CHILDREN'S FOLKLORE REVIEW

VOLUME 22
NUMBER 2
SPRING 2000

PUBLISHED BY THE CHILDREN'S FOLKLORE SECTION OF THE AMERICAN FOLKLORE SOCIETY WITH SUPPORT FROM THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT AT EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR........……………………………………….…….5

1999 NEWELL PRIZE PAPER

BARE BUMS AND WEE CHIMNEYS: RUDENESS AND DEFINING THE LINE BETWEEN CHILD AND ADULT
DONNA M. LANCLOS..7

E-CONTRIBUTIONS………………………………………………....49

CFS: 1999 ANNUAL MEETING…………………………………….50

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS..........………………………......53

CONTRIBUTORS.………………………………………….……..54

ON THE COVER: REPRODUCTION OF THE COVER OF W. W. NEWELL'S *GAMES AND SONGS OF AMERICAN CHILDREN.*

FROM THE EDITOR

The dogwood and azaleas are blooming in eastern North Carolina, and there is pollen everywhere. It must be, and indeed is, time for the spring volume of the *Children s Folklore Review.*

There are two fine essays in this issue of *CFR.* The first is "Bare Bums and Wee Chimneys: Rudeness and Defining the Line Between Child and Adult" by Donna M. Lanclos. This paper is one of the two Newell Prize papers for 1999. The co-winner was John M. Bodner for his paper, "Playing with Networks: An Ethnology of the SCU-MUN Daycare Based on Network Analysis".

Another of the e-mail contributions (which began a few issues ago) comes from Judy McKinty in Australia and is a follow-up to Elizabeth Tucker's "Barney" article in *CFR* 22.1.

As usual, the annual minutes of the meeting of the Children's Folklore Section are printed here. The meeting was particularly important as new people, JoAnn Conrad and Cherry Levin, were elected to positions in the organization.

Little in the way of new Notes and Announcements was sent in this time, and the issue closes with the Contributor's section.

By the time you read this, panels and paper sessions will already have been proposed for the 2000 American Folklore Society meetings in Columbus, Ohio. Please attend those sessions on children's folklore and come to the Children's Folklore Section meeting which, again this year, will be a breakfast meeting.

C.W Sullivan III

BARE BUMS AND WEE CHIMNEYS: RUDENESS AND DEFINING THE LINE BETWEEN CHILD AND ADULT

DONNA M. LANCLOS

A careful consideration of the uses of rude or "dirty" folklore on and off the playground is necessary, because it is around rude performance and references to rudeness by children that adults enact many of their expectations and desires for their children. Reactions to verbal "dirt" reveal both the construction of children in the minds of adults, and the reaction of children to that construction. They explore it, they resist it, and occasionally they attempt to enforce it amongst their peers. The reaction of adults to the forbidden words and actions of kids, whether or not they are their own children, in turn speaks to anxieties and expectations that adults have about children and, by association, the society of the future.

This paper concerns the ways in which Belfast children used rude folklore to mark and question age categories among themselves on the playground. It is based on materials I collected during nine months of fieldwork, from 1996 into 1997, in five different Belfast primary schools: two Protestant/State schools (P.S.1 and P.S.2), two Catholic schools (C.S.1 and C.S.2) and one Integrated school (I.S.).[1] In particular, I address the adult/child divide, the ways in which that separation is dependent upon Western constructions of Childhood, and furthermore, how folklore materials reveal children's awareness of and ambivalence toward the very label of Child. In working-class Northern Ireland, it seems to be particularly difficult to maintain a rigid split between adult and child, and both kids' and parents' awareness of this difficulty informs many of the apparent contradictions between standards of behavior within the schools, and those applied without.

The folklore materials I focus on here are those that the kids themselves classified as "dirty" or "rude": especially those concerned with scatological or sexual words and situations. I found in the course of my research that children's use of rude materials, and corresponding adult reactions to and anticipation of that use, serves as a kind of flashpoint for the discussion and negotiation of definitions of what it is supposed to mean to be a child. Fundamental to this discussion, then, is a sense of what is meant by

"dirty", and what it meant by childhood. Mary Douglas' description in *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* of "dirt" as "matter out of place" is also crucial to this argument, as is Horace Beck's equation of the term "dirty" with forbidden or obscene folklore, in his *Journal of American Folklore* article "Say Something Dirty!" In this case, the "matter" in question consists of the sexual and scatological words and references. In Belfast, I and the children I met encountered two different "places" where particular sorts of "matter" were unwelcome, and therefore "dirty." The first place was institutional settings, in particular schools, which are permeated by generalized middleclass notions of propriety (notions which do not include the public references to sex or other bodily functions). The second place was that of the abstract notion of Childhood, also as defined by the middle-class, as a protected and (forcibly) innocent space ideally unsullied by forbidden, adult knowledge.

While the vast majority of the kids I worked with in Belfast were from working-class backgrounds, in the course of their everyday lives they were in frequent contact with institutions such as schools and with conventional, middle-class notions of proper child-like behavior. In this they were like the adults in their lives, who are regularly forced to confront middle-class expectations of behavior in their encounters with government agencies, city center department stores, and so on. Most adults have long since learned the unspoken rules of conduct that determine when and where particular language and actions are and are not appropriate. Children are in the middle of their struggle to learn the contexts in which "rudeness" is allowed (or at least, tolerated), but are also embroiled in the struggle to understand what can easily be perceived as adult hypocrisy around such issues. Until the conventions are more clear to kids, they often see adult silencing and censoring as hypocritical: how can teachers forbid them to use the very same words they hear other adults using in the shops, or even at home? As they learn the nuances of rudeness, and the importance of context, the distinction between institutional, teacher-based behavior expectations, and the other everyday models they encounter outside of school becomes more clear, and kids become increasingly adept at interpreting and acting on contextual cues.

