Discussion

Lara Kriegel: Now I guess you guys are allowed by the rules of the game to respond. [laughter] We're all novices up here.

Kathryn Gleadle: Well thanks so much Lara for those thoughtful and provocative comments, I've noted down a few things that struck me; I'm sure I will come back to your comments again… First of all, the question of the particular versus the universal: I am more of a nineteenth century-ist too and it's something that has been reverberating in my mind, as well, as I think about these issues. Some of you may know Graham Dawson on imagining masculinity to the end of the nineteenth century and he looks at the ways in which young boys might have identified with military heroes and tried to enact playful military play themselves and tried to enact that kind of masculine identity.[1] I think what is so different in the cases I look at is that critical to Dawson's argument is a sense of boys' distance from war: these imagined colonial spaces kind of free them up, makes it a safe game to play. Whereas I think what I wanted to convey in my paper is that there's such a dangerous edge for these little lads, because for so many of them they are actually going to become part of that war machine themselves.

One similarity perhaps that I haven't yet been able to probe in the archives is to what extent some of these activities may have been adult directed, which would be a little bit closer to the kind of Boy Scout stuff you were talking about. There is tantalizing little glimpses sometimes to formal juvenile regiments in the press, which would obviously take some archival unpicking. So the picture that I have presented here, which is obviously one focusing on juvenile agency, may become more blurred still if you start to factor in the adult contribution of organizing some of these kinds of affairs.

When you were also asking, Lara, about to what extent is this a universal kind of mechanism—[to O'Quinn] which I guess also comes up a little bit in your paper—the kind of psychology that's going on here… I think what I was trying to get across is that there may well be universal psychological needs. I don't think it's particularly … think it's my job to probe that. What I wanted to think about was the way in which they can be differently enacted according to cultural contexts and can be very fluid in terms of juvenile development. I mean, one of the reasons it was so nice to have your paper alongside mine was to enable me to think about some of the multiple ways in which these children are encountering martial qualities, which I hadn't thought of before. Then it got me to thinking about some of the other examples which I hadn't included. Some of you may know Mary Ann SchimmelPenninck's autobiography[2] and she talks in great detail about how when she was a little girl (which would have been late 1780s-early 1790s), she used to build battering rams, she used to build fortresses, and so on. For her, this was based upon her reading of Roland, and obviously through the ancient world, that lesson of what goes on in Roman and Greek warfare. So this is also a cultural specificity in terms of what cultural resources people are drawing upon to construct their kind of imaginings of warfare. They could be very diverse, I think.

---

[1] [Editor's Note] Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (London: Routledge, 1994).

[2] [Editor's Note] *Life of Mary Anne SchimmelPenninck*, edited by her relation, Christiana C. Hankin, second ed. (London: Longman, Brown, et.al., 1858).

Is play stripped of fun? Well… Yes… [laughter] I suppose this made me think a little bit more along the lines of performance studies, which I know you mentioned in your paper. I'm very much a novice in this field: as Lara said my specialty is in women and politics. But the kind of homework I've done so far in relation to children's play is quite an interesting literature on performance studies and children's play, which is trying to probe how do we get at 'what is playing?' And ethnographers often say 'well you know it when you see it'—you know, it's what you sense *as* playing. And that sense of 'When is something playful?' is often non-representational, it can be that kind of *frisson* that goes around a room that can be very hard for historians to recapture. It's that shared look that can be completely leveled out by discourse and text, which I think is a challenge for us to recapture—the kind of actual experience of play because we're missing all those codes.

I suppose in terms of the work that I've been doing, we could see it on a spectrum. So on one end of the spectrum is the kind of play where we've got little boys parading on the village green, where it's shading much more into adult activity, where they're actually pretending to be adults, they're *acting* as adults. On the other end of the spectrum is private play, which may still be very infused with the exigencies of war and the culture by which they're surrounded, but which might have much more of the playful about it.

I came across a nice description recently of 'thick play'; I don't know if this is a term people are familiar with. When I first read that phrase I was trying to think what could 'thick play' mean, and then I remembered, and I'm sure you will all have similar examples from your childhood or from your family… [Editor's note: the speaker has asked that the anecdote she told at this point about her own children not be published, despite its completely innocent and charming nature.] I think that is thick play: where there is accumulation of localized meanings that two or more individuals have constructed together, and the codes are so subtle and built on such close communication that they are almost impenetrable to an outsider. So I think there is very much a spectrum of play, and I suspect the example with which I started, the fictionalized or semi-fictionalized account from Mary Lisle's autobiography[3] where children are in their own play space, is much more fun, is much more playful; so I think the spatial element of where this play takes place is probably quite critical.

I've got a lot of other things jotted down but I will hand it over to you, Danny.

Daniel O'Quinn: Thank you [to Lara Kriegel] as well, really helpful remarks to start things going. I think I need to say a couple of things about where this paper comes from, in order to speak back. It started as an experiment: to take some of the methodological moves of performance studies into what I see as sort of everyday entertainment practices. The eighteenth century is full of these kind of entertainments that then become highly mediated and remediated in the press and on the stage. My most recent book is very much about that convergence of media in the entertainment industry of the late eighteenth century. But this paper on boxing actually anticipated that work because I had built this huge boxing archive because I knew that there was this body of material out there from this subculture that had its own language, its own lingo, and this massive publishing machine attached to it because of the Boxing Annals series, this massive visual archive. But in some sense the archive was so terrific that I had to put it aside, like it was just too… Great.[laughter]

---

[3] [Editor's Note] Mary Lisle, *"Long, Long Ago": An Autobiography* (London: J. and C. Mozley, 1856).

But this one piece did come from it because I wanted to get into the very temporal games that went into this, into these particular fights: the way in which a space was marked, fights always involve the marking off of space, which picks up nicely on Huizinga's remarks about there being a space of play; the elaborate rituals by which the spaces for fighting are established was extremely important to Egan's representations of the fights; and that would seem to be the most obvious place to go when talking about them. What struck me as so interesting is that almost all of these kinds of events have interesting and complicated little temporal folds in them and it's the temporality that I eventually found most interesting. And it is intriguing, and I don't have a full thesis about this, that the most famous fights in British boxing history tend to occur at moments of social crisis. So, for instance, the really important fights between Mendoza and Bill Humphries: one happens in 1788 and then the rematch happens in 1790 and they are fully understood in relation to events in France. So the question of Mendoza's Jewishness and what it means for Humphries, the Englishman, to lose to him then gets thought through in relation to what it means to be English at this moment. Similarly here we have the complication of Molineaux's multiple identifications—or, the number of identifications that are *put onto* Molineaux—and the way that plays out historically.

