Politicizing the (In)audible: A Short Critique of Mark Brett’s Genesis (with specific reference to Genesis 34)

ABSTRACT

In his recent book, *Genesis: Procreation and the Politics of Identity*, Mark Brett argues that Genesis (the first book of the Hebrew Bible) is a political text that addresses the debates within the 'post-exilic' or 'Persian' period concerning the nature of Israelite identity. The dominant push for ethnic purity found in the post-exilic books of Ezra and Nehemiah is time and again undermined in Genesis by an integrationist polemic against the priestly desire for the 'holy seed.' In other words, Brett argues that there is a discernible, 'inclusivist' (anti-ethnocentric) voice in Genesis. In this essay, I dispute the value he places on that alternative voice. That is, I dispute the subversive status that Brett gives to this anti-ethnocentric, inclusivist voice. I agree that it is contestatory, but not subversive. I shall make this argument by focusing on a specific story in Genesis: the so-called "rape" of Dinah (Gen. 34), which on the surface is a text that deals explicitly with these dueling socio-political voices. On the one hand, we have the subversive exogamy-desiring integrationist position represented by Dinah, Shechem, Jacob, Hamor, and the men of Shechem. On the other hand, we have the dominant ideological voice of the endogamy-desiring ethnocentrists, represented by Dinah’s brothers, especially Simeon and Levi. Genesis 34 is read as an explicit narrativisation of this politico-religious tussle. Briefly, I dispute Brett’s suggestion that the lack of agency available to women at this time in history is simply a convention we need to "understand" so as to better come to terms with the editorial response to Simeon and Levi’s crime in Genesis 34. It is my contention that the silencing of women is the principal feature of male dominance, and this silence is the pre-requisite of the debates at hand. In other words, the only subversive voices are those that are intentionally silenced. These are the voices of
women, represented in this narrative by Dinah, Leah, and the women of the land. Furthermore, not only does the narrative rely upon the silence of the female characters to enable the story to proceed in the manner that it does (i.e. as the story of men at war with each other over the question of who gets Dinah), but Brett himself relies upon this silence for the strength of his argument. In not considering the intentionality of the silencing of women on the matter of their exchange, he thus, inadvertently no doubt, replicates the silencing of women that the text itself enacts.

BIOGRAPHY

Julie Kelso recently submitted her PhD in Hebrew Bible and Feminist Philosophy through the University of Queensland, and is currently awaiting the examiners' reports. Her thesis brings the earlier, psychoanalytic work of Luce Irigaray to analyse the Book of Chronicles. Julie has published in the areas of feminist biblical studies, Bible and Film, and creative writing. Her background is in Art History and Australian Literature. She is currently employed as a research assistant for Prof. Carole Ferrier, Dr. Deb Jordan, and Assoc. Prof. Maryanne Dever, on their ARC funded research project (The Vance and Nettie Palmer Correspondence). She is the mother of one daughter and two very naughty dogs.
POLITICIZING THE (IN)AUDIBLE: A SHORT CRITIQUE OF MARK BRETT’S GENESIS
(WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO GENESIS 34)

(All the systems of exchange that organise patriarchal societies and all the modalities of productive work that are recognised, valued and rewarded in these societies are men’s business. The production of women, signs, commodities is always referred back to men (When a man buys a girl, he “pays” the father or the brother, not the mother…) and they always pass from one man to another, from one group of men to another.)

1. INTRODUCTION

In his recent book, Genesis: Procreation and the Politics of Identity, Mark Brett argues that Genesis (the first book of the Hebrew Bible) is a political text that addresses the debates within the ‘post-exilic’ or ‘Persian’ period concerning the nature of Israelite identity. The dominant push for ethnic purity found in the post-exilic books of Ezra and Nehemiah is time and again undermined in Genesis by an integrationist polemic against the priestly desire for the ‘holy seed.’ Brett listens closely to hear a different editorial voice in Genesis, one that subverts the dominant argument for genealogical exclusivism or ethnocentrism. I want to say straight away that I accept the legitimacy of Brett’s identification of an alternative voice in Genesis. Actually, his post-colonial approach opens up many possibilities for reading stories that seem to have been almost closed down when it comes to interpretive possibilities. And I am sure that his reading of Genesis provides many of us with a new, more palatable Genesis, a text of which we can be proud (socially, religiously, and politically) rather than somewhat ashamed. But, as a feminist I dispute the value he places on that alternative voice. That is, I dispute the subversive status that Brett gives to this anti-ethnocentric, inclusivist voice. I agree that it is contestatory, but not subversive.