However, one set of references are uniformly perceived, across class lines, as forbidden to children, and that is references to vio-

lence, especially sectarian violence. The association of rude, "dirty" language and violence is inherent in much of the folklore materials I collected in Belfast. I explore the implications of this connection towards the end of this paper.

For the purposes of the analysis I present here, expectations of "proper" childlike behavior directly inform notions of what is "dirty" when said or done by a child. I will first address some of the theoretical discussions about the status of children in Western society, and the ways in which concerns about obscenity and children's use of same reflect both ideal constructions of Childhood, and the conflicts of reality with that ideal: the lived reality of children, and the reality of adults who care for and about them. I then turn to the various ways in which children in Belfast used obscenity and obscene folklore. Both the folklore texts and the contexts in which they were employed provide a complex commentary on age roles, and especially on the children's perceptions of their own place within their rigidly age-graded society.

A word on age-groups in Northern Irish schools

Schoolchildren receive strong signals about the importance of age in separating themselves from each other in their everyday school practices. The class grouping in Northern Irish primary schools, as is the case in the rest of Britain, Ireland, the United States, and indeed most of the parts of the world that use the Western European model of schooling, are based on age ranges, so that P1 is four to five years old, P2 is five to six, P3 is six to seven, P4 is seven to eight, P5 is eight to nine, P6 is nine to ten, and P7 is ten to eleven. "P" stands for "Primary," so "P1" is pronounced "Pee one," and is short for "Primary Year One." Such institutional separation of age grades frequently translates into separation away from school: parents in the United States frequently use whether or not there are children the same age as their own as a factor in deciding whether to move into a particular neighborhood, and the children themselves can take on these age-grades as given, if they have enough people their own age around to maintain such separations. In neighborhoods or schools with low populations of children, however, the rigidity of the age-grades breaks down in favor of simply having someone to play with; this has been described in America by Marjorie Goodwin, in *He-said-she-said,* and Barrie Thorne in *Gender Play*.

In the Belfast schools in which I worked, even though children mixed with other age groups on the playgrounds, the mixing was controlled by the adults in the schools. For instance, at C.S.1, the teachers allowed the younger girls (P1—P4) to mix with the older girls (P5 through P7) for about ten minutes during their lunch break, but at the end of that time insisted that the younger children line up and go back into their classrooms. Resistance to mixing also came from the kids themselves, especially among groups close in age (e.g., P4s and P5s). This was the case when I saw P5s rejecting P4s who volunteered to play with them, something that happened at most populous schools in my sample: P.S.1, C.S.1 and C.S.2, and I.S. But if maintaining the rigid age-grades meant that there wouldn't be enough players in a game, or simply that play wouldn't be very satisfying, they were quick to adjust, as was certainly the case outside of school in their home neighborhoods, where many age-mates might or might not share a street, but a wide range of ages would.

Internal (that is, within the category of Child) age grade distinctions were most frequently maintained in the practice of play. That is, distinctions were made from one group through the exclusion of people from the game, or from overt declarations that "you don't know how to do it properly," a dismissal that resulted more often than not in the child retreating to the company of an age-mate, and playing with them. Distinctions of child from adult, while also exercised in physical practice (children ran around on the playground and played, adults supervised that play), was more frequently present in the performances of folklore materials, especially in rude rhymes, jokes, and songs, wherein children would not only mark the distinction, but would challenge and mock it.

Regardless of internal divisions among the pupils at all of the schools, all were classified as "children" by the adults, including teachers, playground supervisors, classroom aides, and custodial staff While the divisions within the school of P7 from P4 were important, the constant status of "child," held by all pupils at the schools, and the behavior expectations implied in that label by the adults at the schools, permeated the everyday experiences of every child.

The Child as Innocent: Constructions of Childhood

These behavior expectations are linked to broader Western (European and American) expectations of how children are supposed to act, by virtue of the fact that they are Children. Much has been written about the socio-cultural constructions of The Child, and Childhood, beginning in 1962 with Philippe Aries' seminal volume *Centuries of Childhood.* In particular, the notion of a proper child as innocent, meek, protected, has been discussed as a particularly bourgeois and Western concept, but one that has become a conventional model, in this the end of the twentieth century, for what the behavior (if not the actual essence) of a child ought to be. Because the innocence of children can only be observed by adults through patterns of behavior, underlying assumptions about the true nature of The Child can vary, even within uniform expectations of behavior patterns. Therefore, while one parent may subscribe to the model that children are inherently bad, and must be taught to be good, and one parent may assume that children are inherently good, and learn to be bad from outside sources, both parents may still hold expectations of behavior that require outward appearances of goodness and innocence. In the end, it does not matter if the children curse inwardly, so long as they do not do it aloud, among adults, and so rupture the desired image of the child as innocent.

Of course, Aries was not the first to discuss the culturally constructed nature of Childhood; Margaret Mead and Martha Wolfenstein explored that very issue in 1955, in their edited volume *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures,* as did Beatrice Whiting in her 1963 work *Six Cultures: Studies of Child-rearing.* His discussion of a particularly protected, *bourgeois* notion of Childhood is important here, because it is this notion that Belfast children (and most children in the urban, Western European and American world's) regularly encounter in their everyday lives. This is not to say that this ideal model of the innocent and dependent child is accepted wholeheartedly, either by the children themselves, or by their parents. It is to say that this model has been generalized to such a degree that it has become the picture of what "should be normal," in Belfast and elsewhere, and so it must be confronted,

both in this theoretical discussion, as well as by the kids themselves.