But maybe the best way for me to respond to what Lara said is to just maybe think about or speculate about what it means to bet on Molineaux. Molineaux is clearly of great interest to the fans. Like… I think one model of patriotic discourse would imagine that everyone is betting on Cribb and I think it's far too simple to say that the people who are betting on Molineaux are simply trying to make money. That's obviously part of the game too, but Molineaux is extremely attractive in lots of interesting ways. When the fighters strip in the second fight, there is a lot of interest in what Molineaux's body looks like: it's where the homoerotics of the fight is most explicitly articulated. There's something about his sociability which is extremely interesting … there is a certain disgust contained in Egan. I do that piece on *Timon of Athens* that I think is really quite amazing: that *Timon* is the play that's used to clarify what is going on. So it seems to me, that maybe sitting and thinking about what it means to be in that space in that moment, changing your bets as the fight unfolds: to suddenly shift from Cribb to Molineaux in fight one and to wager for Molineaux in fight two—that's a significant part of the audience population and I'm very interested in what they're thinking about and feeling. Maybe I'll just end it there.

Kriegel: Thank you both. Should we open it up … Oscar, please.

Oscar Kenshur: I want to ask a question of Daniel which is a request for some elaboration on one of the dichotomies that's operating in your very interesting article. The racial one, the national one: I suppose those are fairly predictable. What I found more interesting and more intriguing was the *class* one: the relationship between Cribb and the… What's it called?

O'Quinn: The Fancy.

Kenshur: The Fancy. Especially in light of some later papers such as when we talk about the end of an aristocratic warrior class, it sounds as if there is something going on there that involves the shift to a new kind of champion. But you don't really sort of *dwell* on that and I was wondering if you could say more about that.

O'Quinn: Absolutely. I'm not sure if I don't *dwell* on it. The Fancy is a very interesting social formation, right? As some of the quotations indicate, right, it's fully antinomian. It has this incredible breadth of entry and sociability: there are some of the most elite men in the kingdom, there are women, there are plowshares, and there are working-class men. And we know that from both the newspaper reporting, from Egan, and also from the images that are presented as well that there seems to be a fairly consistent mediation of that diversity within the Fancy itself.

Now…but that said, Egan, when we get into the *Boxiana* series, is always parsing the Fancy, right? So he'll separate the Corinthian… Like if you've ever read *Life in London*, there's an opening play that has a Corinthian column and the details on the top of the Corinthian column show elements of the West End and certain kinds of 'flash' sensibility, and are distinguished from what we would have to describe as something… Well how would we describe it? Something more middling? Like Cribb is a coal *merchant*, right, so he's not a collier, but he has a kind of middle class… The stylization of his masculinization is middling in order. So there is a narrative there about the displacement of a certain kind of aristocratic unreliability and something like an investment, if you want to put it that way, in Cribb's trustworthiness. But again, even as I say that, I have to go into the language of investment, gaming, credit, debit, all those things that define the very discourse that these things are described through, right? So yes, class runs right through the entire archive, but I don't think it's determinate. It runs contrary. So what happens, like, why are the Corinthian men, the 'flash' members of the Fancy, endorsing Molineaux? I mean, that seems to be one of the things Egan is suggesting. That seems quite interesting to me, right, but I don't think I have a full answer for that yet.

Kriegel: Jonathan has a small…

Jonathan Elmer: I just have a quick follow up, just to follow through a little bit on Oz's comment. I think of the description of Cribb going through his serious *training* regime towards the end of your paper in preparation for the second fight, in contrast to Molineaux just fighting and fighting, as echoing a little bit of what Sir Julian Russell talks about happening with the professionalization of the army. Opening it up to the middling ranks: it becomes a new form of discipline promising (promising, often not delivering) a certain kind of advancement, class advancement through that. But as you say, it is a new model of a way to achieve martial valor that is no longer aristocratic, but has many of the previous features: it has this sense of discipline, and separation, and seriousness of purpose about it ….that Cribb echoes.

O'Quinn: I think that's one of the key issues. The fact that Cribb is related to a kind of meritocracy is important…

Elmer: Right.

O'Quinn: …And one of the key issues when the crowd makes the incursion on the fight in the first fight. Because one of the things that that does, it's almost like Cribb… That undermines, that undercuts his claim to merit, right? and that generates like a crisis that then needs to be dealt with.

Kriegel: Oh, okay. Small thing here [gesturing at Gleadle] and then we have Cornelis.

Gleadle: I'm just wondering, is cutting across that a particular formation of masculine identity at the moment? I'm reading that thing by… Is it Downing? who argues that boxing at this period as a construction of this new kind of gentlemanly manliness around which both genteel aristocratic politeness can cohere with other social classes to produce this different discourse of masculinity. So that would cut across some of what we think about as emergent middle-class manliness in this period.

O'Quinn: Well my only hesitation about Downing is that there is as much variousness in ethnicity in the great boxers that are discussed as there is in masculinities. And I think there's different styles of masculinity exhibited amongst these boxers. So that Mendoza, for instance, he writes a really important autobiography. His memoir articulates a very different *style* of masculine behavior than that of The Chicken, or Ned Butcher, or Belcher, or Cribb. They all adopt a *different* persona, different types of masculinity, for different strategic ends. So that seems to me critically important for the archive.

Cornelis van der Haven: I was wondering if you take the definition of Huizinga as your point of departure for determining if boxing in this narrative is presented as a play. Could you say that actually the idea of play as boxing is attacked from two sides: considering more and more the two boxers as being separated, unequal whereas Huizinga says there should always be two equalized parties bound to equal rules? Whereas this narrative is more and more racial, a racial narrative splits the two up. And from the other side, if we see play always as a kind of otherness, as something different from the real world, then if we take the audience more and more described as being equal, as having the same rigidness as Cribb… You can say the difference between the audience, the Fancy, and the player is fading away.

O'Quinn: I'm so glad someone picked up on… For me the central issue in this paper has to do with: we have this moment when the boxers become equal *because* of their loss of face. And when that happens the space of play is then ruptured, right? So that the crowd then says play can no longer continue. And there's the thirty minute, you know, eruption of violence where the crowd inserts itself and it's almost as though the temporal zone of play is suspended until it then restarts. Everything in the narrative then unfolds from that interruption; it's as though the crowd cannot allow a kind of *equal* play to unfold, right. That seems to me… why it's called "In the Face of Difference".

Kriegel: Rob.

