

論文

Hermeneutics of Carnival and Culture

Satoshi Tsukamoto

要 旨

この論文で、著者は文化という概念が中世のイギリスで行われていたカーニバルから派生したということを、文献をもとに検証する。中世カーニバルにおいては、聖なるものと俗なるものが渾然一体となり、地位の高い人が地位の低い人になりすましたり、またその逆のことが起こったりした。また身体は海や地とつながっている存在として認識されていた。しかし時代が進むにつれてカーニバルを、風俗を乱す催し物としてみなす風潮が広まり、それと相まって衛生観念が確立され、カーニバルは性病の巣窟として当局から取り締まりを受けるようになった。また上流階級の人がカーニバルに参加しなくなり、それとほぼ同じ時期にロンドンで劇場が作られ、見せ物は劇場で楽しむようになった。そのような歴史的推移の中で、文化という概念が作り出されたと著者は主張する。

Keywords: culture, carnival, body, theater, hierarchy

キーワード：文化、カーニバル、身体、劇場、階層制度

The word *culture* serves as a worthwhile expression to describe the distinctiveness of one civilization from another. Moreover, we are apt to use the word *culture* whenever we want to refer to the particularity of one community, of one society, or of one nation. Of

course, what we regard as culture may have ambiguous boundaries of defining what culture represents; but at the same time, the term refers to some sort of characteristics in order to distinguish one culture from another. The connotation of the word *culture* implies both centripetal force that puts different kinds of factors together and centrifugal force that excludes deviants from mainstream components that are comprised of its core values. In particular, this paper will present how these two contradictory forces had come to exist and in fact shaped the framework of culture.

A good place to start is with contemporary American culture that may well represent the considerable multiplicity of what culture means. For example, it is very difficult to appraise the constituents of current American culture because of its diversity and amorphous forms of its entity. Judging from a perspective of a person who has not become assimilated to American culture as yet, Disneyland is what reflects on my mind first as the representation of contemporary American culture. Once again, what comprises American culture, of course, is debatable; but what I would like to indicate is that Disneyland is a worthwhile subject to examine when we consider how ordinary people, as participants of festive space, perceive one example of a popular culture in a contemporary sense, which may indeed suggest where culture came from.

Curiously, Disneyland is a complex manifestation of fantasy and dream world in which many people, young and old, aspire to live and to escape to from time to time. Surely, one feels, it represents material wealth that leads us to the satisfaction of our lives. Its implications are, therefore, of special interest. Weinstein maintains that “Disney initially had in mind for this new park: an extremely sentimental and nostalgic place where children can experience the material culture of past generations and where adults can relive their or their parents’ childhood.”¹ There can be little doubt that the abundance of character goods and the excitement of amusement facilities convince us of another world that satisfies our desires that may not be contended in a day-to-day life. Understandably, the fundamental and foremost idea of the Disneyland is “the essence of America—a place of warmth and illusion, with nostalgia of the past, complexities of the present, and glimpses of the future.”²

The Disneyland is an offspring of the carnival seen in the Middle Ages in the sense that visitors feel liberated from burdens of their earthly lives and are allowed to participate in the festive world. At its best, the festivity that prevails there leads the visitors to either the past or the future of America, while the very same atmosphere of the Disneyland makes it possible for them to transcend the barrier between the past and the future, nostalgia and

ambition. The visitors' minds, free from worrying about one's daily work, can easily transfer to another world and enjoy a somewhat temporal illusion and fantasy. There are no boundaries to limit our imagination once we enter the Disneyland, and we cross the borders that restrain freedom of choosing who we become, where we go, and when we live when we participate in the world that the Disneyland envisions.

As one might expect, there are parades around *Main Street* in Disneyland.³ Many young handsome men and beautiful women with gorgeous costume parade as if they had been from the world of fantasy, smiling and waving their hands to spectators. The setting was a Medieval Castle surrounded by woods, and the spectators were made to feel as if they had been in another world that was difficult to identify with a particular time and space. The performers seemed to persuade the spectators that they could be one of those princes and princesses, regardless of occupation, social status, or incomes or any other things to which one referred in defining one's identity. There were no boundaries to distinguish the performers from the spectators in the sense that the performers beneath the splendid costumes were ordinary people, who happened to be full-time or part-time employees of the Disneyland and belonged to the same earthly world as the spectators did. As a result, the spectators might have felt comfortable to see the parades because they might think that the performers are equal, not superior in any sense, to themselves, but still they might have envied young men and women who played the roles of princes and princesses. Despite its astonishing qualities, Disneyland is a democratic world that allows people to feel that they are an integral part of the festivity.

