

УДК 008.001.14

ББК 71

Semenova Elena A.

PhD (in Pedagogical Sciences), Director of the Noncommercial Partnership

"Theatre-EX", 18/20 Bolshaya Pochtovaya Str., Moscow, 105082, Russia

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1316-3162

ResearcherID: ABA-3493-2020

semenova05@list.ru

Keywords: clown, evolutionary theory of humour, A.G. Kozintsev, laughter, artistic image, humorous self-denial, art

Semenova Elena A.

The Theories of Humour in the Study of the Clown Figure



This is an open access article distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

DOI: 10.51678/2226-0072-2023-1-30-67**For cit.:** Semenova E.A. The Theories of Humour in the Study of the Clown Figure. *Hudozhestvennaya kul'tura* [Art & Culture Studies], 2023, no. 1, pp. 30–67. <https://doi.org/10.51678/2226-0072-2023-1-30-67>.**Для цит.:** Семенова Е.А. Теории юмора в изучении фигуры клоуна // Художественная культура. 2023. № 1. С. 30–67. <https://doi.org/10.51678/2226-0072-2023-1-30-67>.**Семенова Елена Александровна**

Кандидат педагогических наук, директор НП «Театр-ЭКС», 105082,

Россия, Москва, ул. Большая Почтовая, 18/20

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1316-3162

ResearcherID: ABA-3493-2020

semenova05@list.ru

Ключевые слова: клоун, эволюционная теория юмора, А.Г. Козинцев, смех, художественный образ, игровое самоотрицание, искусство.**Семенова Елена Александровна**

Теории юмора в изучении фигуры клоуна

Abstract. This article continues the research of the author in the field of studying the phenomenon of a clown. The author discusses the problem of polar interpretations of the figure of a clown in scientific discourse, where there is a noticeable absence of convincing art history and cultural theories and concepts that can explain the connection between the figure of a clown and the phenomenon of laughter and humour. It is noted that, despite the fact that most studies focus on clown laughter, they do not analyse its specifics. In connection with the problem posed, the author suggests shifting away from the established paradigm of considering a clown as an artistic image and a comic character and puts forward a hypothesis, according to which evolutionary theories of laughter and humour hold considerable verification potential for studying the clown figure. The author concludes that based on A.G. Kozintsev's interdisciplinary evolutionary theory of laughter and the theory of humour, it is possible to prove the relationship between the clown phenomenon and the nature of laughter. The article discusses the assumption that man is the only species capable of semiosis and humorous meta-reflection, due to which he can be considered the most superficial hominid or "a flat animal" (the concept of G. Deleuze) that has humour, which is equivalent to a clown. The results of this research can be applied when studying the peculiarities of a clown as an artistic image (representation) in a work of art.

Аннотация. Рассматривается проблема полярности толкований фигуры клоуна в научном дискурсе, обнаруживающем дефицит искусствоведческих и культурологических теорий, способных объяснить связь фигуры клоуна со смеховой стихией. Несмотря на то что в большинстве исследований акцентируется внимание на смехе клоуна, в них отсутствует анализ его специфики. Ставится задача отойти от устоявшегося рассмотрения клоуна в качестве художественного образа и комического персонажа. Выдвигается гипотеза, согласно которой эволюционные теории юмора обладают высоким верификационным потенциалом изучения фигуры клоуна. Делается вывод, что при помощи междисциплинарной эволюционной теории смеха и разработанной на ее основе теории юмора А.Г. Козинцева возможно доказать взаимосвязь феномена клоуна и природы смеха. Рассматривается предположение, согласно которому человек является единственным видом, способным к семиозису и юмористической метарефлексии, благодаря чему его можно отнести к самому поверхностному гоминиду, т.е. «плоскому животному» (понятие Ж. Делёза), обладающему юмором, что эквивалентно клоуну. Результаты исследования могут быть использованы для дальнейшего изучения отличия клоуна как художественного образа (репрезентации) в произведении искусства.

Only animals are deep, and they are not the noblest for that; the noblest are the flat animals.
G. Deleuze. *The Logic of Sense*

The reason for the author to address the declared subject is the problem of misusing the term “clown”, which leads to either unjustified extension of its meaning, or narrowing it to minor, secondary details. As a result, today we vividly sense a lack of awareness of the root cause of this phenomenon and its cultural meaning.

Let us consider the ambivalent nature of the clown figure in science, art, and society. In everyday use, the word “clown” is employed in a variety of meanings: we say, “stop clowning”, “you are such a clown”, etc. In the acting context, however, the word “clown” can mean a compliment on one’s acting skill and talent [34, p. 6].