Robert Schneider: Well that just brings up an interesting point, which might go beyond the concept of these papers and we might want to explore later, and I think it was invoked by Kathryn somewhat (or at least I thought it was). That is the idea of play being implicit and of the context, or the rules, or the very existence of play being something that we don't necessarily call attention to, but it is somehow code. It is sort of understood that you don't necessarily say "we're going to play now" (of course people do), but you enter into a room or into a context and you know it's play. And if you don't know it's play, and yet it is play, then clearly something separates you and the players and you sort of don't get the code, which is more of an anthropological question. But all of us know families… You can enter into a family and something's going on, you realize sort of it's a joke; it's a play and you aren't in on it. So there are obviously microcul-

tures and microcontexts where this is the case. But yours is the flipside of this where the play, that the implicit understanding is no longer allowed to endure. There was something too charged about it; it risked exploding beyond its acceptable boundaries where whatever was at stake was: it was too much. And Kathryn too, the idea of 'thick play' and the idea of textures of play, the boundaries of play is really quite fascinating. The thing that always comes to mind in terms of how this can happen historically… For me, it takes me back to Le Roy Ladurie's *Carnival en Romans* where there's a kind of period where carnival, which is quintessentially play, there's a kind of… What is assumed to be playful, that is, threats, and very serious threats—the *frisson* of the play is that it's serious—but the play is mistaken for real threats. Of course, there is religious and class conflict which interrupts the understanding that this is play, but I mean the frame that is never supposed to be called into question is then called into question and no longer can contain the play. I think this is something that is an aspect of all of the discussion, it seems to me.

Gleadle: One of the anthropologists I found very helpful when thinking about this paper, her study was based on fieldwork with a group of peoples in the Solomon Islands. And she found that she kept reading it wrong: what was play and what wasn't play. In particular what they found very hard to distinguish between, in this society children as young as three were expected to be economically productive and active. There is such a subtle difference between children *acting* as adults, because when they were engaged in that kind of work they assumed the kind of habitus of adults, and children in other moments *pretending* to be adults. And it was very important for communities that there was that distinction, but it was very hard indeed for an outsider to come in and explore that. I guess it was something… I found that helpful because what worried me a lot when I was writing the paper was that maybe a lot of the time maybe this wasn't actually play, you know. This is something encouraged by local communities; it was part of civic ritual; it is much more a part of the adult world. And I guess that the way my thinking is going is that just as we know adult audiences of spectatorship or protest are built of many different, shifting currents, I think so too must groups of children have had very different assumptions about what was actually going on there. Also, I think the fluidity in a time of potential war would have been probably much greater between the two kinds of activities. I find examples of children starting off having a kind of a playful scenario and then suddenly it shifts to become much more serious as they say "Oh, can we have real weapons now because we really think that we're getting somewhere with this." So it's really a very kind of mutable phenomenon that I'm looking at.

O'Quinn: I think that also speaks to a certain issue in the archive as well. I found one of the huge fears I had when first starting to work on these materials was that I just didn't understand what… Like when you read the accounts of the fights, I had *no* idea; I could not explain to myself what was going on until I started finding the dictionaries that decoded the phrases. So I think I went for about five months without knowing what 'bottom' meant and without knowing what 'bottom' meant I couldn't understand anything, really. [laughter]

Richard Nash: That's a good epigram. [laughter]

O'Quinn: If you have 'bottom' you have endurance, right? So, interestingly, there's a way in which the mediation of these events *does* enact a social entity. It activates an audience, and I had

to go there as the sort of participant-observer, you know, historically dislocated, to try and understand what was happening.

To speak to another small point about what you said, I find it quite moving, actually, that Cribb ends up fighting *for* play. That is the most remarkable thing about this event, I think, and I didn't understand it when I first wrote the paper. Cribb fights *against* the people who bet for him, right? In order to preserve the idea of a rule-bound play. And that is quite remarkable because in some senses he's fighting *for* Molineaux when he does that; he's fighting for his opponent. That's a startling moment of affection.

Schneider: Wouldn't it almost be a violation of Huizinga's notion of there being rules: he's sort of changing the rules. It's like refusing to hit the ball back because you're beating your opponent too much…

O'Quinn: Well he's reasserting… He's reasserting the importance of the rules to this entire social interaction, right, against the people who are in some senses supporting him. So there's a moment there when there's a fight for the fight… [laughter] And that really seems quite remarkable; it's almost sort of a meta-performance moment where Cribb has to intervene against the interveners.

Kriegel: Jonathan.

Elmer: There's also a very complex division that's already been introduced into all of this discussion between participant and observer. So Cribb fights for the form; he's both participant and observer. I think it's also fair to say that in these very complex structures, with the Fancy, etc.—and this is the sort of problem that *mutatis mutandis* applies to all of your examples too, Kathryn, it seems to me—that they are also participants in addition to being observers. What you could then maybe try to formalize… I was very interested in Kathryn's 'spectrum', but maybe we can get back to that in a minute. But just to formalize, as a way of trying to introduce (hopefully) some degree of consistency in all of these *incredibly* complicated, labile *moments*, is to say something like, "The nature of play is to put that distinction in operation." That is to say: the distinction between participant and observer is *essential* to what we call play; and the differentiae that interest us as historians, or in other ways, are going to be different modulations of how that particular distinction between spectation and participation plays out, as it were. All this is to say that the interpretation of the line between play and non-play is always at stake, or so it seems to me.

Now there are very, very durable forms: a classic came out, a distinction between play and non-play, last year in the baseball season when an umpire blew the perfect game by making a very bad call. The game continued and everybody acknowledged it, and after the game the umpire said, "Yeah, I totally screwed up", but the guy doesn't have a perfect game. Everybody knows in fact he has a perfect game, but the rule books insist, "No, you don't have a perfect game." So that's a very *rigid* distinction. The Fancy charging the space is a very *porous* distinction, and hence in need of some kind of reinforcement by Cribb himself, to argue for the form itself. These are just two examples, we could come up with many other examples to talk about this line.

To your 'spectrum', Kathryn, it seems to me you had on the one hand… I was very interested in what the logic of the spectrum was. On the one hand you have the idea of the kids playing at

war in a form of parading which was, first of all, in a public space where a regular parade might take place. That was a really important feature of the *difference* of play in your examples in this moment: that they took a public space, not just a private space. And I suppose it was *mimetic* in a really sort of extreme sense, mimetic almost to the point of opening out that porous line between play and participation: of playing at being a soldier and being a child soldier, which you very clearly put your finger on as being always a possibility in this moment and in other moments.