In short, the attractiveness of the Disneyland lies in the forces to transgress the boundaries between fantasy and earthliness and to overcome the limitations of one's imagination. In addition, the Disneyland has the power to transcend the commercial limitations of fairs, exhibitions, and festivals, and carnivals.⁴ The Disneyland is open around the year, not subjecting itself to any calendar but its own schedule that is designed to maximize its sale. The innovation of the Disneyland is "the creation of an actual place in its very creation of placelessness."⁵ Disneyland is a recreation of imaginary world with the frameworks of the actual places. Especially, the blends of authenticity and falsity fascinate the psyche of the populace.

In this respect, carnival in the Middle Ages is a prototype of the Disneyland embodiment in some ways. Both of them temporarily suspend the earthly status of people defined by the world where they actually reside and destined to share the same norms that

lead them to another world. In addition, both transgress the boundaries that set one from the other; both have the power to transcend the limits of constricting communication among people. Taking this into account, from the Disneyland image we now turn to the carnival.

Carnival in the Middle Ages constitutes the birthplace of what we now consider culture. Carnival, according to Bakhtin, is a very complex form of festivity that gives participants a sense of a unified world that permeates all levels of actions and gestures.⁶ Within the confinement of place and time, all participants manage to share the norm of the carnival and communicate with each other in the same language into which all gesticulation and verbal expressions are translated. In other words, the participants in the carnival live together under the same laws. Confronted with this, the law only governs the structure of the carnival; it restricts and prohibits certain behaviors and conducts in the carnival. One important characteristic of the law is that it suspends honor, horror, punishment, and code of conducts and behaviors, all of which come from an established hierarchical structure. As opposed to a hierarchical society, people are free from the boundary to classify their rank and somewhat feel free to communicate with each other without worrying about exhibiting rudeness or offensiveness to the people in the higher rank. True emotion and feeling are revealed, and the psychological distance among people dramatically narrows. In this context, a new kind of interrelationship emerges and new authority replaces the authority of hierarchical society in the carnival. This new authority valorizes a certain eccentricity that allows people to expose deviant behaviors and to express inner hearts. This means that all forms of gesture and verbal expressions as a rule can be interchangeable; there is no physical and linguistic restriction in contacting other people. In the long run, all of the things that have the opposite meanings intermingle: holiness and blasphemy, life and death, wisdom and stupidity, cleanness and dirt, fertility and sterility.

In the carnival all participants enjoy a grotesque body. Bakhtin explains what the grotesque body is:

The grotesque body ... is a body of becoming. It is never finished, never completed; it is continually built, created, and builds and creates another body. Moreover, the body swallows the world and is itself swallowed by the world.... This is why the essential role belongs to those parts of the grotesque body in which it outgrows its own self, transgressing its own body, in which it conceives a new, second body: the bowls and the phallus.⁷

Not only gestures and words but also bodies are interchangeable in the carnival. More

importantly, the grotesque body is a body of growing and of expanding its boundary within the confinement of the hierarchical society. Somewhat disquieting, the grotesque body is not distinguishable one from another; it is a collective body to hold the world of the carnival.

We are reminded that the grotesque body communicates not only with each other but also with the earth and the sea of which the human is a part. At the same time, the grotesque body deliberately communicates with soil and water through the lower strata of the body such as urine and excrement, and this is the most fundamental and significant communication to be human. Bakhtin stresses:

We must ...stress that it was in the material acts and elimination of the body—eating, drinking, defecation, sexual life—that man found retraced within himself the earth, sea, air, fire, and all the cosmic matter and its manifestations, and was thus able to assimilate them. Indeed, the images of the material bodily lower stratum have a prevailingly cosmic connotation.⁸

In sum, the grotesque body is a way of communicating with the cosmic world surrounding the human and of interacting with resources of life to revitalize itself.

Remarkable as it is, the grotesque body that Bakhtin mentioned reminds me of a religious festival in which I had participated several times in Japan. The name of the festival is a *Naked Festival*, held in Inazawa, Aichi prefecture. On January the thirteenth of the lunar calendar, many groups of men who are naked save for their loincloths made of bleached cotton jog in a zigzag line on the road, holding a bamboo tree with branches fastened pieces of cotton cloth in which many wishes are written down, and drinking rice wine. Their destination is the *Owari Okunitama* Shinto shrine sacred to a deity, whose history goes back to the eighth century. These individuals carry a heavy bamboo tree with gallant, “Wa-shoi!” On the way to the shrine, they drink rice wine to make their body warm because it is usually very cold outside. They also offer rice wine to spectators along the roads. After offering the bamboo trees to the shrine, hundreds of naked men look forward to the appearance of the man of god in the front yard of the shrine. The man of god is decided by lot among a few young men who want to hold the honorable position each year. In any given instance, the lucky man who is chosen stays in the shrine for three nights and purifies his body and soul by just eating rice, drinking water, and praying. In addition, all hair of the body including pubic hair is shaved.