The image of a clown is shocking in its unpredictability, controversy, and infernality in the following literary works: *The Clown* by H. Böll, *It* by S. King, *Jac The Clown* by H. Bergman, *The True Story of Federico Rafinelli* by A. V. Soya, *City of Clowns* by D. Alarcon, *The Pilo Family Circus* by W. Elliott; and films: *Joker* directed by T. Phillips, *Terrifier* by D. Leone, *Killer Klowns from Outer Space* by S. Chiodo, *Payasos* by M. Vega, *ClownTown* by T. Nagel, *It* by A. Muschietti, *Clown* by J. Watts, *Gacy* by C. Saunders, and *In the Presence of a Clown* by I. Bergman [14, p. 249]. Conversely, in the films *The Clowns* and *La Strada* directed by F. Fellini, and in *The Circus* and *Limelight* directed by Ch. Chaplin, the clowns appeal to the viewer, excite sympathy and encapsulate the most human and humane (pain, dreams, solitude, love, aging, and death).

In autobiographical works, memoirs, and fiction, authors often impart lyrical and nostalgic overtone of their subjective experiences to the image of a clown (e.g. *My Autobiography* by Ch. Chaplin, *Alchemy of Snow* by V.I. Polunin and N.E. Tabachnikova, *Total Clownery* by I. Terentyeva, *The Invisible Clown — How to Not Be Afraid of Being Yourself* by M. Usov, *The Path of a Clown. The History of the Clown Therapy* by V. Olshansky, *Heart of Sawdust* by V.A. Kulakov, etc.).

In cultural and philosophical studies, a clown has many faces: he is considered the embodied anthropological constant of *Homo ludens*, a successor to the carnival jester and heir to the trickster, the spirit of

disorder, a troublemaker, a protohuman, a personified stage of death; a sign of an aristocratic acting vocation; an outsider peacemaker; an artist entertaining the audience with jokes, etc.

Before we proceed with a more detailed discussion of various interpretations of the clown phenomenon, we consider it important to address the origin of the very word “clown”.

The Russian circus historian S.M. Makarov highlights that “the first time a character called “a clown” appeared on stage of the English theatre in the 16th century. ... Clowns portrayed the common people, mostly servants or peasants, and always had the same masque” [11].

The Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy indicates the relation of the word “clown” to the Italian word “pagliaccio”, which bears two meanings: a frivolous person who laughs at their own statements or actions; and a circus performer who makes the audience laugh. It is believed that the first circus clowns impersonated village people.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica defines a clown as an actor who specializes in portraying comic characters.

As of Russian dictionaries, *V.I. Dal’s Explanatory Dictionary* does not define the word “клоун” (clown), but there is the word “шут” (jester) in one of the definitions of which, along with “потешник” (buffoon) and petrushka, “клоун” (clown) is mentioned.

Summarizing the definitions above, we can single out four main characteristic features of a clown. The first one is related to the definition of a clown as a person who, due to rudeness and rough manners, involuntarily becomes an object of ridicule. The second one refers to the actor’s skills and talent for playing comic characters on stage. The third one implies a clown’s tendency to laugh and ridicule others. And the fourth one, significant, yet not strongly pronounced, — a clown is a *Homo sapiens*, inclined to laugh at himself.

Let us bring the intermediate result in our studies. In various cultures, the figure of a clown is considered a relative and a successor to a trickster [27, p. 228], a jester, and a fool, each of them having their own area of influence (art, reality, ritual, etc.) and location (stage, myth, folklore, etc.). As a result, a clown finds himself in an intermediate position between a real person, an archetype, and mythical, folklore, or artistic images.

The evolutionary theories of humour provide a number of concepts and hypotheses that give valuable insights for the analysis of the humorous

nature of a clown. Thus, M. Hurley, D. Dennett, and R. Adams have put forward a hypothesis according to which humour encourages the process that keeps data integrity in our knowledge representation, which ensures a reduced likelihood of making faulty inferences and fatal mistakes [30, p. 28]. This hypothesis has significant shortcomings that include the distorted views of evolutionary dynamics. However, for the purpose of studying the semantics of a clown's red nose, there is a relevant comparison of humour with redness, which is a product of natural selection, evolved to interpret a certain type of information [30, p. 34]. In this case, redness becomes an indicator of a person's formed humour ability.

The key idea of C. Gruner's superiority theory is that modern humour has aggressive roots. "After defeating an opponent in violent combat, our ancestors were compelled to bare their teeth and pump their shoulders (as a dominance display) and separate their breath into small laughter-ish grunts" [30, p. 29]. Despite the fact that this theory has been criticized for failing to adequately explain the behavioural mechanisms of humour [30, p. 30], it explains the reasons for the popularity of the monster clown image in cinema and literature.

Nevertheless, what all the humour theories mentioned above leave open is the question of who a clown's humour is aimed at and what makes it universal and specific.

Of all evolutionary theories of humour, the one that appears most convincing in explaining a clown's laughter nature is A.G. Kozintsev's interdisciplinary theory of laughter and humour.

From the perspective of ethological research, A.G. Kozintsev analyses laughter as evolutionary heritage of *Homo sapiens* and believes that "one of the key features of the carnival, folk theatre, clownery, farce, and anti-behaviour in general is mock-aggression" [5, p. 125].

Decarnivalization, in turn, according to A.G. Kozintsev, is the reason for using laughter for purposes other than intended (demonstration of superiority, satire, ridicule, etc.).