On the other end of the spectrum was private play… Which I thought you were trying to get at something about a non-mimetic, or in any case, purely idiosyncratic, almost non-social version of play. But even the private play has to instantiate this distinction between participation and observation. A child playing is observing a child playing as well; the line between play and non-play is solely in the hands of that child at that moment. There is no crowd, but sometimes the crowd will be invented by that child, right? "And the fans are loving it…" [laughter] So I just offer that as something to put on the table to sort of formalize what has been said already. I don't know how durable it will be.

Kriegel: I have someone with a quick intervention... Do you want to respond to that? Or…

Fritz Breithaupt: No, no, they should respond to that, I just want to jump on the theoretical issues…

Kriegel: Okay, you should respond. Rules of the game say you guys should respond. Jesse, did you have something…?

Jesse Molesworth: I have a big one, though.

Kriegel: Okay, yeah. I've got it now. [silence]

O'Quinn: Oh, I'm doing something? [laughter]

Kriegel: Yeah, you're up.

Elmer: Are you a participant or an observer? [laughter]

O'Quinn: No, you're entirely… I would entirely agree about the question of activation. The performance does activate, right, and there's a way in which it… If we use the specific example I'm talking about here, there's a preparation of space, people come to the space, something then unfolds and a series of things are enacted. There are ways we can predict what some of those are because we have some sense of… But other times we *can't*, and they are very difficult to capture or rearticulate, and often takes us into places that are very tricky evidentiary matters. Do we take Egan at his word, right? Someone as hyper-stylized as Pierce Egan, clearly this is not an accurate representation of what happened in these events. The press? Well, that was probably written by Egan anyway.

So one of the things I hope becomes clear in the paper is that it's impossible to talk about these social events, their action, without talking about their remediation. So that the porosity you're describing between observer and participant is also true methodologically for us in rela-

tion to it, right? Because we can move in those relations to the archival material. And then, if you push hard enough, or build the texture in a thick enough fashion, then you can actually start getting a sense of some of the undercurrents that I think are operating. I hope the paper had that effect: that you begin to get a sense of what's at *stake* behind Egan's statements.

Gleadle: Yeah, so in terms of my spectrum: the spectrum was there to help me to implement a different question, I suppose, which was: "What was *children*'s understanding of what they were doing?" And I suppose key to all of this, you know, is a sense of the emotional consciousness of what's going on in the child's mind as they're playing at that moment. But also I want to maybe problematize a little bit some of the theoretical literature, which may just be my kind of novice, weak misunderstanding of it, but which seems to be rather demarcated between socio-dramatic play, you know, where children act out being mommies and daddies; and fantasy play, as if these are two completely different social phenomena. I've found it more helpful to think of it in terms of this rather fluid spectrum. On this particular topic, I've found that there are obviously clear gender distinctions, as I've hinted at a little bit in the paper: that the little girls seem to engage much more in fantasy play, often fantasizing about being queens and so on. It might be something we come back to tomorrow when we look at [to Miranda Yaggi] your wonderful paper on Jane Austen, and the extent to which female monarchs are providing little girls with this extraordinary role model to thinking through questions of agency. You know, you have extraordinary conversations with little girls saying, "If I was *queen*, I would do this, this, this and this…" It's a very empowering model for little girls at this time, it seems to me.

So it was for opening up those kinds of questions rather than a 'play'-'non-play' distinction necessarily, but I think the issue of audience—you are absolutely right. There is a lovely example of Elizabeth Ham whose father was a brewer and her and her brother used to go play in the brewery when the workers weren't there, and stage their own little plays and what have you. And then they decided that they needed an audience, so they went 'round to all of the local working-class kids to watch them perform. Then when the adults come in, the whole thing just falls apart because they are horrified at what these children are re-enacting in the brewery. So I guess children can have this microcosmic world obviously within that context still.

Kriegel: Fritz?

Breithaupt: Uh, my moment has left, so…

Kriegel: Oh, okay, so…

Dwight Codr: I had a somewhat specific question: just to follow up on the issue of the umpire screwing up the perfect game, and the example of the crowd is quite specific to this; it's probably less theoretical, hence small… When you read this, is it possible… I was struck by the idea of the *singular* way that Molineaux is holding him, and that the umpires and the seconds are discussing "the propriety of separating the combatants". Is there a way there in which the crowd is actually the group interfering on behalf of play, feeling that somehow the rules have been violated?

O'Quinn: Well I'm not... Not quite to say I'm certain, that would be dangerous… I'm willing to *bet* [laughter] that's how they imagined it.

Codr: Yeah, yeah, right…

O'Quinn: Because in earlier… This is not an unusual phenomenon for interruptions to happen, and they always come around to seconds and umpires and members of the Fancy arguing over the proper interpretation of the rules. The most famous of which was the fight between Mendoza and Lee and there was a similar kind of… Lee kept on falling down without being hit. [laughter] This was to *aggravate* Mendoza and Mendoza assumed he had won when Lee would fall, and the crowd was saying "Well no, this is just a tactical move," and a huge argument broke out. There's a great moment when Egan says: "Fighting was then overtaken by speaking." [laughter]

Richard Nash: …Which so seldom happens. [laughter]

O'Quinn: And apparently the speaking took as long as the fighting. [laughter, inaudible comments] So there is a sense in which the play of the crowd and the play inside the ring are related, but the distinction that I probably want to pursue is their different temporalities. It seems that when the fighters are in that ring, a kind of timeless emerges. When the crowd interrupts a different kind of time kicks in, where there's a sense of sequence: there's ordered numbers of rounds; there's specific singular things that happen. I think that might be worth pursuing.

Kriegel: We go over here and then we have Jesse on a new question after that.

Nina L. Dubin: Can you explain the etymology of the word 'Fancy'.

O'Quinn: Oh, sure, well…

Dubin: Or just why that term; it's just so curious.

O'Quinn: Yeah, it's very strange, isn't it? I don't have an answer. Not because there isn't attempts to define it: Egan's always doing it, so is Hazlitt, so are the dictionaries, and they all have different definitions. But the only thing that's consistent in the phrase is its commitment to diversity, to what we would call "diversity"—a range… And a commitment to what, I guess we would have to call it "fun": a kind of movement through space, a kind of… What Hazlitt will eventually call 'gusto'. I wish I had a better—because it's so close to an aesthetic word, right? —but it seems to have emerged in a different way.

Kriegel: [to Schneider] Is it really small…?

Schneider: Well, I just wanted to… This treatment of the notion of speaking overtaking fighting, and I'm wondering whether that is another sort of distinction: if there is certain play which is constrained by the medium, like in marching. It's almost sacred; you can only perform the body through space, without any other sorts of input. As opposed to play, which is…

Nash: Rules?