On the day of the festival, the man of god plays the crucial role because he is the person whom hundreds of naked men try to touch in order to get rid of any future misfortune. People believe that the man of god takes care of the misfortunes of the people in the following year. Once the man of god appeared, hundreds of naked men elbow their way through crowds to touch the man of god. Nobody knows exactly when and where the man of god shows up in the yard, but it is usually around 4 o'clock in the evening. Since many of the naked man are intoxicated, they are very excited in the crowds. Dozens of strong naked men protect the man of god from massive half-crazy crowds, and a dozen of others water the cold water over the crowds. Usually the temperature on the day of the festival is around 40 degrees Fahrenheit, so it is very freezing when the water is sprinkled from wooden buckets. Yet, to one's surprise, the water soon evaporates because of the heat the huge crowds generate. Since all of the naked men desperately try to touch the living god, the crowds appear to be in a trance. Some fall down with dirt; others jump over the crowds from a fence. Many bodies intermingle into one grotesque body covered with sweat and dirt.

When I was pushed back and forth in the crowds, I felt that my body was a part of the bigger body, and I could not help following the movement of this enormous body. However compelling its rhythms, I felt as if this collective body had had enormous power to control my body and soul. At the center of the crowds is the living god who lies down and almost loses his consciousness with many scars on his body. He is a center of the collective body; his body is a symbol of the grotesque body. It is said that you are the luckiest man if you touch the phallus of the living god. I have touched the man of god four times out of six attempts; furthermore, to my great joy, I touched his phallus once.

On the day of the *Naked Festival*, the world is upside down temporarily. That is, it is common to see the men who are naked save for loincloth made of bleached cotton with rubber soled white shoes and a colored cotton headband on the street. They offer rice wine and a piece of the cotton headband to spectators along the street while they head for the shrine. It means that persons who drink rice wine or obtain a piece of the cotton headband will have good fortune. At the crossroads, the naked men erect the bamboo tree. If this occurs at a junction of the road that allows cars to run on the day of the festival, cars have to stop and wait until a group of the naked men passed by. At this stage, another law prevails. The naked men can feel that they dominate the road, not the cars. It is humorous to see naked men force the policemen who control traffic to drink rice wine. Some policemen

accept; others refuse. On the way to the shrine, there is the police station, and every year groups of naked men who pass by the police try to enter the building, intending to disturb the order. Their attempts always fail because of the policemen who guard themselves against the naked men. At such a time, it is interesting to observe the confrontations between order and disorder represented by the tussle between the police and groups of naked men.

I would add in haste that the grotesque body does not cease to exist; on the contrary, the grotesque body is alive in the place where religious power is strong enough to confine the diffusion of the grotesque body. It is considered that Japan is considered to be a secular society. Yet Japan preserves the tradition in many rural areas of the country in its original design, and unlike Britain or France that executed a king or disembodied a divine body, Japan has conserved the spiritual embodiment of a direct descendant from heaven for thousands of years: the Japanese Emperor.

To put it another way, religious beliefs and activities are so interwoven with other dimensions of ordinary life that it is almost impossible to separate solely one particular idea or practice and to name it religion. It is not until I stayed in the United States for a while and observed what was going on in Japan that I noticed that I had some sort of religious beliefs. I used to go to the Shinto shrines and Buddhist temples near my house to pray for the well being of my family and myself whenever I felt the need. Or I used to pray in front of the Shintoism and Buddhist altars in my house whenever I thought it was the time to do this. My grandfather used to worship three times a day, sitting before the altars of the Shinto and Buddhism in my house. It was so natural and so unconstrained that I thought it was not a religion. Rather I thought that it was a part of my life; praying for my family was the way of my life to keep me alive, like eating or breathing. In such a society, nobody questions the meanings of prayer by joining one's hands. It is because the religious power is so pervasive and so strong in an unconscious way; the grotesque body is preserved intact within the confines of the religious sphere.

In the Middle Ages, religious power was very strong and permeated every corner of daily life; one's personal identity was inextricably tied to the entire society. So it is understandable that the identity of the participants in the carnival was virtually ambiguous. There were no reference points with which they identified themselves in the carnival; the self-perception of the body to space was equivocal. Chiefly, there was no distinction between those who recognized others and the bodies that were recognized by others. For

instance, the dissection of corpses in the public place attracted people in France during the lifetime of Rabelais.⁹ This public dismemberment proved that people at that time regarded other bodies as something familiar and belonging to themselves rather than as something foreign and disgusting. The corpses, like beef or pork, were destined to contribute to the living people rather than to discard; one witness said that the corpses were fortunate because they did not become a prey of the birds. That is to say, no concept of otherness is in the minds of people who joined the carnival, because “carnival is not a spectacle seen by the people; they live in it...”¹⁰ It was not necessary for the people to define and distinguish who they were because it was the carnival itself that upheld the collective identity.