A.G. Kozintsev is the first to refer to laughter and humour as the quintessence of laughter self-denial and a reflection of a human's descent to earlier stages of evolutionary development. He believes that "pulling

the tongue out (which, according to some sources, symbolizes spitting), grimaces, masques and disguising in general appear to be traced back to archaic forms of imitating animals or spirits of the dead but not to pre-cultural behaviour" [5]. In this case, a clown presents a nonserious metarelation of the subject to their attitude towards something or someone, in which the clown acts as a sign and signal of nonseriousness.

A.G. Kozintsev's thesis that humorous reflection is based not on the confrontation between the real and artistic worlds but on the temporary transfer of a *Homo sapiens* to "the third world of reference" and total voluntary playful detachment of the subject from his self [31, p. 191] in which "the object of a humorous metarelation is not reality but the feelings, thoughts and words of the subject about this reality" [8, p. 40] offers grounds to question whether a clown can be limited to the artistic image (representation) of a work of art.

Considering humour as the third world of reference, that is, *the impossible world, the one that is opposed to the real world* [6, p. 60] and is more about the artistic world [6, p. 61], the researcher develops Roman Jakobson's concept of the six functions of the language and defines the seventh one — the anti-referential, anti-linguistic function [6, p. 59–60].

Humour, according to Kozintsev, is an oppositely directed *double-voiced* discourse (the concept of M.M. Bakhtin) which is based on "unconscious imitation" [7, p. 156].

A.G. Kozintsev's theory of humour makes it possible to earnestly apply the idea of the philosopher G. Deleuze that "only animals are deep, and they are not the noblest for that; the noblest are the flat animals" [2, p. 21] to the figure of a clown as to a flat animal. Even though in the study of humour G. Deleuze does not rely on ethological data, his mode of reasoning closely coincides with A.G. Kozintsev's provisions on separation of serious play of order and nonserious play of disorder [13, p. 314]. In *The Logic of Sense*, G. Deleuze, in his own way, supports the anti-referential function of humour, believing that, despite the fact that in humour "on these surfaces the entire logic of sense is located" [2, p. 127], meaning there is just a superficial effect.

G. Deleuze approaches the idea of a person's humorous self-denial, discussing specific stupidity, which is "this relation in which individuation brings the ground to the surface without being able to give it form (this ground rises by means of the I, penetrating deeply into the possibility of thought and constituting the unrecognised in every recognition)" [2,

p. 190]. G. Deleuze's idea that any meaning allows an individual to infinitely regress, informing both about "the great impotence of the speaker and the highest power of language" [2, p. 44] is in consonance with A. G. Kozintsev's meta-semantic approach to humour.

Given all of the above, it does not come as unexpected that A. G. Kozintsev's theory has received much response in the scientific community not only in Russia but also abroad and has won both supporters and opponents. Thus, C. Molineux agrees with A. G. Kozintsev that when analysing tickling as a form of smiling and laughter, it is important to take into account interpersonal factors such as mood [30, p. 53].

C. Molineux takes A. G. Kozintsev's reasoning about subjectivity in humour conditionally [30, p. 34], proposing to introduce the concept of "humorous recall", based on personal experience of repetition and congruity; however, the idea that laughter is traced back to the pre-cultural past occupying a place on the interface between biology and culture [30, p. 40] is accepted by him without any reservation.

Analysing tickling, play, and humour as the categories of stimuli that elicit smiling and laughter, C. Molineux, echoing A. G. Kozintsev, emphasizes that the order the categories are listed indicates their hierarchical structure [30, p. 50], ascending along the line — act, speak, think. It is worth reminding that A. G. Kozintsev and M. L. Butovskaya earlier came to a conclusion that "in the course of history, anti-behaviour in its socially sanctioned form has taken on that miniature, safe and aestheticized shape, which we call humour" [9, p. 50]. This opinion is consonant with the position of P. McGhee regarding the idea that "smiling, laughter, and play must be ruled out as indices of humour in animals" [30, p. 40], since humour is an exclusively human privilege.

In the review of the extended English edition of *The Man and Laughter* (2007) published in 2010 under the title *The Mirror of Laughter* (translated by R. Martin), not only does J. Morreall, great humour theorist, acknowledge the evident novelty of A. G. Kozintsev's theory, but he also points out some of its fundamental shortcomings.

J. Morreall considers almost classical the theoretical grounds of A. G. Kozintsev's theory of laughter the basis of which is formed by ethological data on the play behaviour of primates. However, he cannot correlate A. G. Kozintsev's theory of humour with any other theory of humour of either past or present. The main revolutionary idea of A. G. Kozintsev, according to the reviewer, is his assumption that humour

is a variety of disorderly play [31, p. 191] in which the subject regresses to the mental level of a young child, a drunk or a mentally retarded person.

A. G. Kozintsev's idea which J. Morreall considers novel is that "humour is the subject's relation not to the object but to himself at another stage of development" [31, p. 191, 193], that "the emergence of humorous introspection and humorous metarelation does not mean a split of the personality into two opposing authorities but the appearance, in addition to an integrated and serious personality, of its virtual nonserious double." [8, p. 68].