As a feminist reader, I too listen for hitherto unheard or unacknowledged voices in the Hebrew Bible. However, unlike Brett, the voices I listen for are thoroughly repressed by the text. The voices I long to hear are inaudible; they are the very sound of silence itself. My own hypothesis, which is indebted to the work of feminist philosophers Luce Irigaray and Michelle Boulous Walker, is that I never get to hear the genuine voices of women in the Hebrew Bible because all production of biblical texts is the result of male labour. In fact, these repressed voices of women are the very condition for the audibility of different, male voices in the text, be they dominant voices or the somewhat quieter voices of subversion that Brett hears. This is, after all, a debate that takes place on male-only terms. In other words, that these voices are heard at all is a mark of their symbolic privilege. In this respect, these so-called dominant and subversive voices are in fact cut from the same cloth. Only those voices that are completely excluded or inaudible can be considered at all subversive. What I mean by this will become clearer as I go on.

As an example, I want to turn to Brett’s reading of Genesis 34, which on the surface is a text that deals explicitly with these duelling socio-political voices. On the one hand, we have the subversive exogamy-desiring integrationist position represented by Dinah, Shechem, Jacob, Hamor, and the men of Shechem. On the other hand, we have the dominant ideological voice of the endogamy-desiring ethnocentrists, represented by Dinah’s brothers, especially Simeon and Levi. Genesis 34 is read as an explicit narrativisation of this politico-religious tussle. I’ll first give a brief description of the story, then summarise Brett’s reading of Genesis 34 before responding to certain features of his work. Briefly, I dispute Brett’s suggestion that the lack of agency available to women at this time in history is simply a convention we need to “understand” so as to better come to terms with the editorial response to Simeon and Levi’s crime in Genesis 34. Actually, we need to ask why the dominant ideology of male dominance is left thoroughly uncriticised in Genesis 34, where the ethnocentrist-v-inclusivist debate reaches its volatile narrative peak, while elsewhere in Genesis the questioning of such an ideology is part of the larger editorial pattern Brett discerns in Genesis. It is my contention that the silencing of women is the principal feature of male dominance, and this silence is the pre-requisite of the debates at hand. In other words, the only subversive voices are those that are intentionally silenced. These are the voices of women, represented in this narrative by Dinah, Leah, and the women of the land. Furthermore, not only does the narrative rely upon the silence of the female characters to enable the story to proceed in the manner that it does (i.e. as the story of men at war with each other over the question of who gets Dinah), but Brett himself relies upon this silence for the strength of his argument.
In not considering the intentionality of the silencing of women on the matter of their exchange, he thus, inadvertently no doubt, replicates the silencing of women that the text itself enacts.

2. Sexual Endogamy: The Unquestioned Economy of Sexual Exchange in Genesis 34

Genesis 34 goes something like this. Dinah, the daughter of Leah and Jacob, sets out to visit the women who live in the land in which Dinah’s family have recently settled. On the way, however, something happens to her. Shechem and Dinah are involved in an illicit sexual act, traditionally interpreted as rape but more recently as consensual sexual misconduct. And this is where the trouble starts, even though Shechem is taken with Dinah and asks his father to get her for him as a wife. Unfortunately, Shechem is understood by Jacob and his sons to have defiled (אָמַר) Dinah. Hamor, Shechem’s father, and Shechem himself offer to purchase Dinah from Jacob and his sons, suggesting also that they live together in their land and exchange daughters with each other. The sons of Jacob respond that all the men of Shechem must be circumcised. Only on this condition will they give their consent.

But, while the men of Shechem are still recovering from their circumcision, Simeon and Levi, two of Jacob’s (and Leah’s) sons come to the city and kill all the men and remove Dinah from Shechem’s house. Then they (and their other brothers?) ransack the city, taking all the dead men’s possessions, including their women and children. Jacob is not impressed. He breaks his silence at this point to berate Simeon and Levi for potentially bringing trouble by enraging the peoples who inhabit the land (Canaanites and Perizzites). Jacob fears that they may gather together and destroy him and his family. But the brothers remain firm, attempting to justify their actions by questioning whether their sister should be treated as a prostitute.