The carnival is indispensable for people in order to liberate their spirits that become oppressed and numbed by day-to-day work and society that decidedly confines their lives. It is necessary for them to eliminate their boredom, tiredness, and gloom by participating in the carnival, thus by refreshing their souls. By the same token, within the confinement of time and space, the ambiguity of boundary to enforce power allows the participants to reveal the hidden feelings of various kinds of oppression and suppression and to heal these feelings by virtually being a part of the chaos in the carnival. Ultimately, the carnival is a safety valve which serves to relax the strands of one’s mind that are otherwise strained throughout the year.

There are three basic principles that govern the structure of the carnival. The first is the element of demonization by which a marginalized group is degraded so as to restore specifically the core values that mainstreamers hold. In the case of the carnival, a pig is often used in the process of demonization. This is what Stallybrass and White have to say on the matter: “...the pig became a focus of what we call *displaced abjection*, the process where ‘low’ social groups turn their figurative and actual power, *not* against those in authority, but against those who are even ‘lower.’”¹¹ The second principle is inversion whereby the existing relationships within hierarchy are turned upside down in order to mobilize stiff notions. Stallybrass and White remarked that “inversion addresses the social classification of values, distinctions and judgments which underpin practical reason and systematically inverts the relations of subject and object, agent and instrument...”¹² During the carnival, it is often the case that a fool as a result accedes to the throne and a king becomes a layman. Hybridization is the third principle, which generates the new combination of relationships between the dichotomy of high and low, of sacred and profane, of clean and dirty, of wise and foolish, and of fertile and sterile. While the first two

principles, demonization and inversion, do not basically change the binary poles that support the value system of the carnival, hybridization alters the underlying structure of the binary value system and revitalizes the system itself. Stallybrass and White explained that hybridization “generates the possibility of shifting *the very terms of the system itself*, by erasing and interrogating the relationships which constitute it.”¹³ In summary, demonization is a kind of exclusive force to ostracize a marginal object; and inversion is a kind of two opposite forces to fluctuate between the dichotomy of the two extremes, while hybridization represents discursive forces that ultimately change the fabrication of the carnival so as to give things new meaning.

Costumes, symbols, and masks play a relatively central role in the experience of the carnival. A perceptible use of these devices changes the relationships between those who disguise and those who recognize, or disrupts the relationships, or even reconstructs the completely new relationships. “The grotesque inappropriateness of Carnival masquerade,” Bristol remarked, “reveals the arbitrariness and impermanence in the relationship between the biological individual and his claims and pretensions to a fixed social status and identity.”¹⁴ The participants in the carnival not only make it well-known that their identity is equivocal, but oddly enough, also create the new relationships between themselves and a person or an object that they involve, by which they manipulate the unwritten codes of costumes, symbols, and masks.

Burke more specifically describes how people disguised their identities and played the roles of others:

People wore masks, some with long noses, or entire fancy dress. Men dressed as women, women as men; other popular costumes were those of clerics, devils, fools, wild men and wild animals, for example bears.... An Englishman in Paris for the Carnival of 1786 wrote that ‘popes, cardinals, monks, devils, courtiers, harlequins and lawyers all mingled in one promiscuous crowd.’ This crowd did not just dress up but acted out their parts. ‘One plays the Doctor of Law, and goes up and down the streets with his book in his hand disputing with every man he meets.’ Fools and wild men rushed about striking at the bystanders with pig’s bladders and even stick. People threw flour at one another, or sugar-plums, or apples, or oranges, or stones, or eggs....¹⁵

What the passage makes clear at once is that people, as a rule, metamorphose into the opposite sex, from lower beings to higher ones, and vice versa in the carnival. They create virtual identities with disguise, and consequently, this turns the world upside down.

Furthermore, some of them challenge their own relationship to others in a considerably harsh way.

It may be worth pointing out that we can still at times see inversion and hybridization in a theater. Radical transformation of the body takes place in the art form of dance, especially *Butoh* (Japanese underground and avant-garde dance). The *Butoh* dance was a radical movement of restoring the grotesqueness of the human body in 1960's, led by Tatsumi Hijikata, who danced impromptu to reveal the suggestive and hidden impulses in the body. Among eminent *Butoh* dancers and groups are Kazuo Ohno, Sankai-juku, and Byakkosha. Sankai-juku, which is composed of five men, had performed several times in the United States. Apparently, they were acclaimed as one of the best contemporary dancers who provoke imagination. On the day before their performance, they usually performed a ritual in public. The shaven-head man of a naked save for a loincloth made of a cotton bleach with powder on his body from his head to the tiptoe is turned upside down and is suspended with a rope from the top of the building. On this occasion, they wish their performance were successful. It cannot be overstated that their dance is very weird; their body movements are similar to those of the reptiles. Yet at the same time contours of their bodies draw sharp but sophisticated lines on the stage.