However, it is this provision that J. Morreall regards as one of the shortcomings of A. G. Kozintsev's theory, arguing that if it is agreed that humour has no external stimuli, we will have to accept the fact that humour is "completely self-intensional, that is, it has no objects either in reality or in fantasy" [31, p. 194]. J. Morreall is convinced that recognizing humour as self-intensional, A. G. Kozintsev denies the phenomenon of ridicule, because the so-called "object of ridicule" evokes in laughter not a sense of superiority or *schadenfreude* but a blissful insensibility and thoughtlessness caused by liberation from seriousness, that is, by an imaginary psychological regression [31, p. 194].

Moreover, J. Morreall cannot not fully understand what new ideas Kozintsev has contributed to understanding of the Aristotelian definition of comedy, having started his book with the chapter *The Comical, or Imitation of Inferior People*. We should remind that A. G. Kozintsev highlighted that all aestheticians almost without reservation accepted Aristotle's definition of comedy as imitation of inferior people. The question the author asks is "Who imitates 'inferior people' and why do they do that? Is it only the comic artist — one whose face is covered up by a ridiculous mask or distorted by a grimace?" [8, p. 10]. After a series of probing questions, the author concludes that "Aristotle makes it clear that it is not comic actors who imitate 'inferior people', depicting them in caricatured form with the aim of ridiculing them, but the authors of comic texts and their listeners." [8, p. 11].

J. Morreall suggests that when Aristotle wrote that comedy is imitation of inferior people, he obviously meant actors imitating drunks, lechers, and other inferior types. A. G. Kozintsev, in J. Morreall's opinion, attempts interpreting this quote in the light of the quote from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* which he gives further in the text: "The buffoon is one who cannot resist a joke; he will not keep his tongue off himself or anyone else, if he can raise a laugh." [31, p. 195].

Meanwhile, the author of another review of *The Mirror of Laughter*, A. V. Kozin, considers A. G. Kozintsev's commentary on the quote by Aristotle the key to understanding the very essence of A. G. Kozintsev's concept of laughter. According to A. V. Kozin, Aristotle's quote given at the beginning of the book serves as a background against which the author convincingly proves his point [25, p. 121] regarding the impossibility of applying moral categories to laughter [25, p. 122].

Taking into consideration the theoretical provisions of the evolutionary theory of laughter and humour under study, we conducted a survey among 40 students of culture and arts universities and 20 street theatre actors. The questions in the survey were organized in such a way as to determine the respondents' attitude to the figure of a clown based on their answers.

When asked about the difference between carnival play and theatrical play, students of departments of stage management gave the following answers: "Carnival play is more independent in contrast to theatrical play when actors have to follow the script"; "What makes carnival different from theatre is openness and improvisation"; "Theatrical play implies separated stage and floor, actors and the audience, but carnival play does not"; "Carnival play is primarily a festival and only then a certain performance", etc.

Interestingly, students of culture and arts universities do not feel the difference between a clown as an actor's masque and as a fictional image generated by our humorous introspection.

In contrast to students, street theatre actors having professional education in acting and practical experience of performing as clowns and street artists associate clowning with a vocation, creative element, and recognition of their performance [34, p. 6].

When sharing their understanding of the clown figure, street theatre actors mentioned the following: a clown is a unique world, a universe; clowning is a conversation with others (the audience) in the language of mime, dance, symbols and images, about who we are and why, what we are like; it is something otherworldly and intimate. The most common idea expressed to the question about the meaning of a clown masque for a street theatre actor was that a masque is the only guide to the carnival world. Several actors responded that clowning is a kind of environment,

a parallel universe (which exists separately from ours) with its own rules and laws, including physical ones. Almost all the actors confirmed that, in a close circle, they have a nickname or a name-masque [34, p. 6].

While someone else's representation of a clown often embarrasses street theatre actors, their own interpretation of a clown masque, being innermost, is hidden from others. They frequently mention such concepts as character, masque, fool and clown. Apparently, the main peculiarity of street theatre actors' attitude to the figure of a clown is that they consider a clown both an image of someone's fantasy and a frivolous, playful, creative hypostasis of their own selves.

On the one hand, in the context of A. G. Kozintsev's theory of humour, one can see the inconsistency of approaches to clowning as the art of ridicule and satire. On the other hand, by means of the theory provisions, it is possible to test theories of clowning based on different theoretical grounds.

Let us consider the following example: analysing the art of clowning and comedy, G. Moder appeals to the philosophical provisions of G. Hegel, B. Spinoza, G. Deleuze, L. Althusser, J. Lacan, S. Žižek, R. Pfaller, M. M. Bakhtin and others. Addressing the creative work of the Russian clown V. I. Polunin, G. Moder identifies such techniques as a play of status, a dialogue of doubles, an imaginary identity, and a shift of identities.