Genesis 34 is a notoriously obscure tale. In general, most readers deliberate upon the intention of the ancient authors or editors, particularly where the placing of blame is concerned. All of this hinges on the nature of the actions of Shechem in v.2, and in particular, the translation of the Hebrew verb אָמַר, which more often than not is translated as ‘rape’ in this instance. Brett relies quite heavily on the work of Lyn Bechtel, who, through a close analysis of this verb as it appears throughout the Hebrew Bible, argues that the verbal sequence in v.2 meant to convey consensual, though illicit sex. She translates אָמַר as ‘humble’ or ‘shame’ rather than ‘rape.’ Bechtel finds that in v.2 Shechem’s shaming of Dinah is a shaming of her family and the ‘cohesion of the tribal structure’ itself. She argues that the story intended to portray is not the rape of Dinah but the unwillingness of some members of the group to accept her consensual liaison with an outsider. The subsequent outrage on the part of the brothers is a result of the failure to maintain group purity and separation. Dinah is found to engage freely in a sexual liaison with Shechem, and the violence that arises, her brothers’ reaction, is a result of their isolationist attitudes. Bechtel reads Jacob’s anger and fear as revealing the danger of maintaining these attitudes given their situation.

Extending Bechtel’s argument, Brett concludes that Jacob and Dinah are given ‘the editor’s indirect blessing’ for their willingness for exogamous marriage and interaction with outsiders who are content to respect their customs, while Simeon and Levi are subtly rebuked for their isolationism. The narrative antagonism results not from Shechem’s rape of Dinah, but from the perceived impurity brought about through exogamy. So, according to Brett, the tensions in this story that erupt around the volatile question of who constitutes Israel are the result of the debate that surfaces through the editorial layers of Genesis.

My own argument is that this very debate can only take place because of the silencing of women. The reason for this is that this debate between ethnocentrism and inclusivism essentially hinges upon the controlled exchanging of women’s bodies among men. Or more specifically, it hinges upon the control of women’s potentially productive maternal bodies. Now, Brett states quite clearly that the absence of women’s voices in this text, most notably the absence of any response by Dinah to her situation, is simply to be expected in light of the patriarchal cultural assumptions of the time. So too, the fact that the relevant legal material pertaining to the crime of Genesis 34 (Deut. 22:28-29) gives no legal agency to the female involved. Indeed, we are to accept that this is the case so as to apprehend the editorial judgment of Simeon and Levi’s response to Shechem and Dinah’s encounter. Let us look at what Brett has to say.
First of all, the silence of Dinah, together with the ambiguity of the verbal sequence in v.2, allows for the interpretation that Dinah was a willing participant:

Genesis 34 is usually taken to be a crime and punishment story, beginning with Shechem’s rape of Dinah. But the Hebrew text of 34.2 is somewhat ambiguous: when Shechem saw her, ‘he took her, lay with her, and debased (‘nh) her.’ The agency of the male protagonist is clearly represented in these verbs, and Dinah’s point of view is occluded, but it does not follow that Dinah must be seen as unwilling.

We can understand how problematic it would be to have Shechem, one of our subversive heroes, raping Dinah who also is aligned with the progressive voice of inclusion. However, we don’t have to insist on the interpretation of rape in v.2. Actually, I tend to agree with Bechtel and Brett that the translation of ‘rape’ is somewhat problematic here. But that Dinah’s lack of voice concerning her predicament may be useful for Brett’s argument makes me somewhat uneasy.

This lack of voice is the correlate of the lack of agency given to women in the Deuteronomistic laws concerning illicit sexual behaviour. As Brett reminds us, according to the law in Deut 22:28-29, sexual intercourse with a woman like Dinah who is not betrothed is only a problem if her illicit sexual partner does not wish to marry her. Brett tells us that

(functioning entirely within patriarchal cultural assumptions, the law requires that fifty shekels of silver be paid to a woman’s father and that the couple never divorce. The woman concerned is completely deprived of legal agency, but a descriptive interpretation needs to focus here on the cultural assumptions of the biblical material; it is precisely these patriarchal assumptions that are relevant to whether or not the editors saw Simeon and Levi’s actions as an appropriate response to the crime.