Another *Butoh* dancer, Kazuo Ohno, is a legend, not only acclaimed in Japan but also extolled abroad. He used to be a physical education teacher at a junior high school before he became a dancer. At the age of about forty-five, it is said that he recognized that a demon had lived in his body and it had driven him to dance, so he suddenly quit his job and became a dancer. In 1984, there was a revival of the *Butoh* dance in Tokyo, and I myself saw this legend on the stage. He had already reached over 75 years of age at that time. He was an ugly old man with deep lines on his face. Instead, what I saw was an old man dressed as a young girl on the stage. He powdered his face and put on lipstick and rouge, with a ribbon around his head. He wore a lovely blouse and a pretty skirt, holding beautiful flowers in his arms. His socks were cute. All his efforts did not stop at this point. To my surprise, the ugly old man metamorphosed into a pretty young girl, but it was wholly undeniable that the young girl was an old man. At first glance, he intermingled youth and old age, beauty and ugliness, and innocence and wickedness. As he danced extemporaneously, it turned out to be obvious that a demon using his body was disguised as an honest girl; it became a dance of a demon that expressed the innocence of an angel. Finally, his body transgressed the boundaries of time and sex, and transcended the borders

that distinguish between sacredness and profanity. No wonder he deserved the name of a legend proportionally in the world of the avant-garde dance.

In short, I have embarked on this digression because I wished to consider the indispensable body to which the basic principles of the carnival were applicable. Initially, then, let me return to my main subject. All this holds good in the Elizabethan era where there was a stratum that roughly drew a line between gentility and plebes, although both of them were ambiguous entities. Wrightson stated that the scholars in the sixteenth century defined gentility in rather ambiguous terms; one of them “thought that gentlemen could be summed up as ‘those whom their race and blood or at least their virtues do make noble and knowne.’”¹⁶ Those who earned a living without doing manual labor were gentlemen, but Wrightson pointed out that there was a good deal of ambiguity to denote the clear groups as gentility in terms of occupation and social status below the level of knights.

The plebes, likewise, were rather broad category of the populace. According to Bristol, the plebes were the people who, because of their entitled capacity, came to exist as a result of being excluded from the privileged gentility. They identified themselves with actual manual labor such as farmers, artisans, and merchants, and depended upon an existing alliance among themselves. Because of the multiplicity involved in its constituents, the plebes constantly generated dissonance and friction among themselves. In addition, they usually faced the customary subordination from gentility.¹⁷ To sum up, the release of their grievance and dissatisfaction as a result of the subservience was compensated with demonization, by which they ostracized more marginalized groups such as Jews, foreigners, prostitutes, and actors.

Correctly understood, demonization extends its implementing power outside the confines of the carnival, while inversion and hybridization were restricted inside the boundaries of the carnival. We have to keep in mind that the early target of the demonization, for example, was prostitution, although it took a long time to bear fruit on brothels. Orme substantiates how prostitution and brothels were, initially, approved and then become frowned upon and denounced.¹⁸ Until 1546 brothels were recognized as licentious institutions in London. People tolerated the existence of immorality because they generally reckoned prostitution as a necessary evil. In addition, a great many people benefited from the brothels. Prostitution generated a lot of money and brought about wealth to those who were involved in the brothels, like bawds keeping them and traders selling prostitutes luxuries such as jewels and gorgeous dresses. But in so far as this activity is

concerned, syphilis and the Christian reformers changed people's attitude toward the prostitution. One of the major fears, a sexually transmitted disease, might have restricted men's propensity to commit an immoral act, but it was a secondary force against the prostitution. The widespread force to execute the brothels was that Christian reformers—Anglicans, Calvinists, Lutherans, and Catholics alike—called for the improvement of morality in a society. This became clear because punishments against adultery and fornication, enforced by the Church, had already been severe, but the Christian reformers were altogether anxious to lift up the society as a whole to the point where strict regulations of prostitution were enforced. Essentially, their intolerance of immorality reached the peak throughout the Europe; and they attacked any legalized prostitution of the cities. In the present context, Henry VIII decreed that the licensed brothels in London be closed and whores and bawls leave the brothels immediately.

