

## 美容する男性性：メンズ美容から見る霸権的男性性の〈存在と不在のあいだ〉論文要旨 和田千寛

本論文では、メンズ美容が現在の日本でどのように語られ、男性性概念とどのように関係しているのかをメンズコスメ会社二社の代表へのインタビューを軸として分析している。インタビュー結果からは、メンズ美容とはその製品や材料の特異性ではなく、それと関連する何らかの「力への志向」が語られることで男性向けの美容として成立することが明らかになった。一社では、メンズ美容の効果として仕事と異性愛的恋愛の充実が語られた。もう一社では、メンズ美容とは「カルチャー」（文化）であると語られ、その普及は「文化的発展」であると語られた。前者は実用的な、後者は抽象的な効果を語る点で異なるが、二社とも社会における経済資本と象徴資本をメンズ美容そのもの、もしくはその効果として志向する点が共通であった。総じて、メンズ美容の語りには、社会における男性の優位に関連するような「力への志向」が見られた。

本論文の後半では、美容という概念を〈痛み・イタミ〉として定義し、メンズ美容の語りから男性性について考察をしている。美容を〈痛み・イタミ〉と考えると、その結果として生じる「美しさ」を楽しむためには自分や相手の〈痛み・イタミ〉を忘れることが必要になる。しかし、人間は他人の〈痛み・イタミ〉を自分のものとして感じる可能性をもっており、その刺激を避けることができないと考える。他者の他者性を尊重した上での刺激の共有では、「あなた」の〈痛み・イタミ〉はまさに「あなた」のそれとして理解される。一方で、他者の尊重が欠けた上での共有ではその刺激は自分の輪郭を存在させるものとしてのみ受容され、「あなた」は忘れ去られる。男性の美容は基本的に共有が許されていない存在であり、それは男性性が「自然」な「力」との結びつきに基盤を置く概念であることに関連する。〈痛み・イタミ〉の共有が許されない男性性は、「私」の輪郭を感じさせるものとしてのみ刺激を受容し、同時に「あなた」を放棄する。男性性は常に全ての認識の枠組みと結びつく可能性を保持し、したがってその時間による「内容」の「変化」は男性性の変化というよりも可能性が露見したことにすぎない。全ての可能性から「男性性」とし

て成立するには、「あれではない、これではない」と可能性との間に類似を拒否し続ける動的な動きが必要であり、その動きこそが男性性である。男性性はその他のものとの線引きをすることそのものであると指摘でき、したがってその「内容」が時間的に「変化」という説明よりも、「どこに、いつ、どのように」境界線を引くのかという説明こそが適切であり重要である。

**Beautifying Masculinity: Men's Beauty Industry and (Non-) Existence of  
Hegemonic Masculinity (Abstract)**  
**Chihiro WADA**

In this essay I analyze the ways in which the beautification of men is narrated and relates to masculinity in contemporary Japanese society. As evidence from interviews with the directors of two men's beauty product companies in Japan suggests, men's beautification is not constructed by the products' uniqueness or their components, but by narratives with an "intention to authority" (social authority). At one company, the director discussed success at work and heterosexual love as results of men's beautification. At another company, the director explained men's beautification in terms of the spread of culture, or a cultural phenomenon. Whereas the former narrative exhibits the practical effects of men's beautification, the latter shows its abstract aspects. Both narratives of men's beautification in Japan, however, involve the idea of social authority, whether achieved through success at work and heterosexual love, or as part of a larger cultural phenomenon.

Drawing from the concept of *itami* in Japanese (both in Kanji and Katakana), I define *beautification* as both pain and pathos. Pain indicates the stimulation of the body involved in beautification by, for example, applying facial lotion to the skin or massaging one's legs. Pain is an inevitable part of beautification because any beautification practice constitutes movement towards the surface or the inside of the body, which in turn involves a physical reaction. In addition, beautification is a pathetic experience because enjoyment is one of its fundamental aspects. In order to enjoy others' beauty people need both pathos and forgetting the pain of others. Yet, it is nearly impossible to enjoy beauty and feel other's pain and pathos at the same time. This dynamic does not mean that people cannot feel others' pain and pathos, rather because people inevitably share or accept others' pain and pathos they need to forget them as well. If sharing pain and pathos is inevitable, then people cannot escape from being

hurt by others' beautification; however, such sharing does not mean forgetting the otherness of others by feeling that one's pain and pathos is also another's pain and pathos. Instead, the otherness of others is forgotten when people refuse to share their pain and pathos with others. If feeling another's pain and pathos is inevitable, then rejecting the process of sharing means forgetting the other's pain and pathos and feeling only one's own pain and pathos.

Whether practiced by men or women, beautification is characterized by a relationship with social authority. Although women's beautification also involves an intention to authority, their beautification is perceived to be excessive and readily visible when society fails—as it often does—to legitimize women's relationship with authority, which is assumed to relate specifically to men's bodies or masculinity. Consequently, women's beautification intends to be readily visible, and feminine subjects are therefore allowed to share the pain and pathos of others, which does not threaten their femininity because it lacks the presumed connection to authority that masculinity possesses. At the same time, as long as the relationship between masculinity and authority is perceived to be natural and invisible, masculine subjects may not share the pain and pathos of others. Beautification—as a process of constructing authority—has to be concealed, and consequently, masculine subjects are not allowed to share the pain and pathos of others but are required to consign them into oblivion. Therefore, masculine subjects are allowed to only feel their personal pain by rejecting the process of sharing beautification. Refusing to accept others' pain and pathos is to confirm one's personal outline in light of the irritation caused by others' pain and pathos. In sum, masculine subjects need to refuse to share their pathos and pain with others in order to validate their masculinity.

These arguments suggest that masculinity is the ceaseless repetition of its demarcation in contrast to other modes of gender. To confirm the boundaries of masculinity, masculine subjects need others, whom or which can be anyone or anything because their content does not construct the beautification of men. Significantly, masculinity can therefore be anything as long as society recognizes

it as masculinity. Elements not recognized as constructing masculinity and the culturally unrecognized or unthinkable are always embedded in masculinity as possibilities. The culturally unthinkable is not excluded from culture, but it exists as unthinkable or unacceptable in particular cultural situations. Consequently, all components of a culture can be recognized as masculinity at any time because masculinity retains its possibility to contain them. Masculinity ceaselessly distinguishes its subjects from others in pursuit of defining what it means to be a man, and is thus a continuous repetition of the declaration "I am not you." In this sense, masculinity can be identified and defined by its exclusivity.