The epistemological move that Aries documents via social history, removing young people from the realm of everyday adult life and into a separate, protected Childhood, coincided in the nineteenth century with an invention of notions of obscenity and pornography that very explicitly constructed women as particularly susceptible to the corruptive influences of pornography, as has been discussed by the authors in Lynn Hunt's edited volume *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity*. Women and children both were constructed as the vulnerable, and therefore needing protection from harm, including the potential harm of obscenity. It was not until 1977 in the U.S. that child pornography laws were in effect; in the face of women's rejection of male "protection," this is a striking parallel with the move from women being the "problem" informants in anthropology, as described by Edwin Ardener, to children being classified as the same.[2] Some feminist theorists today define pornography as another form of violence, and if women and children must be protected from violence, then they must likewise be protected from pornography and obscenity.

This is not to suggest that children (and women, and all others) should not be protected from sexual and other sorts of abuse. The fact that obscenity definitions include far more than just pornography, however, means that children's speech is regularly censored by well-meaning adults who are afraid that children's familiarity with "dirty" materials will lead to familiarity with other, more dangerous and anti-social realms, including violence.

While in the Belfast city center, I would regularly observe women or men talking to friends, on buses, in taxis, or simply on the street, as if their child were not there, observing every act and listening to every word. The adults would often use words such as "fuck," "shite," "hell," – words that children are simply not supposed to say, even if they know them. Even if these adults themselves do not punish their children for rudeness—I did observe some parents laughing indulgently at a "cheeky" child—some adults will, especially teachers and playground supervisors. Regardless of the individual model of childhood constructed within each family, then, the broader "societal" model will be encountered by chil

dren at regular intervals, and they will have to deal with the tension that ensues, between what they have observed to be true about adult behavior, and what is expected of "proper" children's behavior.

Folklore and Definitions of the Obscene

G. Legman, in his introductory essays to Sandra McCosh's *Children's Humor: A Joke for Every Occasion,* and Vance Randolph's *Roll me in Your Arms: "Unprintable" Ozark Folksongs and Folklore,* details with some dismay the long history of folklorists' struggle with obscene materials, of self-censorship and the censorship of informants, especially children, who produce obscene or even slightly off-color materials. It is telling that the censorship in print of children's lore begins in the seventeenth century, a time that Aries identifies as one of the most "plentiful" in the definition of Childhood as an innocent time apart from the adult world. During the late nineteenth century, when folklore was just beginning to be defined as a discipline, censorship of children's folklore was at its height, as evidenced by the production of what in 1979 Legman called the "lily-pure" (xvii) collection by Lady Alice Gomme, *The Traditional Games of England, Scotland, and Ireland* published from 1894 to 1898. The Victorian sensibilities surrounding Childhood in turn continued to influence subsequent generations of folklorists, most notably Peter and Iona Opie, as evidenced in their works *The Lore and Language of Schoolchildren,* and *Childre' s Games in Street and Playground.* While the Opies' collections are undisputedly important contributions to the field of folklore collection, they dismiss scatological or sexual materials as only used by "ogre" or "savage" children, first in *Lore and Language* (95-96), and additionally in Iona Opie's *People on the Playground* (26). Such dismissal continued the tradition of normalizing "innocence" among children, and marking the display of any other kind of knowledge as pathological.

Of course, Freud and those who were to follow the thinking in his *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* wrote much to disrupt the Victorian hegemony of the innocence of the (middle-class) child, and there were folklorists influenced by his attempt to re-introduce the notion of childhood sexuality as normal, and

as requiring more study than silence.[3] Martha Wolfenstein's *Children's Humor: A Psychological Approach* is exemplary in its analytic approach to children's humor of all sorts, including the sexual and the scatological. Legman noted in 1979 that the number of folklorists actively collecting (and more importantly, finding publishers for) obscene materials from anyone, including children, had remained a steady trickle since the 1930s, especially in the United States and Britain. Now, in the 1990s, one can with relative ease find published collections of children's obscene lore, for example, parts of Simon Bronner's *American Children's Lore,* as well as Wendy Lowenstein's *Shocking, Shocking, Shocking: The Improper Play Rhymes of Australian Children.* Many of these published works lack analysis, and remain disembodied collections, with little sense of the purpose to which children would put such folklore. It should also be noted that many collections of obscene materials, both from children and adults, are the result of attempting to fill in the "holes" left by expurgated volumes printed earlier, as Randolph tried to do with his Ozark collections in *Roll Me in Your Arms.* With children's folklore, researchers are trying to balance the previous "lily-pure" picture given by earlier scholars, and in so doing produce volumes that actually exaggerate the existence of obscene children's lore in everyday practice. Publishing the materials in separate volumes highlights them in a way that is not true to the actual performance of the lore, which tends to be mixed, and highly dependent on intentions of performers, and context in which they are performing.

Such exaggeration can feed the fears of adults who continue, as most do in the United States and Britain, to hold to at least some extent the now middle-class ideal of the good child as an innocent child, and a good childhood as one that shields children from inappropriate experiences and materials. Such an ideal has an impact regardless of the economic class, in that it tends to be the middle and upper class who make and enforce the rules, and when those rules pertain to children and child welfare, the middleclass ideal of innocence is imposed upon everyone.

The censorship of children's folklore in print and in practice speaks as much to the adult need to protect themselves from the awareness that children are not and cannot be the ideal innocents so perfected in image by the Victorians. But as Michel Foucault

made clear with the case of sexuality, in *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction: Volume 1*, the silencing of the obscene (much of which was defined as such because of explicit references to sexuality, not coincidentally) in fact highlights its titillating appeal, for adults as well as children.