Again, Brett needs those cultural assumptions to be accepted as given, so that we may hear the alternative editorial voice that he hears. But this alternative voice certainly does not challenge the legitimacy of these cultural assumptions that remove agency from women, and remove their voice. Dinah’s lack of voice, not to mention the silencing of her mother in this matter, must be read as more than just that which is to be expected in Genesis, given the cultural conditions of its production. And actually, wasn’t an anti-male-domination voice supposed to be audible in Genesis. Where, we might ask, is it now? I am not referring to a voice that would condemn Shechem’s act. This would in many ways simply be the reversal of Brett’s thesis (i.e. the text condemns those willing to go beyond ethnic boundaries rather than the other way around). I am listening for the voice that challenges the purely objective status of women that is insisted upon in this story; a voice that challenges the complete denial of any symbolic space for women other than as the conduits or mediators for relations among men, particularly through the reduction of women to a social value defined by and for men. By social value I mean the imprisonment of women in their maternal function for man.

In my own work on Genesis 34, I follow Michelle Boulous Walker’s suggestion that we need to understand the silence of women’s voices in the texts of our cultural heritage as more than simply the absence of speech. The process of silencing, as Boulous Walker theorises it, is the result of more complex strategies such as repression, denial and foreclosure. Her thesis, derived from French feminist philosophy and psychoanalysis, is that ‘the maternal body occupies the site of a radical silence in the texts of Western philosophy, psychoanalytic theory and literature.’ By this she means that the maternal is only a symbolic place that may be spoken of or for, rather than a legitimate place from which to speak. This is not to say that female characters who are mothers (usually of sons) never speak, nor that females who speak about things other than the maternal possibilities of their bodies are exceptions to this. We must not rush into optimistic readings of the speech of female characters in texts like the Hebrew Bible that are saturated with the ideologies of patriarchy. We must first acknowledge and understand these more complex strategies of women’s oppression through silencing. Boulous Walker argues that Luce Irigaray’s thesis that the repressed maternal body (the repression of the maternal body and voice from systems of signification) provides a model of reading that enables us ‘to pursue the way the masculine imaginary silences women.’

I would like to add Genesis to Boulous Walker’s textual list. But for now, if we return specifically to Genesis 34 and examine it closely, we find certain linguistic and narratological features that draw together, as logically coextensive, the absence of narrated women’s voices in a story about the problems concerning the exchange of women and their symbolic maternal status. This story about the struggle between two systems of exchange (endogamous and exogamous) fails to conceal the very condition for the existence of this struggle in the first place: the subordination of (re)productive nature
to its socially inscribed function for men. That no women enter into the narrative’s dialogue concerning the question of the exchange of women is the effect of women’s exclusion from the symbolic (in its Lacanian and Levi-Straussian sense) and is not simply a matter of cultural convention. Or rather, their lack of narrative presence, as actants and speakers, is the logical expression of the more radical form of their silence: their presence within the symbolic as the site or place of the maternal. The maternal body is overwritten and silenced by the maternal function – to produce children for men, and to ensure relations among men alone.

The substantive used in v.4 in place of Dinah’s name, יְנִיהָ, is the crucial signifier of this silence: ‘And Shechem said to his father, ‘Get for me this יְנִיהָ for a wife.’ יְנִיהָ is usually translated as ‘young or marriageable girl.’ And yet, this translation conceals the functionality implicit in the verbal form of this noun: יְנִיהָ, to bear or bring forth. In fact, this verb appears in vs.1: ‘And Dinah, the daughter of Leah (יְנִיהָ) whom she bore (יְנִיהָ) for Jacob, went out to see into the daughters of the land.’ While Dinah is syntactically and grammatically closer at this point to Leah than she is to Jacob, the appearance of Jacob’s name ensures that we become aware of the role of women in this economy and this story. Jacob/man is the receiver of that which Leah/woman bears (יְנִיהָ). His presence as the receiver/owner in the very first verse of Genesis 34 bestows upon the female subject (Leah) and female object (Dinah) of the verb ‘to bear,’ their very symbolic and social reason for being. Leah bore (יְנִיהָ) Dinah for Jacob.2x Dinah is the daughter of a woman whose productive capacity is, it needs to be stated, for someone else. The child (male or female), produced for-someone-else, becomes, in the case of the girl-child, she who will one day, like her mother, produce for-someone-else. Dinah is produced for Jacob in v.1, and she is anticipated by Shechem to produce for him, i.e. to be his producer, in v.4 when he refers to her as יְנִיהָ.

