of knowledge that belief is (political, religious), where an object is verified by the integrating strength of the field effects that it arises and maintains in the believer.

### 11M3. Dementias

Indicialities and indexations operated by the hominid transversalization comprise enough metaphorical and metonymical flexibility, enough discontinuities and games, to make that inferences (abduction, induction, deduction) <4C> should produce, between the Same and the Other, not only a thousand objects and ideas, but also a thousand attitudes. This goes from the common flexibility of mind up to dementia (mens, de-), when the discontinuities become so considerable, so constant, so quick that they prevent relations with facts (Sachverhalt, atomic fact), with others, with oneself. Distinguishing the flexibility of the mind and the ever-hovering dementia, and maintaining their distinction, is a primary function of the intergesture and the interlocution.

### 11M4. Initiations and conversions

Finally, all cultures display initiations and conversions. **Initiations** are in an X-same the passage from a state A to a state B, where it truly becomes another for itself or for another, in a true recommencing (initium). We find the same four moments everywhere: isolation-retreat, unbinding-purification, evanescence-death, resurrection-awakening. The most widespread initiations are those of adolescence, various consecrations, catechumenate, social grades, marriage, sometimes death, even birth when it is a gradual insertion into increasingly wide spaces (certain Berbers).

We shall draw a similarity between initiations and **conversions**, that are both reversals (vertere, cum) and rebirths. When Luther, after having "hated" the words of the epistle to the Romans for thirty years: "Justitia Dei revelatur in illo", finally understands that it is a "passive justice by which merciful God justifies us by faith", he continues: "I felt as though *reborn*." The translation "reborn" ("rené, in French") is by Michelet, a historian who had the most vivacious sense of conversion in individuals and people; his *Histoire de France* is a suite of collective conversions.

In the X-same, vagations and divagations are close. Instances and roles of the Devil and the good God, of propitious and redoubtable, are interchanging vertiginously by crossing rapt and possession, exorcism and adoricism. Like health and madness interchange. To the extent of conceiving a "Holy Fool" in Russian and English and a "great Health" for Nietzsche and Deleuze. The convergences of the healthy and the fool reclose the circular prism of the distinctions and confusions of the X-same and X-other that we call "humanity", between terror and tenderness <26>.

## 11N. The temporal limitations of hominid specimens

A living only takes place once in the Universe and determines there an event, i.e. a clear-cut salience and a vast pregnance, in virtue of the negentropies and states faraway from the balance that it introduces at the heart of its environment. Already animals are more salient and more pregnant in this sense than plants, as they are born and die in more striking catastrophes.

In hominid specimens, the commencement and the end are even frankly a problem, or a mystery, insofar as they are not veritable ends or true commencements. It is because, in these occasions, everyone goes beyond its vital limits, would it be only by its possessions (estate) that continue and sometime precede it. Then language, which ties its actions and names it, makes everyone an autonomous and durable semiotic constellation. Very early, Homo had to conceive modalities of survival going hand in hand with pre-life modalities, first for others, then for oneself, as far as its \*world conferred him a more consistent X-same. Not because of a desire of immortality or permanence, that will suppose the western "I-my-mine", but of the techno-semiotic consistency of its components.

### 11N1. Death

Given the standing position, the lying cadaver of Homo, shrouded by its *indicia* and indexes, bearing language images and designations, had to be a theme of perplexity for the group very early on. And palaeoanthropology finds, at least since the end of Homo erectus, manipulations imposed to the hominid cadaver, and then since the Neolithic, ritual incinerations and burials, with not only primary sepulchres on site, but also secondary sepulchres, by a return to the native motherland of the remains of those who died far from their homeland. The cadaver is then frequently accompanied by its everyday utensils, and arranged in symbolic attitudes, for instance in a foetal position, or pointing to a privileged cardinal point. In Homo, the death of others was all the more significant that it concluded a more or less long illness, thematized by the technical and semiotic care by which it was accompanied.

In opposition with this death of others, the own death is firstly in Homo what it is in the animal kingdom, the result of a suite of non-presential states <8B1>, or presential states that follow each other one by one without any orchestrating link, right up to a definitive state of non-presentiality. In other words, the own dead is insignificant, i.e. without particular mental resonance (techno-semiotic-presentive). It will require the stabilizing designations of the X-same by means of languages or of durable pictorial and sculptural languages, or still, the astonishment of the presence-absence irreducible to the order of functionings, so that its disappearance becomes in a hominid specimen a theme (tHèma), a problem (balleïn, pro), a mystery (mustèrion, secret, closed, silent). Resulting one day in metempsychosis doctrines, or even in doctrines of singular, temporary or definitive immortality.