The individuals defining materials as rude are the adults, and they make these definitions known by silencing or censuring children who are "dirty" within adult earshot.[4] Children then take these definitions on amongst themselves, gasping in disbelief, disapproval, or (frequently) pleasure when one of their peers would come out with a joke or rhyme that, had adults heard, would elicit the usual adult response. This is a context-driven definition very much based on a "because we [the adults] say so" rationale regarding the nature of obscene materials. The *bourgeois* model of an innocent childhood could be seen in the expectations of many parents in Belfast, and in the precautions children took to make sure they were not caught being "improper" (and in the joy they took in disobeying the rules of propriety). It should be noted that what I am calling the Innocent Child model of behavior was not uniform, and was very dependent on class; children can be protected only insofar as the family can afford to, and if the child is needed for domestic work, such as childcare, doing the shopping, or even just taking care of themselves while their parents/grandparents are at work, then the adults are aware that children are more "exposed" by necessity, and are less uniformly condemnatory of obscenity and other "improper" behavior. In some cases, such behavior would be classed as "cheeky" or "bold" in a good way: the working class child needs that attitude to succeed in the economically and politically and socially hostile world outside (and sometimes even within) their own neighborhood/community.[5]

Sandra McCosh noticed while collecting jokes in schools in England and America that teachers uniformly censored kids who asked if they could tell "rude" jokes, but for a variety of reasons. One teacher in Leeds simply asserted that the kids "shouldn't know any" rude jokes (75), while a teacher in San Francisco was afraid that once the kids started, they wouldn't stop telling dirty jokes. This idea that kids would become uncontrollable once they were allowed to express dirty materials speaks eloquently of broader

adult fears concerning the need to control children, and in particular the fear of the potential for "other" children to get out of control. "Other" children are those of the other, whether it be class or race-based distinctions of otherness; teachers in Belfast, and often in America and England, are frequently from a community other than the one in which they taught (although this is changing somewhat) and so do not see the children they taught or the children's parents as necessarily members of the same community that they, the teachers, belonged to. This fear of uncontrollably "dirty" kids implies that the slope from rudeness to outright obscenity and beyond is a slippery one, nearly impossible to escape once embarked upon.

Additionally, these fears seem to point to an underlying assumption behind the Innocent Child model: if children are not made innocent through the efforts of adults around them, then they will become Bad Children, uncouth, antisocial, and even violent. There are, in fact, two related models of Childhood imbedded in Aries' discussion, and in contemporary popular concepts of the Child: the first, the innocent protected Child, is the ideal cleaved and aspired to, especially by those who can afford to shield their children from the "real world." It is incumbent on parents operating under this model to make sure their children are not exposed, or do not indulge in, behavior that does not fit this model of innocence. Therefore they censure kids who refer to sex or bodily functions, because they interpret such references as beginning the slide down the obscenity slope mentioned above. The second model, that of the uncontrollable, bad Child, is one frequently employed to discuss the problems with "other people's children." This is the case in many parts of the world with "street children" problems; the kids are stigmatized as inherently out of control and uncivilized, a contaminating influence on whoever they contact and wherever they live.[6] These "bad children" are the logical result of not protecting children, as well as justification for protecting children in the first place. What is missing from these complementary models is any sense of middle ground, any feeling that kids could, for instance, use "bad words" and still be worthwhile members of society, let alone children.[7] The fact is that kids, like most people, mix obscene, "bad" materials in with the rest of their everyday discourses. They just have to try and make sure they do it out of adult earshot, so as not to invite punishment.

Gender and Class in uses of Obscenity

There are clearly class differences regarding rudeness and the appropriateness of dirty words. The working-class parents I observed outside of school seemed to be more tolerant of cursing, so long as it wasn't directed at them, or seen to be intended as hurtful. Intentionality was far more important than just the bare fact of cursing, and so standards of behavior as far as obscenity (in terms of words, anyway) were more contextual, less absolute in the "children should never say that" way. Standards about other kinds of unacceptable behavior, including making fart noises, potty talk, and sectarian language, were also situational. I saw some adults simply ignore such things, if they did not feel it was directed at them, or if they saw no real harm in the activities. I also saw some adults use that behavior as an excuse to come down on a child who "had it coming," who had been acting up in more innocuous ways, and who was perhaps getting on their nerves, and so the obscenity was the last straw, and the adult wasn't prepared to overlook it. It is a more flexible approach to obscenity among children, one which actually gives the kids some credit for being capable of knowing when it is and is not appropriate, and to some extent lessening the hypocrisy of those adults who do use obscene language in their everyday speech practices. It also acknowledges that one cannot control one's kids' speech all of the time, and that being selective about the battles one has with them conserves precious energy needed to spend on the real problems and pleasures of life.

However, while it might have been more acceptable for the kids in the neighborhoods I was working in to be "obscene" by middle-class Belfast standards, it was still restricted by the potential for adult disapproval. Many kids were still learning and testing when and where they could get away with obscene language, in much the same way (and often at the same time) that they would test the limits of physical play, often dancing on the edge of verbal or physical violence, and sometimes going beyond it. When they did go beyond it, the kids were frequently pulled back, by peers as well as adults. Kids who were viciously physical or obscene with their peers were not played with as often, or were interacted with cautiously, and not with abandon.

Kids might also, in their uses of obscene language and images, have been rebelling against the hypocrisy of adults who used those very same words and phrases, but attempted to prohibit children from doing so. Such prohibition from adults was very gendered; most of the censure I witnessed came from women, and furthermore, girls tended to be scolded for such language more so than boys. This speaks to particular constructions of the masculine in working-class Belfast, where it is not only expected but more acceptable that men would curse and be crude. This is not to say that women didn't similarly indulge, only that public perceptions of who could do so "acceptably" were strikingly split. This model is also particularly class-specific, where in the working class, it is more accepted that women do indulge in such behavior, while middle or upper-class women would not do so, for fear of seeming "lower class." Again, the ideal model of gender behavior is class-situated, so that even if working class women actually accept it far more amongst themselves, they are still aware of the abstract potential for censure from the middle and upper class establishment-whether or not they change their behavior because of the potential censure is an individual matter.