Schneider: Yeah, but rules as constraining- especially speaking as opposed to gesture.

O'Quinn: Well it would appear that language, anyway, has a different set of rules than what these guys are up to.

Schneider: Right.

Kriegel: Jesse.

Molesworth: Let me go to Kathryn Gleadle and ask about child's play, the concept: it has to be ontologically different than play in general. I say that as the father of a one-year-old daughter and everything is play with her. I try to feed her and, I'm perfectly serious, I do… [inaudible, probably gesturing, followed by laughter] I can only get her to eat if I turn it into a game, that has some game-like component; that's what she wants everything to be. The question for me is… This is an argument partially about this trickle-up theory wherein child's play becomes a model for larger social structures, and Lara talked about how there's a murkiness between the ontological status of the child and the adult in the period. But for me, as an *English* professor, it's actually quite the reverse in the histories that *we* tell. Romanticism is the period in which the child becomes a fundamentally *different* thing than the adult, and you would get that in Wordsworth or Blake or virtually any poet. In eighteenth-century paintings, children look like small adults, there's nothing sort of distinguishing them ontologically, whereas with Romanticism we get a totally different concept of what childhood is. So the thesis that you're giving *me* is working against everything that I've conceptualized about the period. I'm just wondering…

Gleadle: Good, 'cause that's the point, really. [laughter] Yeah, that's absolutely my starting point. Because the sources I was reading—and what I came to first were stories of women—seemed to me that in everyday family interactions, peoples' experience of being in families and in communities didn't seem to map on at all well to precisely the types of questions that you are talking about. I thought it would be fun to see what would happen if we change the model around, so that rather than having children as these passive pawns receiving these social practices, could we turn the model around; and the way I came into this originally was through the sugar boycott actually. So there's a large literature on the extent to which the sugar boycott politicized women, and it was a way in which they were able to perform as domestic actors within the domestic space—which seemed fine.

But then when I went and actually looked at those family papers, I found that the family's concerned, at least the ones that I looked at, didn't conceptualize it as a women's issue; they conceptualized it as a *child's* issue. They were saying, or the way they were articulating it at least, was that it was the children's idea, and that the children suggested it to the family, and they were going to give it a go. Which made me think there was something more complicated going on about how people were actually imagining children to have agency. But I think also if we relate that more broadly to political culture, and I guess this comes back to the 'play'-'non-play' thing … As a political historian, which is I guess essentially what I am, the modes of political culture in this period are so ritualized anyway, you know; we think of the theater of the electoral canvass, or the use of simples, and so on. So it's already a kind of highly playful, theatrical scenario, which I think made it particularly accessible for people of juvenile maturity. Once I started to do the archival work, it seemed to me that there were a whole range of juvenile political activities going on which contemporaries were well aware of, but doesn't seem to actually get

articulated very much, perhaps because it cuts across those discursive boundaries that you were talking about. But children having mock election, children giving election speeches, minors standing for parliament are very much part of this Georgian political world. That was my way in, rather than as a historian of play.

Then I suppose it got me thinking, as I was putting together this paper for Rebecca, about how we can think about this more broadly in terms of loyalist identities. One example that I particularly like (I'll just say this briefly) is Thomas Cooper, a nineteenth-century radical, who remembers that after the great peace celebrations of 1814, him and his friends—who I think would have been about ten or eleven [years old at the time], all decided they want to do something. So they all dress up as a different general and they're really fired up by the whole community being so into this whole *show* of patriotism. They decide essentially they're going to bust in; they go from house to house in the local neighborhood completely dressed up in ridiculous costumes and with labels as to who they are (in case there was any doubt), singing the songs that they know (and it turns out they don't know that many). The local community is obviously quite touched by this and they get a whole load of money for it.

So this started me thinking about the ways in which children's activities actually has an implication, because you're giving money to the kids, you're reaffirming the sense that this is a show of communal unity and loyalty. For contemporaries, children's activities might have had a significant impact on how they viewed contemporary political events. That's where the paper comes from.

Kriegel: I have Richard next.

Nash: I have one question that I'm gonna ask, but I'm gonna try and fork it to speak to each paper. I'm just asking each of you to think a little more about *outcome*. One of my favorite lines in *Rocky*, a movie that speaks to your paper… [laughter] is when the fight is over, but before the decision is announced, you can hear almost as an off-line Apollo Creed saying "ain't gonna be no rematch." Which seems to me is one of the thematic interests of your paper, but also of the whole history of that sport, where the action is largely *about* rematches. There is a certain sense in which play resolves things, unless it really works. When play really works, it *doesn't* achieve resolution, it achieves something better than resolution: a need to play that game again.

So where I was thinking about this in your paper, Kathryn, is on page 7 where you quote from Somerville:

"the scholars divided themselves into soldiers and radicals. As the soldiers were the most respectable in the eyes of the better dressed sons of farmers and tradesmen, and as they took the lead in everything, they made themselves soldiers; and, in addition to that, took upon themselves to pick out those who were to be radicals."

And you stopped there, and I can guess how that game is supposed to come out, but I'm immediately thinking that it will be much more fun if the radicals beat up on the soldiers here, right? That is, and in some larger sense of the narrative, your paper seems to me to be talking about play socializing boys into becoming soldiers for the state.

Which on the one hand, this would be the good, socialist state at work teaching you how to play for the state, but it seems to me - my memory of play - is that a lot of the best enjoyment in play is precisely when the script gets undone. In those moments when the script gets undone is this eruption of pleasure which precisely moves for the need to *re*-play, rather than to say "it's now settled". This comes back to that moment when… Cribb—Cribb, is that right? —Cribb

intervenes, one of the things he's doing is intervening in his role as second; one of the things he's doing is he's intervening on behalf of fair play; and one of the things he's doing is that he's preserving Molineaux as an appropriate opponent for his rematch, right? There's a certain sense where he has an incentive in wanting that to remain a necessary match.

So I just throw that out there and ask for some sort of response.

O'Quinn: There's a number of things there that are… But one of the most interesting sub- genres in this whole archive of boxing material is accounts of challenges and rematches. So like in the first *Boxiana* volume, most of the things are… Pierce Egan is extremely interested in boxers who *write* to the papers and how they respond to each other, and sometimes it will go for months and months and months about how they negotiate rematches. A lot of important coding occurs around what is an appropriate kind of response, who is being a gentleman, who is being appropriately masculine, etc. and it gets down to parsing their discursive moves in the same way that they parse their actions when they describe the fights. That in itself is kind of interesting. But you're right about… In some senses it's the repetition that's so interesting to me: we're *staging* events in order that they can be controlled. So when the outcome doesn't work out in the way you want it to be, you have a rematch to give it the one that you want.