By the example of "The Clown and the Coat" performance from *Slava's Snowshow* by Vyacheslav Polunin, G. Moder studies the clown's technique of a voluntary alienation of one part of the clown's self from another [29, p. 237]. He proves that in clowning we observe *split subjectivity* [29, p. 240] in which we are only authentic inasmuch as we can become what we pretend to be [29, p. 239]. This specific feature of V. I. Polunin's clowning G. Moder compares to ventriloquism in mime and the portrayal of jesters talking to a mirror. The researcher comes to the conclusion that the greatest comic effect is produced when it is not only other people who are confused about the identity of the person they are talking to, but when that person begins to question his or her own identity [29, p. 233].

Relying on the philosophical judgments of S. Žižek, L. Althusser, and R. Pfaller, G. Moder tries to defend the ontological status of frivolity of the acts of the Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army (CIRCA) [12, p. 100] in

the analysis of which, in his opinion, it is essential to take into consideration the effect it achieves in making the audience enjoy nonsense or non-ideological interpellation [12, p. 93]. Analysing the Clown Army in this vein, G. Moder draws attention to the fact that the actions of the actors of this group, who “are just copying the police formation ... do not threaten anyone, do not attempt any particular movement” [12, p. 100], give ground to considering such actions as non-ideological interpellation, which is the opposite of L. Althusser’s ideological interpellation.

We suppose that G. Moder is right when he claims that in the art of clowning a personality is split, does not coincide with one’s own self and that the essence of clowning consists in pretending. Nevertheless, in his arguments there is absolutely no concept of a voluntary incongruity of a person with his self, without which humorous introspection lacks specificity.

For all the compelling arguments given by the researcher in defence of the non-ideological interpellation of the Clown Army, they go against scientific data on humour, which has no objects from without, unlike the actions of rebel clowns in the style of clowning and humour.

However, V.I. Polunin’s clowning is mainly supported not by G. Moder’s arguments but by the provisions of A.G. Kozintsev’s theory, according to which “a clown is a clown, he represents no one, he does not and cannot have any concrete prototype in the real world. His only prototype is “man in general” — *Homo sapiens*” [8, p. 29].

Thus, A.G. Kozintsev’s interdisciplinary theory of laughter and humour reveals the problem of impossibility to interpret the figure of a clown within the context of traditional semantic and evolutionary theories of humour and challenges cultural and art research that limit a clown to a work of art or classical definitions of the comic.

The results of this research can be applied when studying the difference between a clown as an artistic image (representation) in a work of art and pure aesthetic enjoyment of the subject in humorous self-denial at the behavioural (laughter) level and psychological (humorous) levels⁽¹⁾.

(1) The author expresses deep appreciation to E.V. Dukov, A.G. Kozintsev, and G.R. Konson for reading the manuscript and making insightful comments.

References:

- 1 Akopjan YU.G. Stroenie smeshnogo [The Structure of the Funny]. *VI Kongress etnografov i antropologov Rossii, Sankt-Peterburg, 28 iunja – 2 iulja 2005 g.: Tezisy dokladov* [VI Congress of Ethnographers and Anthropologists of Russia, St. Petersburg, June 28 – July 2, 2005: Abstracts], ed. YU.K. Chistov, Associacija etnografov i antropologov Rossii, RAN, IEA, MAE im. Petra Velikogo (Kunstkamera). St. Petersburg, MAE RAN Publ., 2005. P. 82. (In Russian)
- 2 Deleuze G. *Logika smysla* [The Logic of Sense]. Moscow, Akademicheskij proekt Publ., 2011. 472 p. (In Russian)
- 3 Jean-Paul. *Prigotovitel'naja shkola estetiki* [Preparatory School of Aesthetics]. Moscow, Iskustvo Publ., 1981. 448 p. (In Russian)
- 4 Ivanov S. *Blazhennye pohaby* [Blessed Obscenities]. Available at: <https://mybook.ru/author/sergej-ivanov-11/blazhennye-pohaby-kulturnaya-istoriya-yurodstva/read/?page=2> (accessed 15.08.2022). (In Russian)
- 5 Kozintsev A.G. Karnavalizatsija i dekarnavalizatsija: na grani prirody i kul'tury [Carnivalization and Decarnivalization: On the Verge of Nature and Culture]. *Kunstkamera: Etnograficheskie tetradj*, 2003, issue 13, pp. 125–129. (In Russian)
- 6 Kozintsev A.G. Ob antireferentivnoj funkcii jazyka [On the Anti-Referential Function of Language]. *Logicheskij analiz jazyka: Mezhdu lozh'ju i fantaziej: Sbornik statej i ocherkov* [Logical Language Analysis: Between Lies and Fantasy: Collection of Articles and Essays], ed. N.D. Arutyunova. Moscow, Indrik Publ., 2008, pp. 55–66. (In Russian)
- 7 Kozintsev A.G. Raznonapravlennoe dvugolosoe slovo: estetika i semiotika jumora [Multidirectional Two-Voiced Word: Aesthetics and Semiotics of Humor]. *Antropologicheskij forum*, 2013, no. 18, pp. 143–162. (In Russian)
- 8 Kozintsev A.G. *Chelovek i smeh* [Man and Laughter]. St. Petersburg, Aleteja Publ., 2007. 236 p. (In Russian)
- 9 Kozintsev A.G., Butovskaya M.L. O proishozhdenii jumora [On the Origin of Humor]. *EO*, 1996, no. 1, pp. 49–53. (In Russian)
- 10 Litszyun G. “Chelovek, kotoryj smeetsja”: reprezentacija obraza v russkom jazyke [“The Man Who Laughs”: Representation of the Image in Russian]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. Serija “Russkaja filologija”*, 2019, no. 4, pp. 22–34. (In Russian)
- 11 Makarov S.M. Klouny i teatr Aristofana [Clowns and Theater of Aristophanes]. *Sovetskaja estrada i cirk*, 1974, no. 1. Available at: http://www.ruscircus.ru/klouny_i_teatr_aristofana_741 (accessed 15.08.2022). (In Russian)
- 12 Moder G. Chemu Al'tjusser mozhet nauchit' nas ob ulichnom teatre – i naoborot [What Althusser Can Teach Us About Street Theatre – And Vice Versa]. *Stasis*, 2014, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 92–104. (In Russian)
- 13 Semenova E.A. Vklad Zh. Deleza v razrabotku koncepta “jumor protiv ironii” [The Contribution of G. Deleuze to the Development of the Concept of “Humor Versus Irony”]. *Logiko-filosofskie shtudii*, 2022, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.52119/LPHS.2022.60.67>. (In Russian)
- 14 Semenova E.A. Kul'turotvorcheskij potencial iskusstva klounady v formirovanii pedagogicheskikh kompetencij epohi massmedia [Cultural-Creative Potential of the Art of Clowning in the Formation of Pedagogical Competencies in the Era of Mass Media]. *Yaroslavskij pedagogicheskij vestnik*, 2021, vol. 5, no. 122, pp. 247–254. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20323/1813-145X-2021-5-122-247-254> (accessed 12.10.2022). (In Russian)