One would also hear girls scold each other and their male peers, far more than boys ever would, for obscenity. In my experience, boys rarely threatened to tell an adult about a peer's obscene conduct, even if they were not friends. Younger boys (under the age of 6, for the most part), did appear to be more likely to report obscenity. I was frequently used in attempts to get others in trouble, when boys would run up and tell me "So and so said a bad word!" The minute I asked them (as I tried to do consistently), "Which one?" the tattlers knew I was a lost cause as an authority figure. Frequently they would start to say the word, and then catch themselves, shooting me a startled and cross look as they went in search of a more effective authority figure. Girls of all ages, on the other hand, would police each other far more vigilantly, even if sometimes it was only in play; they would threaten to tell, playfully, and so highlight the naughtiness of the just-uttered joke or word.

Definitions of Dirt

For the kids I met in Belfast, the awareness of potential adult censure was enough to make most uses of obscenity self-consciously

rebellious acts. The older kids, especially boys around the age of 11, seemed to have a less self-conscious attitude towards cursing—while they were still very self-conscious about sexual matters. This may be related to the rather unself-conscious cursing that many adults in Belfast appeared to engage in, and could reflect the growing conception that the boys (and some girls) have of themselves as near-adults, even at the relatively young age of 11 or 12.

What then counts as forbidden or rude materials? By whose standards are materials proclaimed as such, and do these definitions always hold true? In her collection of children's jokes in the U.K. and the U.S., Sandra McCosh included all "dirty or 'rude' jokes" under the analytic category of "sex, " which for her included "actual or implied reference to the physical relationship between men and women; parts of the body, both male and female; swear words or dirty words; and bodily functions, such as going to the toilet (75)." She based this definition on children's attitudes towards the joke, and I agree that this is the most effective way of ascertaining the level of rudeness that the kids are engaging in. If they perceive the materials to be forbidden, then they are. However circular that definition may be, it is certainly a relevant one to the kids, who know how to classify materials like jokes based on the reaction of those around them, including peers and adults. McCosh notes that the younger children, from about 6 to 8 years of age, she collected from tended to indulge more often in jokes concerning bodily functions, especially toilet jokes, while the older kids, starting at about 9 and for her sample, through the age of 12 or 13, tended to tell what she names "actual" sexual jokes.

I define "dirty" materials, for the purposes of this discussion, as either language or subject matter considered by adults to be unacceptable, rude, or even wicked for children (and in some cases, depending on the social context, for adults). This includes curse words, the most popular of which were "fuck" and "shit," references to undergarments and sex, and references to other bodily functions, especially excretory ones. The materials were frequently marked by the kids themselves as "dirty," either in exclamations about another's joke ("Oh, that's a dirty one!"), or in a warning phrase before a joke was told ("This one's dirty"). Some of their "catches" played with the notion of "the dirty," especially the following:

> Wanna hear a dirty joke?
> A man fell in the mud.
> Wanna hear a clean one?
> He got washed.[8]

The above teases the audience with the teller's knowledge that his or her audience *does* want to hear the dirty joke, and then further teases with a very literal punchline. It indicates the teller's knowledge of the attraction of truly dirty materials, both for him or herself, as well as for their audience.

My consideration of rude materials on the playground is one that I hope makes clear the integral nature of materials considered improper or forbidden by adults within the traditions of children. They use "dirt" in very measured ways, for very particular purposes, and not simply because they know adults don't want them to-although that is certainly part of it.

At what point do materials used by children cease, if ever, to become dirty, and segue into the realm of acceptable? It is possible that such materials, because the joy taken in expressing them is so tied to the awareness of an abstract adult disapproval, that it would be singularly dissatisfying to ever move rude materials into the realm of the acceptable.[9] Their very forbidden nature is what makes the jokes, rhymes, and isolated words and exclamations, so very attractive, and so particularly useful as well. In some cases, they were used to mark and question my own status. I encountered most such marking early in my field season, when I was still being introduced to the students, and when they were still unsure about my status on their playgrounds. I was, clearly, not a "kid", not one of them. So was I a supervisor? Was I a teacher? If I was none of those, what was I, anyway? In addition to direct questions—of which there were many—the children at all of the schools tended to employ jokes and very measured uses of rudeness as a way of gauging my status.

Concealing Dirt in the Schools

The sensitivity of the kids to their uses of dirty materials may in fact be far more related to their awareness of the requirements of the institutional setting (the school), rather than their adherence to some far more abstract notion of innocence perpetuated by

middle-class notions of a proper childhood. The two are not unrelated, however, as the schools' ethos, especially surrounding that of the place of children in society, is directly informed by such middle-class notions, regardless of the class identity of the kids within the school. One game perfectly mocked this sense of propriety: at both C.S.2 and I.S. I observed kids playing "Sorry," wherein the players deliberately run into each other, almost but not quite knocking other players over. Each time they knock into someone, the players call, "Sorry!"—often in whining, insincere tones of voice.[10] The message of the game appeared to be that so long as one held to social conventions and appearances, however insincerely, one's rude, actual behavior could become acceptable.