Similarly, the carnival faced two religious oppositions exemplified by the Christian reformers. Important as it is, the first was theological opposition. "The reformers disliked many popular customs because they were pagan survivals ..."¹⁹ They denounced magic and cult practice. Indeed, what they tried to do was to separate the sacred elements from profane elements of the carnival because they could not tolerate people doing things that emphasized the lower strata of the body. The next opposition was, as has been frequently pointed out, moral. "Festivals were denounced as occasions of sin, more especially drunkenness, gluttony and lechery, and as encouraging servitude to the world, the flesh, and the Devil—especially the flesh."²⁰ They blamed boisterous activities such as plays, songs, and dances in the carnival, claiming that such entertainment fostered lewdness and debauchery.

General hospitals began to exclude the patients who had venereal diseases in the eighteenth century.²¹ In the sixteenth century, two royal hospitals treated types of patients who reminded people of promiscuity and confusion, including sexually transmitted diseases and mental disorders. Hospitals were gradually intolerant of seemingly contagious diseases that resulted from indecent or abnormal behaviors or from something unknown to the doctors, and general hospitals began to refuse patients with diseases that caused disorders in a society. As it is, the intention of the hospitals was to safeguard other patients from being exposed to malicious diseases. In 1746 the London Lock Hospital was established, where the patents with venereal diseases and other disorderly symptoms had the priority to be treated. This hospital symbolized the enclosure of the deviants; what the founding of the

hospital implied was that people attempted to confine the area in which diseases were contagious. A memorable feature was that people became intolerant of disorders that threatened the security and stability of their life.

The relationship between the hierarchical society and the carnival started to change when people infringe the boundaries to distinguish the plebes from gentility within the hierarchical society. The forerunners of threatening the boundaries were masterless men who belonged to nowhere in a society. There were five kinds of masterless men.²² First, there were the vagabonds and beggars, wandering in search of employment, sometimes living on the streets. For instance, rapid expansion and economic transformation in London produced this kind of masterless men. They did not go to church; nor did they belong to any organization. Very shortly, their presence endangered the social stability. In their different ways, the second type of masterless men was the mob that lived in an underworld of London and indulged in illegal activities. They preyed on others' benefits and their existence was a threat to normal economic activities. The third types were the Protestant sectaries. They were religious refugees and lived just above the level of pauperism. They simply formed their own communities to support one another and escape from feudalism. A fourth type consisted of cottagers and squatters who did not have lords to depend upon in the rural areas. They were exposed to the improvement of agricultural betterment and had the potential mobility to go to the place where jobs were potentially available. Itinerants were the final type of masterless men, who traveled around the country for trade or sale. Since they had a great deal of mobility and only were driven by economic motives, they possibly could have diffused radical ideas to challenge the hierarchical society. In 1569, the number of the masterless men in London was estimated at 30,000; in 1602 the number was a lot more.

In particular, the masterless men had no faces; they did not have references with which they identified themselves, as opposed to the plebes who identified themselves with their specific occupation and the gentility with titles. In the hierarchical society, everyone could notably situate himself or herself, but the masterless men fairly stood outside this tradition or convention. They moved from one place to another while occupying the margin of society, transgressing the established boundaries of vertical and horizontal structure of the hierarchy.

This is due chiefly to the fear that the masterless men were not visible; it was because of their invisibility that they gradually encroached on the boundaries between the plebes and

gentility, urban areas and rural areas. The structure of the hierarchical society provided the framework that enabled people to understand the roles they played, and before their emergence, people could define who they were by referring to others who were visible. Yet the masterless men, without wearing a particular set of clothes to be visible, broke the system of identifying themselves and threatened the fixed notion of who people were and where they lived. They were amorphous, easily hiding their identities. Consequently, their existence itself was firmly a threat to the hierarchy.

Another indication of the disintegration of the hierarchy was the emergence of theaters. Theaters tend to be a more enclosed and more restricted form of the carnival. Actors play the roles of someone other than themselves, hiding their true identity and pretending to be someone that was fitted in a particular time and space. This calls to mind that the actors were akin to the masterless men who “could take on a new appearance; vagabonds, like the players included in their motley company, could make themselves over again.”²³ The hierarchy gradually lost the power to confine within the carnivals partially because of a threat from a mass of seemingly masterless men. That is, the masterless men might have felt it necessary to create the actors as an occupation to maintain their lives without losing their ambiguous identity. “The public playhouses were born,” Mullaney stressed “at a time when traditional hierarchies were breaking down, and neither they nor the plays they fostered were thus contained by the customary antitheses of rule and misrule, order and disorder, everyday and holiday.”²⁴

Technically and theoretically, theaters were a direct descendant of the carnival, but they came to restrict the functions of the actors and ranges of expressions the actors articulated as the authors’ theaters took shape. One example of this trend in the theaters was the exclusion of clowns from playhouses. When written texts for a play did not exist, actors were enabled to behave merely like the participants in the carnival; the actors were allowed to show disruptive improvisation that caused laughter. The champion of the discordant impromptu was a clown. The clown was the body of becoming; in which case he was the grotesque body restricted by the space of the theater. The clown “presented a figure his audience could both laugh at and laugh with.”²⁵ Yet because of the advent of the playwrights in the Elizabethan era who were conscious of the power of the nation, clowns were destined to be excluded.