But it's interesting because I had a question that I was going to ask Kathryn that goes right to this. When I read your paper, all I could think about is Blake. Blake is continually deploying these children in different… So in "Holy Thursday", their childishness is contained in one version of it and anxiously reproduced in another. Continuing in *Songs of Innocence*, he's interested in what you're describing there: how kids interact in agential fashion with the adult world. It seems kind of striking that he plays it out in two different ways quite often, like he wants to see how the kids almost dialectically engage with the political world around them.

Gleadle: Well, thank you, I'll have to go re-read my Blake. You'll be pleased to hear he got 'em. [laughter]

Nash: That's right, that's right. Since he was telling the story I was guessing that's how it came out. [laughter]

Gleadle: No, no, it's a really helpful question. I suppose I'll give a very contradicting response, though, since my original rationale was to think not in terms of outcome, but to think of socialization in terms of process. Because it seems to me that part of not the problem, but where maybe we can move on in terms of thinking about socialization, is not just to think how successful was it ("Did it work?") but rather to remodel political socialization and actually to think how politics is formed in these microprocesses of social interaction. So I wasn't interested in the broader question that you asked. I suppose that the theoretical models I've been looking at in the world of political sociology and sociology are very insistent that this shouldn't be about outcome. But I'm a historian, so I quite like the story and I quite like the narrative; I can't resist thinking a little bit about outcome.

I suppose for me, unsatisfactory though it may be to some of you, I've started to think of it in terms of generational cohorts, and what do these particular kinds of experiences create a bonding amongst particular sets of generations. I've touched on it very briefly here but I've noticed it more starkly in other kinds of contexts. I did a piece on children in the 1830s. Turns out, who knew? that the first mass protest of children was in the early 1830s, when factory kids barricaded

factory commissions in their hotels and wouldn't let them come out when they were doing their peripatetic commission in the early 1830s. And in many locales it was precisely in those places that five, ten years later you have really active young Chartist associations and it would literally be the same individuals. So I was more interested in it from that perspective.

Kriegel: John? Did you…?

John Han: Yeah, I have a question; I hope that it's articulate. There have been so many great comments that I'm jotting more down in my notes and my question has passed, so I hope it makes some sense.

I want to return to the issue of *gender* and play, particularly the way it seems to me that Fancy becomes feminized. The way Egan describes the Fancy as sort of antinomial, abstract, and almost fantastic almost accords with Kathryn's description of the way girls play. They play more not so much in such a dramatic play, but in a more abstract, fantasy for a fantastical purpose. I was wondering if the Fancy was necessarily feminized as a way to be, as Huizinga put it, to be the spoil-sport; to intervene and to add another layer, another opponent. Because it seems like the Fancy and the boxing match, it's an abstract force that forces a rematch; it changes the outcome in a way that is more creative in a feminine way and less than a masculine, "I'm going to beat the crap out of you" way. Finally I wonder if that leads more to some of the recent rules of gender in, say, play and warfare; if spectatorship is gendered as well. In World War One where women are spectators, but they also become active participants in it as well: they produce the weapons. I'm just wondering—I hope that made some sense—if gender and the way you describe the Fancy has some sort of role…

O'Quinn: Well the gendering of the Fancy is extremely complicated. I can't really talk about it without also talking about sexuality at the same time, and it's also partly distorted by the nature of this paper, right? One of the things I do in the paper is that I'm showing one very particular problem with the Fancy. But Babcock and Egan are also part of the Fancy; they are interested in it as a subculture because it has very useful functions in their other narrative jobs. So, for instance, when Egan comes to write *Life in London*, he has *two* characters: he has Tom—Corinthian Tom—and Jerry, who is from the country. Jerry seems to exhibit a very different kind of gender identity and a different sexual identity than Tom does. Their relationship to clothing is different, their relationship to the various women, the prostitutes and whoever else they are interacting with, is *different* but in ways that aren't immediately legible to us as the difference between heterosexuality or homosexuality, or a difference between a kind of butch masculinity or not, a machismo… So now my answer to your question is getting very complicated, right? It seems to me the same kind of complication that attends discussions of Byron's masculinity, right, and Byron of course is kind of the shorthand person for talking about the Fancy, in a sense. If you've been to Byron's house, he has a screen where he carefully cut out pictures of boxers and decoupaged them onto the screen; which is such a fascinating thing, right, because decoupage is such a thoroughly feminized activity, right? Playing with those little scissors… [laughter] And what he's cutting out are boxers and putting them on the screen, so that seems to me a perfect encapsulation of a style of masculinity that is quite distant from us now.

But to get to the heart of your question, I think that is why the Fancy is useful, right? Because they can be deployed in these narratives and in some senses operate as a shadow site or backdrop to someone like Cribb. Cribb can then come forward without having to say, "This is what the

kind of man we're looking for looks like." Right? We can do it by talking about these other people who are much more interesting, so in other words the evacuation of representation is extraordinarily powerful; it can generate Cribb's normativity and yet keep all of the fun of Corinthian Tom and keep the narrative, the excitement, the *frisson*, the play of the text alive. That seems to be a crucial dynamic to me.

Han: It seems like especially in the earlier eighteenth-century novels—a lot of the romance novels like *The Recluse*—there are lots of stories about women who masquerade or can change their appearance on a whim. It seems to me there are some similarities in the way the Fancy is amorphous in the ways it was represented earlier in the period and I was just wondering if there's some connection…

O'Quinn: Just one quick other remark as well: I think it's also very interesting to think about how the bodies of these men are presented, right?

Han: Right.

O'Quinn: The stripping is such an important part of the fight and actually takes as long as the fight itself. It moves from this very high-collared, very sexualized dress—the short coat, the very tight pants—and then you move down to everything bare above the waste. That seems to me to be like a very vital scene in all of the descriptions and Egan goes to it again, again and again…

Han: It's like the masquerade ball or modern day [inaudible]…

Kriegel: Rebecca.

Rebecca Spang: I was just really struck on that point in the contrast between the two papers: where what's so important in your paper [to O'Quinn] is stripping; and what's so important in your paper [to Gleadle] is dressing up. [laughter] Like, "you can't play soldier if you don't have a uniform." [laughter]

Gleadle: Can I come back briefly on the gender point? Obviously my problem is sources in terms of excavating children's play, it's really difficult. For the rest of the project I'm using children's diaries a lot, and in children's diaries they tend not to talk about play, for obvious reasons. It's a very disciplined genre that's often there for the consumption of an adult audience: showing how you're becoming acculturated to particular adult codes. It's quite hard to tease these things out, and the descriptions of fantasy play, for the most part—not all of it, but for the most part—is coming from autobiographies and there are obviously issues of gender and genre in terms of how women are expressing their interiority in that sense.