- 15 Uvarova I.P. *Povest' ob odnom domike* [The Story of One House]. Moscow, GTSTM im. A.A. Bahrushina Publ., 2018. 335 p. (In Russian)
- 16 Frejdenberg O.M. *Poetika sjuzheta i zhanra* [Poetics of Plot and Genre], text preparation, reference and scientific apparatus, preface, afterword N.V. Braginskaya. Moscow, Labirint Publ., 1997. 448 p. (In Russian)
- 17 Astington J.H. Richard Preiss. *Clowning and Authorship in Early Modern Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 287 p. *Early Theatre*, 2016, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 154–157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12745/et.19.1.2900>.
- 18 Bársony M. *Shakespeare's Clown. The Decarnivalization of the World in Three of His Dramas*. Doctoral Dissertation. Budapest, 2016.
- 19 Blanché B. Richard Weihe (Hg.): *Über den Clown: Künstlerische und theoretische Perspektiven*. Bielefeld: transcript 2016 (Edition Kulturwissenschaft, Bd.77). 284 p. *MEDIENwissenschaft*, 2017, no. 2, pp. 232–233.
- 20 Bruhn M.M., Cruz L.R., Boscolo K.O., Barboza R.P. Psychology, Clowning and Psychodrama: Collective Construction for Learning and Intervention Purposes. *Rev. Bras. Psicodrama*, São Paulo, 2019, v. 27, no. 1, pp. 60–69.
- 21 Buissac P. *The Semiotics of Clowns and Clowning: Rituals of Transgression and the Theory of Laughter*. London and New York, Bloomsbury, 2015. 218 p.
- 22 Caballero Vega J.A. *Los dramas del clown un acercamiento teórico a la dramaturgia del clown*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México Ciudad Universitaria, Alcaldía Coyoacán, Ciudad de México, 2020. 183 p.
- 23 Hornback R.B. The Fool in Quarto and Folio King Lear. *English Literary Renaissance*, 2004, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 306–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0013-8312.2004.00046.x>.
- 24 Jürgens A.-S. *Violent Clown Artists Between Science & Art*. Available at: <https://www3.hhu.de/wuk/en> (accessed 01.08.2022).
- 25 Kozin A. The Mirror of Laughter. *Russian Journal of Communication*, 2011, vol. 4, no. 1–2, pp. 120–124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19409419.2011.10756794>.
- 26 Lipovetsky M. *Charms of the Cynical Reason: The Trickster's Transformations in Soviet and Post-Soviet Culture*. Boston, Academic Studies Press, 2011. 301 p.
- 27 McConville D. The Trickster and Transdisciplinarity. Tercera entrega de la trilogía del juego [Third Part of the Gaming Trilogy]. *Homo Ludens Ludens / Playware / Gameworld Optical Nervous System*, 2004, pp. 228–230.
- 28 Meiri N., Schnapp Z., Ankri Itay A., Nahmias I., Raviv A., Sagi O., Hamad Saied M., Konopnicki M., Pillar G. Fear of Clowns in Hospitalized Children: Prospective Experience. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 2017, vol. 176, no. 2, pp. 269–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00431-016-2826-3>.
- 29 Moder G. Comedy as Performance. *The Object of Comedy. Performance Philosophy*, ed. J. Mascot, G. Moder. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2019, pp. 231–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27742-0_13.
- 30 Molineux C. *The Role of Humour in the Evolution of Hominid Cognition and the Emergence of Language*. A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Department of Social and Political Sciences, Brunel University London, March, 2019. 300 p.
- 31 Morreal J. Alexander Kosintsev. The Mirror of Laughter. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction, 2010. 220 pp. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 2013, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 191–196.
- 32 Pascale S. *Tracking the Trickster: Critical Comparison of Ancient Greek, African, and African American Trickster Figures and Myths*. 2018. Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wushta_spr2018/121 (accessed 28.07.2022).
- 33 Sampietro A. Review on Buissac P. The Semiotics of Clowns and Clowning: Rituals of Transgression and the Theory of Laughter. London and New York, Bloomsbury, 2015. *SOLS*, 2016, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 495–498. <https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v10i3.30707>.
- 34 Semenova E.A. A Clown's Laughter Specificity: From "Anesthesia of Heart" to "Synesthesia of Love". *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, July – September, 2019, vol. 11, no. 2. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v11n2.20>.
- 35 Tsakona V. Book review. Bouissac, Paul (2015). The Semiotics of Clowns and Clowning: Rituals of Transgression and the Theory of Laughter. Bloomsbury Advances in Semiotics. London: Bloomsbury, 218 p. *European Journal of Humour Research*, 2016, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 122–125.
- 36 Vagnoli L., Brauer K., Addarii F., Ruch W., Marangi V. Fear of Being Laughed at in Italian Healthcare Workers: Testing Associations with Humor Styles and Coping Humor. *Current Psychology*, 2022, April 9, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03043-9>.
- 37 Weihe R. Das (Un-)Behagen am Clown. EINLEITUNG. *Über den Clown: Künstlerische und theoretische Perspektiven*, hrsg. von R. Weihe. Bielefeld, transcript, 2016 (Edition Kulturwissenschaft, Bd. 77), pp. 7–21.