The professional clown competes with the authorial voice for attention and control,

Hermeneutics of Carnival and Culture

producing a dialogic text in place of the monological scripted play. The formal unity that could be achieved only by subordinating subplot to main plot, commoners to aristocrats, comedy to history, by imposing, that is, the same hierarchies of privilege and power that exist in the state upon the play, is ruptured by the clown's refusal to be subordinated to the serious plot. His presence serves to counter the totalizing fantasies of power, to destabilize the hierarchies upon which they depend.²⁶

During the 1580's and 1590's clowns were the central figures of the players' theaters, praising and ridiculing the common people. Yet a famous clown, Will Kemp, departed the Globe in 1599, which theoretically resulted because of Henry IV's rejection to Falstaff, who represented the grotesque body, in *Henry IV, Part Two* written by Shakespeare in 1597 and the following year.²⁷

Overall then, Falstaff in *Henry IV, Part Two*, speaks vulgar language that expressly belonged to the lower class. He was boisterous and profane. He liked drinking, laughter, and women. This confirms that he was the grotesque body that emphasized the lower strata of the body. Subsequently, at the end of the play Henry IV expelled Falstaff.

For God doth know, so shall the world perceive,
That I have turned away my former self.
So will I those that kept me company.
When thou dost hear I am as I had been,
Approach me, and shalt be as thou wast,
The tutor and the feeder of my riots.
Till then, I banish thee, on pain of death,
As I have done the rest of my misleaders,
Not to come near our person by ten mile. (5.5.58–66)

This is a fictional play, but Shakespeare must have been aware of the substantial degree of power that the King exercised and of the fact that the King tolerated vulgarity and profanity that Falstaff symbolized. The King's words reflected the inner change of himself and his intolerance of the grotesque body. Moreover, the King's words implied the emergence of the social structure that exerted power that might replace the hierarchy, other than the power that the King himself had as the center of the hierarchical society. From Shakespeare's point of view, he must have perceived that he in fact needed the power, other than the King, upon which depended the security of his position as a playwright. While Ben Jonson, Shakespeare's contemporary playwright, relied on the King as a reference point to establish his drama as an art, Shakespeare had other things in his mind to achieve the objective that

Jonson had. An assumption is that Shakespeare must have known the fragility of the King's power.

As the power of maintaining the hierarchical society, which was the power the King exerted, gradually waned, the noblemen progressively withdrew from participating in the carnival. Burk stated that between 1500 and 1800 “there was a gradual shift taking place away from the more spontaneous and participatory forms of entertainment towards more formally-oriented and commercialised spectator sports....²⁸ In successive attempts, the noblemen also started to distinguish themselves from the plebes by using different language. “The noblemen,” Burk observed, “learned to speak and write ‘correctly’, according to formal rules, and to avoid the technical terms and dialect words used by craftsmen and peasants.”²⁹ In addition, the noblemen differentiated themselves from the lower class by adapting distinct mannerisms. “As their military role declined,” Burk explained, “the nobility had to find other ways of justifying their privileges: they had to show they were different from other people. The polished manners of the nobility were imitated by officials, layers and merchants who wanted to pass for noblemen.”³⁰ They came to have the notion that they should separate sacredness from profanity, along with the Christian reformers, which resulted in the intolerance of some activities in the carnival and the distinction between themselves and the plebes.

Without the gentility the carnival was not as vital and entertaining as before, because without their participation in the carnival three principles of the carnivalesque world did not function well enough to create the dynamic of the carnivalesque world. After the withdrawal of the gentility, what remained in the carnival was profanity, low spirits, blasphemy, stupidity, and dirt. There was hardly a place for demonization or inversion, much less hybridization. By 1800 gentility including the clergy and the merchants had withdrawn from the popular festivity and left it to the common people without a high breeding and had acquired the very different ways of looking at things from the commoners.³¹

The power that disintegrates the hierarchy which confines the carnival and the grotesque body became stronger as gentility was aware of rationality in the self that set various kinds of boundaries. Drawing the lines imposed and handling the fragmented sections divided by the line became steady activities and people gradually separate themselves from what they used to associate with—other people, animals, the earth, the sea, and God. The power to dissociate the body with the brain turned out to be even stronger. This means that people learned to see themselves objectively, not obscurely, separating their

minds from their body and banishing the lower strata of the body as dirty as if it were not part of their body. Curiously, they also became aware of hygiene.³² In fact, the notion of health not only placed importance on the awareness of disease but also emphasized the disintegration of the grotesque body into a more externalized and peripheral body that limited the contact with others and the communication with the earth and sea.