But just briefly, my kind of hypothesis would be that within the home it appears to be much less gendered than we would think, and that also there are all sorts of other kinds of family playful practices going on that cut across genders. I did have a paragraph on pet naming which went, but there was one little girl calling her kittens, 'Bonaparte' and 'John Bull'. Well you can imagine that that would follow an obvious point of playful discussion about political identity for

that family every time the kittens are playing, wouldn't it? So there are lots of family practices which are actually fairly non-gendered.

[long pause]

Kriegel: We're open… [laughter] Jonathan.

Elmer: Unplummable, methodological question, but both of you touched on it, so we might as well just plunge in… It's your question, Kathryn: what can a historian do with this material? What can actually be made to make history according to our contemporary protocols? And I think Danny ventures on some possible answers to that based on performance, a kind of theory of performance. Just to invite you both to talk about it, I'll just quote a passage from Danny's paper. … It has to do with repetition:
"The fact that this terror is resolved through acts of staged violence, as opposed to conflict arising from large-scale geopolitical forces is I believe of singular importance, for it suggests that in the realm of entertainment, events can be structured, repeated, and re-engaged until the compensatory effects of the action are *activated*."
(A lot of very interesting words there…)
"In other words, it is the *fact* of repetition that not only allows for the phantasmatic scene to play itself out, but also reveals the artifice of the historical resolution. This has important methodological implications because it speaks to the way singular acts of performance engage with the historical undercurrents of performativity itself…"
And I'll just stop there because that's enough. But it's a very interesting set of arguments there, and I know you've made similar ones; you're working through this larger methodological argument. But it does, I think, also speak to something Kathryn put her finger on as well having to do with the way we read these staged acts as either mimetic, or allegorical, or compensatory... The repetition involved in them… But maybe you can just gloss it for us, or tell us what is most at stake in that formulation.

O'Quinn: This is all like [inaudible]… As you're reading that, I'm like, "Oh no…" [laughter]

Part of what I've been trying to do over the past few years is to try and talk about entertainment in a way that accounts for its very particular manifestation in the eighteenth century. The intense commercialization of entertainment and the hyper-mediation of the entertainment world generated styles of sociability and subjectivity that are recognizable to us now, but are rarely talked about in eighteenth-century studies in that way. So I was bringing a lot of the tools from performance studies to try and talk about newspapers, theater, and what those two media share is an intense relationship to repetition. The way they mutually inform one another means you can activate them in time: a paper comes out in the morning; the content in the papers is picked up by the players; is inserted into the play in the evening; gets reported on in the morning paper the next morning; becomes a phenomenon in the audience, etc. I'm only describing one possible trajectory for that information, right? So by opening the analysis of this kind of entertainment activity to a kind of media/performance studies approach, it does generate a number of questions around, mostly around, reception. How do we talk about audiences? That's come up already, but it is the endlessly difficult thing to talk about, right, and I find it really, really frustrating when I'm working on theatrical materials that—well, I'm being harsh here—but the discussion of audiences is very… "Well, we have rich people up here, and we have poor people here, and

they would read the thing this way", and that's so just not borne out by the evidence at all. You can see in the press, even if you are one of those people who can't afford a box, you are reading the *Morning Post* the next day, so you have access to certain aspects of these experiences.

Now, to these particular sentences, I was wanting to use the repetition structure of the fight as an allegory of sorts for the methodological problem that this poses. Maybe that's the simplest gloss. The fact that we can *re*-stage: that seems to be crucial to the entertainment cultures of this period. That's how you generate the success of a paper, of a play, of a boxer—is whether they repeat, whether they keep going. You know, Sheridan basically says, 'That's why commerce will save us.' At the end of the American War he says, 'Commerce will save us because it will force us to keep making culture; even though we've lost Garrick, and we've lost the colonies and we've lost whatever, eventually something will get thrown up because we repeat'. That doesn't seem very far away from some of the things Huizinga is arguing about play: it will generate culture, it will *be* culture. Is that…?

Gleadle: I guess for me it would be another way of responding to Jesse—Jesse, right? —Jesse's question, which would be that if you followed your line, I guess we would end up in a separate spheres model of childhood history. Maybe this is why we have literary critics as well as historians. [laughter]

Elmer: You've wondered. You've wondered for a long time: Why? [laughter]

Gleadle: Just as we now know the multiple ways in which women could contribute to the political process, in ways that we cannot fathom just by looking at certain kinds of texts. So too, I think, the ritualized nature of the phenomena I'm looking at help us to further unsettle the boundaries of the political nation. Ritual, as I said earlier, is obviously so apposite for understanding Georgian political culture. I'm reminded of this really nice quote from I can't remember who, someone in Philadelphia, writing to James [inaudible] in 1793 saying, "I've got this great idea for a parody. I'm gonna write this *parody* where boys at school try and upturn the school hierarchy by using the language of the Rights of Man, just as they are doing in France…. But I've heard they've just done it!" At Westminster School, this is what they did in one of their rebellions: they get a cap of liberty, they put big slogans around the school, and so on.

But more generally the ways in which juvenile actors could appropriate these kinds of rituals to make local communities stop and think—they had to call the local militia out for these schoolboy activities—is really significant at the community-constituency level where you do have children re-enacting electoral rituals in ways that have consequences. The consequences are important for me, and that appropriation and playing around with political culture is another way of thinking about how the state operates at a political level, and not just the kind of monolithic entity in which the franchise really dictates who has political clout. But to think of the many interstices through which small actors could open up opportunities for their voices to be heard from part of that really lively electoral theater that we are all so familiar with.

Kriegel: Okay, so I've got here… We're technically at time. Was that a real question, or was that…?

Breithaupt: Oh, I thought it was the closing… No, no, it's okay, I'll pass.

Spang: But we have a half-hour, go for it… Let's finish, we've got ten minutes.

Kriegel: Let's see what I've got here… Because strategically you might be playing it wrong; you keep trying to ask your own question and everybody jumps in.

Breithaupt: No, no, I'll pass.

Kriegel: Let me say what I've got, and then… This is what I want to suggest… I've got with small interventions here, I think: Cornelis, Rebecca, Richard, Hall, and Anne; and then Fritz with a question.