Список литературы:

- 1 Акопян Ю.Г. Строение смешного // VI Конгресс этнографов и антропологов России, Санкт-Петербург, 28 июня – 2 июля 2005 г.: Тезисы докладов / Отв. ред. Ю.К. Чистов; Ассоциация этнографов и антропологов России, РАН, ИЭА, МАЭ им. Петра Великого (Кунсткамера). СПб.: МАЭ РАН, 2005. С. 82.
- 2 Делёз Ж. Логика смысла. М.: Академический проект, 2011. 472 с.
- 3 Жан-Поль. Приготовительная школа эстетики. М.: Искусство, 1981. 448 с.
- 4 Иванов С. Блаженные похабы. URL: <https://mybook.ru/author/sergej-ivanov-11/blazhennyye-rohaby-kulturnaya-istoriya-yurodstva/read/?page=2> (дата обращения 15.08.2022).
- 5 Козинцев А.Г. Карнавализация и декарнавализация: на грани природы и культуры // Кунсткамера: этнографические тетради. Вып. 13. 2003. С. 125–129.
- 6 Козинцев А.Г. Об антиреферентивной функции языка // Логический анализ языка: Между ложью и фантазией: [Сборник статей и очерков] / Отв. ред. Н.Д. Арутюнова. М.: Индрик 2008. С. 55–66.
- 7 Козинцев А.Г. Разнонаправленное двуголосое слово: эстетика и семиотика юмора // Антропологический форум. 2013. № 18. С. 143–162.
- 8 Козинцев А.Г. Человек и смех. СПб.: Алетейя, 2007. 236 с.
- 9 Козинцев А.Г., Бутовская М.Л. О происхождении юмора // ЭО. 1996. № 1. С. 49–53.
- 10 Лицзюнь Г. «Человек, который смеется»: репрезентация образа в русском языке // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия «Русская филология». 2019. № 4. С. 22–34.
- 11 Макаров С.М. Клоуны и театр Аристофана // Советская эстрада и цирк. 1974. № 1. URL: http://www.ruscircus.ru/klouny_i_teatr_aristofana_741 (дата обращения 15.08.2022).
- 12 Модер Г. Чему Альтоссер может научить нас об уличном театре – и наоборот // Stasis. 2014. Т. 2. № 1. С. 92–104.
- 13 Семенова Е.А. Вклад Ж. Делёза в разработку концепта «юмор против иронии» // Логико-философские штудии. 2022. Т. 20. № 3. С. 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.52119/LPHS.2022.60.67>.
- 14 Семенова Е.А. Культуротворческий потенциал искусства клоунады в формировании педагогических компетенций эпохи массмедиа // Ярославский педагогический вестник. 2021. № 5 (122). С. 247–254. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20323/1813-145X-2021-5-122-247-254> (дата обращения 12.10.2022).
- 15 Уварова И.П. Повесть об одном домике. М.: ГЦТМ им. А.А. Бахрушина, 2018. 335 с.
- 16 Фрейденберг О.М. Поэтика сюжета и жанра / Подготовка текста, справочно-научный аппарат, предварение, послесловие Н.В. Брагинской. М.: Лабиринт, 1997. 448 с.
- 17 Astington J.H. Richard Preiss. Clowning and Authorship in Early Modern Theatre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 287 p. // Early Theatre. 2016. Vol. 19. № 1. P. 154–157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12745/et.19.1.2900>.
- 18 Bársony M. Shakespeare's Clown. The Decarnivalization of the World in Three of His Dramas. Doctoral Dissertation. Budapest, 2016.
- 19 Blanché B. Richard Weihe (Hg.). Über den Clown. Künstlerische und theoretische Perspektiven. Bielefeld: transcript, 2016 (Edition Kulturwissenschaft, Bd. 77). 284 p. // MEDIENwissenschaft. 2017. № 2. S. 232–233.
- 20 Bruhn M.M., Cruz L.R., Boscolo K.O., Barboza R.P. Psychology, Clowning and Psychodrama: Collective Construction for Learning and Intervention Purposes // Rev. Bras. Psicodrama, São Paulo. 2019. V. 27. № 1. P. 60–69.
- 21 Buissac P. The Semiotics of Clowns and Clowning: Rituals of Transgression and the Theory of Laughter. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015. 218 p.
- 22 Caballero Vega J.A. Los dramas del clown un acercamiento teórico a la dramaturgia del clown. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México Ciudad Universitaria, Alcaldía Coyoacán, Ciudad de México, 2020. 183 p.