As with the rigidity of gender separation on the playground, described in Barrie Thorne's *Gender Play* as well as in Derek Van Rheenen's article "Boys Who Play Hopscotch," the apparently strict awareness of what is "proper" behavior on the playground may fade once off school grounds, both among kids on their own, as well as among kids and parents. This would go a long way towards explaining why, away from school, I witnessed parents tolerating and even encouraging some kinds of language and behavior that on the playground was instantly censured. The parents were aware of what was "proper" for particular contexts, and were enforcing this sense of propriety when appropriate. In many cases, kids who violated that propriety on the playground did not do so out of ignorance, but rather did so in a very deliberate and calculated way, as a part of their continuing evaluation of the loyalty of their peers, and of the actual rigidity of the boundary that separated the acceptable behavior of adult and child.[11]

One strategy for walking that fine behavioral line was the use of several different versions of the same rhyme within a given child's repertoire. Most notably, the knowledge and use of a "G-rated" version in place of an "R-rated" version allows reference to the forbidden material without actually saying it. Some 6 and 7 year old girls at C.S.2 gave me this counting out rhyme:

Ip Dip[12]
Dog Shit
You aren't on It
Everyone But You
You aren't on It

But one girl at C.S.1 had a censored version that still allowed her to indulge in the imagery of dog excrement, without saying a completely forbidden word:

> Ip Dip, Dog's Dirt [etc.].

A cognate, and much milder version of the two rhymes above,
also collected from C.S.2, went as follows:

> Ip Dip Dip
> My little ship
> Sailed down the alleyway
> And you aren't On It

This last version was used quite frequently, especially during the early months of my fieldwork, and I continued to collect it at the larger schools, especially I.S., where not all of the kids knew me well, or were very comfortable in my presence. The rude versions were said in situations where either the kids did not know I was around (in which case they acted horrified when they realized I'd just taped them), or knew me well enough not to care that I was hearing them say those words. For example, at P.S.2, two five-year old girls counted out to "Ip Dip Dog Shit," but while I was listening, the first time they did it, the girl doing the counting out simply fell silent at the place where the dirty word belonged. After the first rendition, she actually said the word "shit," perhaps confident in my lack of censure after the first round.[13]

Some counting out is done in complete silence, with the child doing the counting out saying the rhyme to themselves as the rest of them count along, keeping track of who should be out. You can tell that the others do keep track, because occasionally there would be disputes about who should "really" be out. The "silent performance" of a counting out rhyme allows for "closet" rudeness, where all know that the forbidden rhyme is being used, because it is "called" beforehand (e.g., "Ip Dip!"), and so can enjoy the knowledge that they are violating adult interdictions even while they are protected by their overt silence.

Among the Peer Group: **Rudeness** as a **Means of Testing Loyalty**

As I witnessed this process of assessing tolerance for the forbidden as applied to me, I began to realize that they applied this to each other, as well. Kids regularly used rude materials as a sort of test, not just of me, but of their peers, as a way of determining who was more loyal to their friends, and to children's notions of conduct and propriety, than to abstract adult standards of same.

Many issues of belonging and identity are invested in who one's age mates are, and how loyal they are. Loyalty to friends is expressed in a variety of ways, including tolerating (and not interrupting) particular jokes, or, alternately, tolerating someone's interruption of their joke, and even accepting corrections (or at least, accommodating them). It is also expressed in a toleration of rudeness, and very specifically, in not reporting it to adults in authority. In telling me dirty jokes (starting at a low level and progressing a higher level), they were assessing my trustworthiness, and therefore my eligibility to be included in some way in the group.

For instance, invariably, at every school, the first even slightly-off color joke I was told was the following:

> Knock knock
> [who's there?]
> Bear
> [bear who?]
> Bare bum!

Generally this joke would come after one or two "why did the x cross the road" jokes, or some other equally innocuous piece. My reaction to the "bare bum" joke was inevitably closely scrutinized, and when I encouraged them to tell more, the kids would usually continue, not necessarily immediately following with an even more off-color joke, but usually throwing one or two into the subsequent mix.

And no wonder they were curious how I would react. The joke is actually quite provocative. One P4 girl at C.S.1 followed her performance of "bare bum" with:

Knock knock
[who's there?]
Bear
[bear who?]
Bare Clare!

In making herself bare as a part of the punchline, Clare revealed, so to speak, that the bum in the original joke is not just anyone's behind, but is in fact that of the joke-teller. The joke allows the teller to (in American argot) "moon" the listener without actually doing so, a masterful substitution of words for action.[14]

They did the same among their peers. In a "joking relationship," as traditionally defined by anthropologists,[15] individuals tolerate impropriety within the frame of play, as defined by Gregory Bateson, as an expression of trust. While peer groups were predominantly age groups, they were also cross-cut by gender. Therefore, if a girl wanted to emphasize her difference from boys, she might exaggeratedly disapprove of their fart jokes as "disgusting." If she wanted to emphasize how much older she was than a group of boys and girls, she might do the same; or, she might even bewilder or impress them by upping the ante from toilet humor to sexual references.

Sometimes the testing incorporated a catch question as well as some kind of dirty reference. For instance, an ll-year old boy at P.S.2 asked me:

What do you call a wee man made out of cement?
A wee hard man

He then moved on to:

Knock Knock
DML: Who's there?
Bear
DML: Bear who?
Bare bum. [giggles]

And for the finale:

Guess what?
DML: What?
You guessed

As I was laughing, the boy exclaimed, "This is cracker!" meaning, "this is great," and I tried to get him to say even more jokes by telling him I knew he was "full of them." The above exchange shows him testing me, seeing how I will react to the mild dirtiness of the bare bum joke and then catching me with the "you guessed" joke. He shows his pleasure with "this is cracker," which might be an indication that he's pleased with my positive reaction, or lack of a negative one; I laughed, rather than scolding him for tricking me, or for mentioning bare bums.

