

13 “For the humoral body, *all* boundaries were threatened because they were – as a matter of physical definition and functional health – porous and permeable.”

14 “What I infer from this history of bodily regulation is the structure of a contradiction between a popular medical practice authorizing experiences of somatic uncontrol in the form of humoral evacuation and an emergent ideology of bodily refinement and exquisite self-mastery.”

For Bakhtin 15 “The grotesque body is a popular-festive body that, outgrowing itself, threatens forms of established order for the sake of its own immediate self-celebration and for the long-term goal of promoting social cohesion and purposiveness from below.”

Bakhtin’s grotesque body is a collective form

“The grotesque body is a thematizing image of the popular body which by definition cannot belong to or be identified with selfhood, with the discrete, pathetically finite boundaries of the individual life in time.”

Opposed to the classical bodily canon “If the classical body – opaque, closed off, finished, a body all surface and no interior – instantiates the body ideal of Renaissance absolutism, it does so more as a denial of common bodiliness *tout court* than as a new form of bodiliness individualized.”

Bakhtin interested in “...body as instrument of political critique.”

16 “The suppression or silencing of the body’s functions – first from view, then from memory – is also a gradual suppression and silencing of the evidence of its humoral, agential interiority, and physiological porousness.”

“Finally, humoralism provides a fertile theoretical groundplot for psychoanalytically motivated revision of both Bakhtin and Elias.”

“...the materials of early modern humoral theory encode a complexly articulated hierarchy of physiological differences paralleling and reproducing structures of social difference. Prime among these, of course, is the structure of gender difference, the most basic social category of the body and one that both Bakhtin and Elias silently subsume.”

One-sex model differences of degree and not kind

17 “...difference without opposition until well after William Harvey’s discovery of the female ovum in 1651 and Regnier de Graf’s discovery of the ovarian follicle in 1672.”

We look for the beginning of “enculturation” in the mirror stage, moment of recognition between the baby perception of his/her bodily exterior and the movement he/she feels animating them