Admittedly, the force that was unified for the maintenance of the hierarchical society became diffused and, in contrast, was applied to frame nationhood or sovereignty that embraced larger yet much less cohesive entities. It appears that the vital force which once worked for the grotesque body that enabled it to interconnect with each other moved inward, as thereby becoming each person's self rather than the outward ability to communicate with each other. The balance of powers was chiefly shaken and disrupted by the marginalization of prostitutes and the growing intolerance of general hospitals to treat disorderly diseases. Add to the foregoing the opposition to some practices in the carnival, the Christian reform movements to make society moral, the appearance of the masterless men, the emergence of the theaters that did not need clowns, the declining power of the king, and the withdrawal of gentility from the carnival. All of these prime examples contributed to a shift of powers. Entropy of the hierarchical society was at work during the period that these occurred.

In the final analysis, the admired grotesque body became the pitiable enclosed body that refused to communicate with other bodies except through sexual intercourse. Stallybrass and White stated "...the grotesque was now an unpalatable and interiorized *phobic* set of representations associated with avoidance and with others. It could never be owned. It was always someone else who was possessed by the grotesque, never the self."³³ In a society in which the force to impose on the boundaries of the carnivalesque world ceased to exist, one's body, at best, could never become the grotesque body again. Yet it is possible to deliberately relax the boundaries of the vividly enclosed body and earnestly allow it to intermingle with another body simply by changing the balance of powers within the society. As a habit of mind, the problem is that nobody knows how to do it: the misfortune is that only history is capable of doing it arbitrarily.

It is true that the distance between the exceptional centripetal force that defines the self and the centrifugal force that delineates the sovereignty of the nation changed over the course of the history. What emerged is that people always situate themselves between these boundaries. Because the precise powers are invisible, people cannot, to a large extent,

perceive their position exactly, but nevertheless they are conscious of the distance. It comes as a surprise that the narrower the distance, the more people feel united yet intolerant of others. Then people started to widen the distance unconsciously. The wider the distance, the more people feel sullen and isolated although tolerant of others. Over the course of the history, these two characteristic forces oscillate from one extreme to the other. The two forces that shaped the boundary of what should be included or excluded contributed to the development of the concept of culture.

Endnotes

- 1 Raymond M. Weinstein, "Disneyland and Coney Island: Reflections on the Evolution of the Modern Amusement Park," *Journal of Popular Culture* 26 (1992): 149.
- 2 Ibid., 150.
- 3 What I refer to in the following paragraph is based on a visit to the Tokyo Disneyland on May, 1996
- 4 Stephen F. Mills, "Disney and the Promotions of Synthetic Worlds," *American Studies International* 28 (1990): 70.
- 5 Ibid., 71.
- 6 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. and ed. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 122–123.
- 7 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 317.
- 8 Ibid., 336.
- 9 Ibid., 360.
- 10 Ibid., 7.
- 11 Peter Stanlybrass, and Allon White, *Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1986), 53.
- 12 Ibid., 56.
- 13 Ibid., 58.
- 14 Michael D. Bristol, "Carnival and the Institutions of Theater in Elizabethan England," *ELH* 50 (1983): 642.
- 15 Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 183.
- 16 Keith Wrighton, "Estates, Degrees and Sorts," *History Today* 37 (1987): 20.
- 17 Michael D. Bristol, *Carnival and Theater* (New York: Methuen, Inc., 1985), 42–51.
- 18 Nicholas Orme, "The Reformation & the Red Light," *History Today* 37 (1987): 36–41.
- 19 Burke, 209.
- 20 Ibid., 212.
- 21 Judith Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 59.

Hermeneutics of Carnival and Culture

- 22 Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (Edinburgh: R.&R. Clerk LTD, 1972) 32–37.
- 23 Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1988), 51.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 49.
- 25 Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 216.
- 26 David Scott Kastan, “‘Clownes shoulde speake disorderlye’: Mongrel Tragicomedy and the Unitary State,” quoted in Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 226.
- 27 Helgerson, 223.
- 28 Burke, 249.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 271.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 271–272.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 270.
- 32 Dorinda Outram, *The Body and the French Revolution: Sex, Class, and Political Culture* (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1989), 47–48.
- 33 Stanllybrass, and White, 108.