Catch questions like "Guess What" were frequently used by boys to mark the boundary of an in-group from an out-group.[16] The person caught in the catch is made to appear to say, do, or be something embarrassing. Those who fall for the catch could be: 1) not in the age group of the person executing the catch, 2) not in the peer group of the person executing the catch, or 3) actually in the peer group, but the person "catching" you is "only messing," and in so doing, is emphasizing your friendship. The third option is seldom the case, because if you are firmly a member, you do not fall for the catch-primarily because it is not done to you in the first place. A more likely scenario is that you learn the catch from witnessing a member of your in-group doing it to a non-member.

Children's rules for appropriate behavior-much like those employed among adults-are not hard and fast, but rather are guidelines that allow kids to use language in fluid, complex ways to suit their own purposes, and not just that of the adults in their world. It is because the rules are variable and context-dependent that kids relied on a "testing" strategy to evaluate a person's trustworthiness. In my experience, children would seldom come right out and be rude first thing. They went, as a rule, through very measured stages of evaluation, observing my reaction to mildly risqué material before escalating to something more explicit. For instance, "Cinderella" was an immensely popular skipping rhyme at P.S.1, and the versions I invariably heard on the playground were some variety of:

Cinderella
Dressed in Yellow
Went upstairs to see her fellow
How many kisses did she give him?
1,2,3

This was an extremely popular rhyme, not least in part because of the reference to kissing, which is assumed to be engaged in by the skipper. The more skips the skipper successfully carries out, the more kisses she "gives," making the truly skilled skippers into extremely experienced "kissers" in one fell swoop. The embarrassment of being a "kisser" thus tempers the joy in skipping, and might even discourage some skippers from monopolizing the rope. Those waiting their turn to skip frequently sing along, which allows them to enjoy the potential discomfort of the current skipper/kisser.

One day, a couple of months into my field season, I was taping the a group of P5 girls "cold," that is, taping them singing without them skipping, and one girl, Amy, led the group into the following version:

Cinderella Dressed in Yellow
Went upstairs to Kiss her Fellow
When she came down
Her knickers Busted
How many people were disgusted

I had never heard this version before, but the rest of the girls clearly had, and were initially quite giggly and nervous that Amy had chosen to sing it for me. I asked them to repeat it for the tape, however, and with that all of the girls chipped in singing, quite loudly.[17] The sexual nature of Cinderella's actions (resulting in her "knickers busting") was what both attracted the girls to the rhyme and made it such a risky thing to chant in the presence of a real adult—that is, one who would punish them for uttering it in the first place. While I did have that potential power, I had never exercised it. I had successfully made the transition, distancing myself from "'real" adults, and becoming a fit, potentially appreciative audience for the rhyme.

Much later in the year, at I.S., a small group of P3 girls were skipping, and one girl in particular, Kira, insisted that I record the following version of Cinderella. I had already recorded the "usual" version, the first one listed above, many times at this school.

Cinderella Dressed in Blue[18]
went upstairs to do a poo

how many poos did she do?
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20

These much younger girls had hit upon a particularly rich vein of adult disapproval—any mention of excretory functions, in particular "doing a poo," but also including farting, or making fart noises. The girls who chanted this rhyme were particularly pleased that Kira managed to skip as high as twenty times, maximizing the number of "poos" they could refer to in the rhyme. Notice as well that the obscenity for the younger children, in this case about six years old, concerned excretory functions, while the older children, eight or nine years for the ones who sang the "knickers busted" version, are using sexual images.

Where there was no gradual buildup to outright dirtiness, it was because I asked for it first thing. The only time I did this in my fieldwork was when I specified to the kids that I wanted "rude Christmas carols." These were almost inevitably parodies of Jingle Bells,[19] and I had discovered that if I did not specify that I wanted the rude ones, that I would be left with several minutes worth of the regular Christmas carol on my tapes. Direct inquiry yielded songs such as the following, from I.S.

Jingle Bells, Jingle Bells
Joker smells a thousand miles away
He let a fart
Behind the cart
And blew up the IRA.

This is rude not only because of the mention of farting, but also because of the reference to the IRA. I collected this Christmas parody from Protestant, Catholic, and Integrated school pupils, all of whom appeared delighted to be singing about farting *and* blowing up the IRA, a lethally funny combination of forbidden subjects: bodily functions and sectarian violence. Children were not supposed to mention the paramilitary organizations around adults, and were often shushed for doing so in my presence. After that rendition, which is a combination of the parody involving Batman and the one involving Santa Claus, several kids[20] remembered that they knew that one, so I got a group version:

Jingle Bells
Santa Smells
A hundred miles away
Let a fart
Behind the cart
And blew up the IRA—Ho!

Similar stuff was to be had at C.S.2, from some of the older girls, ranging in age from 9 to 11:

Jingle Bells
Santa smells
A thousand miles away
Let a fart
Behind the cart
And blew up the IRA!

The only non-Jingle Bells parody I collected was the following, from C.S.2, sung right after a version of "Jingle Bells, Batman Smells," and was probably inspired by the reference to farting:

The Addams Family started[21]
When Uncle Fester farted
He farted through the keyhole
And
Par-al-ysed the cat
The cat got all excited
And shouted, "Man United"[22]
And Man United Shouted
"The Addams Family!"
Duh deh deh DEH
thpph thppph[two farting noises]
Duh deh deh DEH
thpph thppph[mad giggling at all this farting noise]
Duh deh deh DEH
Duh deh deh DEH
Duh deh deh DEH
thpph thppph

Much could be said here about the image of Uncle Fester "starting" the family by farting, reminiscent of Freudian theories of male appropriation of birth through images of defecation, as

has been discussed by Alan Dundes in his article "Couvade in Genesis," but in this particular performance of the rude song, what were clearly most important at the time were all of the farting noises, which inspired gales of giggles and laughter, and were so much fun that the girls had no hesitation at all in repeating the song for me, so that I might capture it on tape. Once it was recorded, the girls insisted that I play it back for them, and they thoroughly enjoyed hearing—and occasionally sang along with—their voices on tape.