Breithaupt: Oh no, no, that's too long, it's fine…

Kriegel: No, come on, you skipped your other one. So why don't you guys all go around and each say your intervention without having them respond; and then if there's a collective response to that; and then Fritz's question. Yes.

Breithaupt: I'll find my moments, it's okay; I'm not shy.

Kriegel: Okay. [laughter] So we'll just kind of say what these things were to put them on the table.

Van der Haven: Yeah, small question: if patriotism, in both cases actually needs passive force to be activated, in order to play. If you can compare the Fancy in boxing maybe with the kids, or rather the girls especially supporting boys, who are in a way activated, as a function of inspiring them… As we can say also of the Fancy tends to inspire the fighters, and how it relates patriotism to the idea of play and destroys it, or…

Kriegel: [writing] So patriotism, play, active, passive…And … Rebecca.

Spang: When Danny was glossing the passage Jonathan read about repetition and restaging, I was wondering again whether the restaging depends on knowing what the outcome will be. So when you write the outcome of a fight, you *do* know who won, and I was thinking this was a very different culture from, for example, that of live blogging where you don't know what is going to happen. And then again, the obvious, it seems to me, point of reference with the thing about repetition is: what would have happened if Freud's grandchild had only played 'Fort-Da' once? [laughter]

Nash: To the grandchild? [laughter]

Spang: "Do it again, dammit. I need a theory!" [laughter]

Nash: My very small question on Jonathan's big question about history and play was about… What would it do if we thought about history *as* play? My hook into this was your really nice adjectival description of the Cribb-Rimmer fight as a "fascinating fight", and it got me thinking

what is it that makes that fight in particular fascinating, if we think about fascinating as a reaction *in play*, right? That's all I was thinking.

Kriegel: Hall.

Hall Bjørnstad: Along with Rebecca and Richard I wanted to return to the passage singled out by Jonathan and the methodological stakes. I'm thinking the passage points back to a key phrase in the introduction where you say something that I sense is important, but I don't fully understand it. I would ask you to unpack "the nascent historicity of performativity itself".

Kriegel: And Anne…

Anne Maurseth: Yeah, my question or my comment is related to this question of repetition, and I think that is a very, kind of core question from the theoretical point of view with regard to game in general. Ever since you've mentioned the "thick play" where the children are completely immersed in their play and there is no external world; nobody can enter the thick play from outside. This is maybe a very essential of play that is limited in time and space, and that you are completely absorbed by the game. But at the same time, the condition for this is that you can repeat it, that the integration is somehow embedded in the thick play as well. I think that's an important clue to the understanding of game in general, but also that this is kind of related to what I've discussed here, and that's the question of narration: what is the narration based on? Is that based on a link that you are constructing between the similar events, between the singular games somehow; or is the narration something that you can extract from the single event, or can you construct narration from the interaction of similar events? I think that is something that applies to both of your papers somehow, and is also a little bit complicated: how to make that link between the single events and the integration. Is that a question of the applicability of game that you can actually see the extent to which the game is transferable to society, for example, that children's play can be transferred into a socializing process that is somehow outside the game?

Elmer: Having asked you to gloss [inaudible] … At least three rather important theses are put forward in these sentences. One is that this kind of an entertainment has compensatory effects. That is kind of a theory of its ideological functions: that it is making up for something in 'the Real' or it is resolving something that is problematic in the Real in a more or less phantasmatic way, and that it is effective. That is the first thesis.

The second thesis is that the fantasy or phantasmatic as you say aspect of this play - at least your *words* to me seem to me to imply - are only made possible by the fact of repetition. This is like a structure of iterability at some level; the fact that this phantasmatic scene can take place at *all* is due to there being a thing called repetition and that this particular moment is subjected to a law of iteration or repetition. This is very Derridean or deconstructive point, but also a Freudian point on some level, right?

The last is that there is something in this repetition that reveals the artifice of the historical resolution, which is sort of the second part of the ideology-critique thesis. If there is a compensatory effectiveness but there is also a revelation of the artifice of the resolution, and these things are apparently not in contradiction one with another, according to you. All of these seem to be very rich theses built in here and coming out of the problem of repetition very generally, which I

think you're right is having to do with how we think of narration. That's not a question, it's just adding to the table.

Kriegel: Um, okay, closing statements or one more question or…? Perhaps closing remarks based on these things.

Spang: And then a fifteen-twenty minute break, and then the next panel.

Gleadle: Okay, well I guess I'll close with a response to your question. I can't remember your name, I'm sorry…

[multiple voices]: Cornelis.

Gleadle: Okay, I suppose I would want to critique the assumptions underlying "passive" or "active" there.

Van der Haven: Yeah… [likely with hand gestures] Passive… Active… [laughter]

Gleadle: Yeah, obviously patriotism obviously isn't just a kind of special occasion phenomenon. It must be something that people are constructing in lots of microprocesses and local quotidian contexts, but there seems to be a sort of gendered assumption there that passive will be 'not fighting', I guess. Where if you are a female servant working eighteen hours a day, maybe your only way of expressing a political identity, however banal it may seem, is to "Come on let's stitch these little dolls and their uniforms", and that's your way of engaging [inaudible]… So I think it's how people feel about what they're doing rather than what they're doing that helps us to think about whether it's possible or not.

Van der Haven: Yeah, I mean that patriotism needs the presence of a passive subject to be activated.

Gleadle: Ah, okay.

Van der Haven: Because it could be women in their role as inspirants inspiring the masculine hero; of course these are constructions of masculinity. But I was wondering how this relates to the role of the girls: how are they relating to their acting of these boys?

Gleadle: We should talk more about this later.

Van der Haven: But yeah… [laughter]

O'Quinn: I'll just be very quick. My favorite moment in Kathryn's paper is the best way to answer the group of questions. When you do the speculation number in the square bracket, that was like a really thrilling moment in the paper… [laughter] But it's such a great moment because in some senses it speaks to the historicity of performance, right? Because the performative moment happens in the present, something we can't capture, right; the present is always running away from us into the past and into the future. But so much of performance studies focuses on

the past, on the reconstruction of past events, but it's important to remember what Judith Butler says about that, right: every performance in the present inscribes a future. In a sense that's why repetition is already presupposed in performance, right, and why it's going to generate these kinds of effects. It's also why the symptom, right, lives and reveals itself at the same time because it inscribes the futurity that will give its revelation. So it seems to me it's a place where performance studies can help us understand some aspects of historical action, if you want to put it that way. That's in some senses how I gloss Kathryn's example there about that moment, "how do Chartists come to become Chartists", you know… That seems to me to be really interesting.

Kriegel: Well, thank you very much.

[applause]