- 23 Hornback R.B. The Fool in Quarto and Folio King Lear // English Literary Renaissance. 2004. Vol. 34. № 3. P. 306–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0013-8312.2004.00046.x>.
- 24 Jürgens A.-S. Violent Clown Artists Between Science & Art. URL: <https://www3.hhu.de/wuk/en> (accessed 01.08.2022).
- 25 Kozin A. The Mirror of Laughter // Russian Journal of Communication. 2011. Vol. 4. № 1–2. P. 120–124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19409419.2011.10756794>.
- 26 Lipovetsky M. Charms of the Cynical Reason: The Trickster's Transformations in Soviet and Post-Soviet Culture. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011. 301 p.
- 27 McConville D. The Trickster and Transdisciplinarity. Tercera entrega de la trilogía del juego [Third Part of the Gaming Trilogy] // Homo Ludens Ludens / Playware / Gameworld Optical Nervous System, 2004. P. 228–230.
- 28 Meiri N., Schnapp Z., Ankri Itay A., Nahmias I., Raviv A., Sagi O., Hamad Saied M., Konopnicki M., Pillar G. Fear of Clowns in Hospitalized Children: Prospective Experience // European Journal of Pediatrics. 2017. Vol. 176. № 2. P. 269–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00431-016-2826-3>.
- 29 Moder G. Comedy as Performance // The Object of Comedy. Performance Philosophy / Ed. by J. Mascat, G. Moder. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2019. P. 231–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27742-0_13.
- 30 Molineux C. The Role of Humour in the Evolution of Hominid Cognition and the Emergence of Language. A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Department of Social and Political Sciences, Brunel University London, March, 2019. 300 p.
- 31 Morreal J. Alexander Kosintsev. The Mirror of Laughter. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction, 2010. 220 pp. // Humor: International Journal of Humor Research. 2013. Vol. 26. № 1. P. 191–196.
- 32 Pascale S. Tracking the Trickster: Critical Comparison of Ancient Greek, African, and African American Trickster Figures and Myths. 2018. URL: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wushta_spr2018/121 (accessed 28.07.2022).
- 33 Sampietro A. Review on Buissac P. The Semiotics of Clowns and Clowning: Rituals of Transgression and the Theory of Laughter. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015 // SOLS. 2016. Vol. 10. № 3. P. 495–498. <https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v10i3.30707>.
- 34 Semenova E.A. A Clown's Laughter Specificity: From "Anesthesia of Heart" to "Synesthesia of Love" // Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities. July – September, 2019. Vol. 11. № 2. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v11n2.20>.
- 35 Tsakona V. Book Review. Bouissac, Paul (2015). The Semiotics of Clowns and Clowning: Rituals of Transgression and the Theory of Laughter. Bloomsbury Advances in Semiotics. London: Bloomsbury, 218 p. // European Journal of Humour Research. 2016. Vol. 4. № 1. P. 122–125.
- 36 Vagnoli L., Brauer K., Addarii F., Ruch W., Marangi V. Fear of Being Laughed at in Italian Healthcare Workers: Testing Associations with Humor Styles and Coping Humor // Current Psychology. 2022. April 9; 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03043-9>.
- 37 Weihe R. Das (Un-)Behagen am Clown. EINLEITUNG // Über den Clown: Künstlerische und theoretische Perspektiven / Hrsg. von R. Weihe. Bielefeld: transcript, 2016 (Edition Kulturwissenschaft, Bd. 77). S. 7–21.