What the verb יְנִיהָ and the noun יְנִיהָ make clear in vs. 1 and 4 is that women both produce and are produced for men. For which men they produce is here, of course, the fundamental narrative problem. And it is a problem about which no woman is given the narrative space to speak. ‘Woman’ is silenced most radically when the (re)productive capacity of her body is at stake. Located at the site of this mute maternal, ‘woman’ ensures the replication of a symbolic and social order within which she cannot actively participate. She ensures both the repetition of a social order that brings and keeps men amongst themselves, for good or bad, and the continuance of stories for and about them.

In this respect, יְנִיהָ is better translated as ‘one capable of bearing for a man’ or ‘one whose duty it is to bear for a man’ rather than ‘young girl’ or ‘marriageable girl.’ When Shechem tells his father to get this יְנִיהָ for a wife, we can see the symbolic, social role of women in operation. Dinah is understood by Shechem to be his future producer, the producer of his future. All the men of the story are brought together to discuss the implications of this desire of Shechem’s, an obvious problem on the social and religious levels. But not, we might add, on the level of sexual identity sustained through the exchange of women.

But this is the maternal as imagined by the ‘son,’ within a male imaginary universe. The silenced maternal body is the imagined body of the son’s mother. Reading Genesis 34, we can see that this repressed maternal body also services the phantasy of masculine, monosexual (re)production, with Dinah metamorphosing from being ‘the daughter of Leah whom she bore for Jacob’ (v.1), to being simply ‘the daughter of Jacob’ (vs.3,5,7,18). What is more, she is also recognised as the saleable product of an all male symbolic labour when Hamor and Dinah’s brothers indirectly refer to Dinah as the daughter of Jacob and his sons (34.8,17). In other words, corporeal maternal origins must be disavowed (‘I know I am born of woman, but all the same…”) to allow the mirage of male productive labour, the only labour valued here.

In fact, this complex strategy of silencing women through their imprisonment in the symbolic maternal function, along with the denial of maternal origins and the appropriation of maternal power when it comes to the economics of sexual exchange all take place alongside the sundering of female genealogy. Dinah is only ever Leah’s daughter in v.1, where she also has the distinct possibility of ‘seeing into the daughters of the land’ whatever that might mean. While Brett suggests that Dinah is continuing the expansive mood set by her father in 33:19, when he buys a field from the sons of Hamor, he points out that the story quickly turns to ethnic violence. Dismissing v.2 (the so-called “rape” of Dinah) as non-violent, he states that ‘it is only the actions of Dinah’s brothers that are unambiguously violent’ (101).
Now, if Dinah is to be read as continuing her father’s business by going out to see the women of the land, one wonders why she is not simply referred to as the daughter of Jacob, the epithet by which she is mostly known in this story. Dinah goes out as her mother’s daughter, and it is only in this verse in Genesis 34 that Dinah appears as ‘the daughter of Leah.’ Of course, we are told that Dinah is ‘the daughter of Leah whom she bore for Jacob,’ but she is still explicitly named as ‘the daughter of Leah’ not ‘the daughter of Jacob’ when she goes to see into the daughters of the land. I want to suggest that this very sudden shift away from the possibility of women amongst themselves in v.1, and away from the possibility of a story about them, not to mention the sundering of the mother-daughter genealogy that takes place from this point on in the story, is the fundamental violence of the text. The ensuing narrative goes to great lengths to contain women within their symbolic maternal function so that they may remain symbolically silent in matters concerning their exchange as commodities among men. Would not the possibility of a female character – a mother’s daughter no less – heading towards a group of women function as the greatest threat to a culture that needs to recognize and value only that which pertains to the masculine? In fact, are these not the most subversive voices imaginable in a text ‘functioning entirely under patriarchal assumptions’? For this reason they must be forbidden.