## 11N2. Birth

The beginning of an X-same, and its death, has social consequences. First, the gestation and the birthing of a standing primate is problematic, and they have resulted in complicated obstetrics in various regulated positions: standing, seated, lying, requesting an assistance reminded by the etymology of midwife (wife, mid <with>, assistant) and accoucher (ad-col-locare, locare, cum, ad, assist from close by), [which means to give birth in French]. Then, and foremost, in a techno-semiotic group, the appearance of a new specimen shakes up the distribution of instances and roles <3E>. Finally, a hominid birth initiates a complicated education over a long period of time <3C>. Whence the coming into the world, i.e. the entrance into the \*world modifying the \*world, will be progressively celebrated (celeber, frequented).

However, the newborn never seems to have held as much importance for Homo as the dead do. This is because, if birth is a verifiable and datable phenomenon, it is the result of ten lunar months very ostensible in a standing position, and foremost the result of an unobservable fecundation, to such an extent that it was not everywhere linked to coupling, but rather to the fantasies of a diffuse animism, before being understood as the implementation of a masculine semen, only active in a hatching feminine body (Hebrews, Greek). On the other hand, birthing was often perceived as a birth in a suite of births: intervening often after the prior births of a foetus already “born” to a vegetable form, then to an animal form, then a human form for Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, and before the ulterior births of adolescence, marriage, death, initiatory, thus marking a beginning (initium). If, in Lascaux, we encounter a stiff lying dead we see there no newborn, human or animal.

Therefore, whilst the death of the X-same will trigger everywhere in Homo innumerable post-mortem protocols (books of the dead in Egypt and Tibet) and ante mortem (the chronicle of feudal agony of a Constable collected by Duby), its birth has always remained confuse and available to divagations, up to astrology <5H2>.

## 11O. The hominid specimen as complicated and complex system

To conclude on the articulation of the hominid specimen, can we specify what type of system it belongs to within the framework of the General System Theory, a general theory of the system or theory of the general system that has taken shape since 1950? Assuredly, it is not a theoretical system, but a physical, alive system, even a techno-semiotic system, that has the property of producing technical objects and signs, for example indicia, indexes, textures, images, songs, dialects, writings, mathematics, logics, physics, ontologies, epistemologies, anthropologies. Much more, technical objects and signs, this system does not only produces them, but “is” them. Its technique-signs constitute it at least as much as it institutes them.

We shall then point out that the system that a hominid system is, in addition to its structures (textures, growths) is gifted with restructuring, i.e. a capacity of structural transformations. In machines, restructurings come from "restructuring workstations" whilst the hominid specimen "is" a permanent restructuring, in two different aspects: (a) as in any central nervous system, the software gives in the hominid specimen rise to a hardware and inversely <2A1>, (b) the techno-semiotic systems that the hominid specimen produces, and that it literally "is" are themselves in constant restructuring, either because they balance their unbalances (homoeostatically) or they open their balances (allostatically), or mainly that the designated and performances in constant movement make the concepts and designating move in the hominid system.

In French, the adjectives *complicated* and *complex* are ethymological doublets of *complecti*, embracing (plectere, tresser, cum). By its phonosemics and its allure of a frequentative, the word **complication** targets cases where a system contains elements that are not very likely to be embraced, because they are too numerous, or because they belong to frankly heterogeneous series. In comparison, **complexity** aims the cases where, despite their multiplicity or disparity, the elements of a system can be embraced in one grasp, in such a way that they are perceived as proceeding from one same source or as being creating themselves one sole source or aim. *Homo economicus* is particularly complicated. *Homo musicus* is particularly complex. *Homo* is, in the close Universe, the most complicated and most complex system that we know.

It is its characterisation as a system amongst all systems that indicates *Homo*'s situation in the Universe. We will find it derisory to try to know if he is the only one of his genus and species, since his genus and species are in constant anthropogeny. But there is some sense in wondering if all the systems of the Universe as they become more complicated and complex have a tendency to become, in areas of games resembling those of *Homo*, technical and semiotic, indicializing and indexating, imaging and linguistic, inter-gestural and presentive, producing compliant and extreme works, thematizing static, kinetic, dynamic, excited field effects, or even of being transversalizing and giving X-same(s).

### *SITUATION 11*

*Inscribed in the first part of Anthropogeny, which has not yet considered detailed images or detailed music or detailed linguistic, this chapter could only envisage the hominid specimen in an abstract and general manner, by distinguishing a downstream and an upstream, corporal schemes, an own body, fantasised endotropic corporal representations, a hierarchy of fantasies, the stances of the gesture and the work, etc. All this will have to become concrete through the accomplishments of Homo in the second and third parts, and through its social articulations in the fourth part. As for the deployment of the galaxy of the X-same, it supposes the vision of the rest so much that it makes up the last chapter of an anthropogeny <30>.*

*Translated by Paula COOK, 2017*

*(Last update, October 16, 2017)*