Both the dominant (ethnocentric, exclusivist) and so-called ‘subversive’ (ethnically inclusivist) voices Brett draws our attention to in Genesis rely upon the given status of an economy of sexual exchange. That men exchange women amongst themselves is never questioned in Genesis at all, and certainly not by any female character. It is just that the process itself is always fraught with problems. Nowhere is this more evident than in Genesis 34, where not only Dinah, the principal female protagonist, is silenced, but so too Leah and the daughters of the land. Nobody asks the women for their opinion as to how their social world should be structured, perhaps because either option (endogamy or exogamy) exploits the productive powers of their bodies without any recompense to them.” The silence of women is more than just an absence of speech, but a necessary muting. As Irigaray, mimicking Marx, puts it, ‘what if these “commodities” refused to go to “market”? What if they maintained “another” kind of commerce, among themselves?” In fact, Genesis 34 begins with the possibility of women-amongst-themselves: ‘And Dinah, the daughter of Leah whom she bore for Jacob, went out to see into the daughters of the land.’ Had Dinah actually made it to the daughters of the land, their own stories may have been told within what perhaps could have been a different economy of exchange. It is no mere coincidence that the journey of Dinah, the mother’s daughter, towards a group of women is suddenly, even violently torn away from her kind and unceremoniously dumped into the world of men. Shechem’s narrated actions on or with Dinah (rape or not, it really doesn’t matter) ensure that the story is redirected back on to the socio-political stage of men-amongst-themselves. This violent redirection away from the stories of women ensures that the stories of men can be told, implying that the controlling of women’s bodies and the controlling of story-telling itself are inextricably related.

3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, according to Brett, Genesis 34 is yet another instance of the consistent undermining of the dominant position of ethnocentrism by a subversive integrationist voice within Genesis as a whole. I have no problem with the fact that Brett wants to intentionalise this integrationism in Genesis 34. However, both of these voices – dominant and subversive, exclusivist and inclusivist – include within their program an unquestioned (and therefore necessary) controlling of the bodies of women. Brett’s subversive editor offers just an alternative variation of male-male relations within a given historical and cultural frame, a feature not entertained by Brett who prefers to hear an egalitarian relationship between the sexes posited by this subversive voice. Indeed, I would suggest that the hybridity of voices that Brett draws our attention to in Genesis all take place at the expense of historical women’s voices. Yes, we can agree with Brett that the lack of agency and voice of Dinah in particular is to be expected given the cultural assumptions behind this patriarchal text. But that silence needs to be heard, and it needs to be intentionalised so that the silencing that the text enacts upon the female characters is not replicated by the critic through descriptive interpretation.
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For those outside of biblical studies, this statement may seem confusing. Genesis, in its complete form as we have it (the Masoretic text), is presumed by most non-biblical scholar readers (and, indeed, some biblical scholars themselves) to have been produced much earlier than the post-Babylonian exile or so-called Persian period (the Persian rule of Israel: late sixth to late fourth century BCE). Brett’s position (like many other contemporary biblical scholars) is that Genesis was indeed written prior to the post-exilic period, but it was during this period that an editorial or redactional process took place. In other words, the older text of Genesis has been edited in the post-exilic scribal process, and we may find traces of this later political context as a result of the redactor’s work.
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I am insisting on the translation of the inseparable preposition le as ‘for’ rather than ‘to’ in this instance to emphasis the functionality of women’s bodies in this story.

Irigaray points out that the anthropological terms “exogamy” and “endogamy” are terms valid only to patriarchal social orders:

> The exchanges upon which patriarchal societies are based take place exclusively among men. Women, signs, commodities, and currency always pass from one man to another; if it were otherwise, we are told, the social order would fall back upon incestuous and exclusively endogamous ties that would paralyze all commerce. Thus the labor force and its products, including those of mother earth, are the object of transactions among men and men alone. This means that the very possibility of a sociocultural order requires homosexuality as its organizing principle. Heterosexuality is nothing but the assignment of economic roles: there are producer subjects and agents of exchange (male) on the one hand, productive earth and commodities (female) on the other. Culture, at least in its patriarchal form, thus effectively prohibits any return to red blood, including that of the sexual arena. In consequence, the ruling power is pretense, or sham, which still fails to recognize its own endogamies (L. Irigaray, *This Sex*, 192).

Irigaray’s claim here is that sexual exogamy has never taken place. That is, all exchange under this social order is sexually endogamous, based on a homosexual logic of desire for men amongst themselves.
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