At C.S.1 I frequently held "recording sessions" with a particular group of P4 girls who, once they figured out I wanted to hear from them, were happy to provide me with materials. The girls would crowd around me and my tape recorder, and would often simply sing or chant the rhymes. It was evident that it was far easier for them to remember the words to counting out and clapping rhymes if they were actually doing the counting out or clapping, and so I would encourage them to "say it like you're doing it," if their memory failed them as I was taping them "cold." A series of materials they gave me in November, still fairly early in my field season, began with a counting out rhyme containing no risqué material.

> One potato, two potato, three potato four[23]
> five potato, six potato, seven potato more
> [This] spud's OUT!

The next volunteer ("Can I say one?") proceeded to a rhyme wherein the main character has her "knickers [underwear] in the air and her jumper [sweater] inside out," suggesting improper if not outright obscene behavior. The performer initially forgot how the entire rhyme goes, but clearly remembers the important part, that of the knickers being in the air. A nearby friend took over the recitation of the rhyme. For these girls, the part of the rhyme that made them giggle appeared to be the very mention of the word "knickers," and not so much the implied situation that would have resulted in the knickers being in the air in the first place. Again, the mere mention of bodies, especially those improperly exposed, or engaged in private and often gross functions, was plenty amusing for these younger children.

There is a party on the hill
would you like to come?
[Yes]
{pause}. . . with your knickers in the air. . .
{interruption} [No!]
{someone else takes over}
There's a party on the hill
would you like to come?
[Yes]
Who's your very best chum?
[Martina]
Martina will be there
with her knickers in the air
and her jumper in-side- OUT[24]

A series of knock knock jokes was started at this point, and towards the end, one girl then told the following knock knock joke.

Knock Knock
[who's there?]
Paddy
[Paddy Who?]
Paddy Irishman

This joke signals a whole new turn in the joke telling, which led to a series of Paddy jokes, three in all They go from mild to rude, with the last one actually having the word "shit" in it. A different girl starts the series with a Paddy Irishman, Paddy Englishman and Paddy Scotsman joke:

> Paddy Irishman, Paddy Scottishman and Paddy Englishman were in this big haunted house. And they were starving, and Paddy Irishman went down intil the kitchen, and he—he went til the cupboards and he got a cup of tea, right, and he was looking in the fridge and he sees a big thick slice in the fridge and he…and he hears this voice, {makes her voice deep} "I told you once I told you twice I told you thirty times not to eat that thick slice."

This is an unfinished joke, cognate with several others I collected involving a ghost protecting something, usually food or money, that the various characters want.[25] The last character to go in and

try for the object is usually the one to get it. This joke speaks to a desire to ignore edicts about what you can and cannot have-adult restrictions on children's desires-and allows for that desire to be satisfied within the joke, with the usual punch line allowing the final protagonist to get away with the desired object. In this version of the joke, however, the teller leaves us with the edict "not to eat that thick slice" unchallenged by any of the characters, perhaps indicating less conviction about the possibility of defying such a command from a figure of authority.

Another girl joined in the session with the following contribution:

> Paddy Englishman Paddy Scotchman and Paddy Irishman were all in a haunted house and they brought guns and that and they heard somebody go "Whoooo Whoooo!" And one of them shooting and banged the door open and went and knocked the door in 'hi the toilet and there's a wee girl in there picking her nose going, "Whooo Whoooo!" [the teller mimics the blissful smile the girl in the joke would have had].[26]

This joke maintains the thematic thread of the "Three Paddys in a Haunted House," but introduces the mention of a rude action—picking one's nose, and furthermore, enjoying it. The girl telling the joke was explicit both in tone of voice and in expression that the girl in the joke was having a wonderful time both picking her nose, and perhaps in scaring the three (adult) Paddys, who were probably expecting a ghost.

The end of this short session was the following:

> Paddy Irishman, Paddy Englishman, and Paddy Scotchman were all on this flying carpet, right? Whatever they wished for they got. And Paddy Irishman wished for a pot. . . Paddy Englishman [she gets help here—"Wished for a pot of gold!" teller says "No," the corrector says, "He did!" So I say to let her tell the joke her way for now.] Paddy Englishman wished for a big thing of. . . you know. . . pot of [corrector says, "Money!"]. . . GOLD. Paddy Scotchman wished for a big bottle of Scotch. And Paddy Irishman, didn't know what to wish for, and he tripped and said, "Shit" and landed in a big pile of shit."

The theme has shifted again here; this is still a Paddy joke, but it belongs to the set of jokes involving wishes[27] The joke was hurriedly told, and to some extent "by committee," with help from the audience, indicating a desire to get to the punchline, which contains not only the word "shit," twice, but the terribly funny image of Paddy Irishman landing in a big pile of it. Not only does the joke itself violate adult standards of proper children's conduct, but the image of landing in a pile of shit runs rather contrary to adult admonitions, regularly heard on the playground, not to get dirty, to be careful with one's clothes, etc. These jokes were told in November, and while it rains frequently throughout the year in Northern Ireland, it is particularly rainy in the winter, and supervisors at this school and at others had been particularly vigilant about not letting the students into the grassy areas near the playgrounds, so that they would not get muddy.

This was a very long session, involving rhymes, jokes, and songs, and I had been extremely careful not to act shocked or disapproving of any of the materials they gave me, so as to make the girls feel at ease. Just as the bell was about to ring for them to return to class, some of the girls wanted to give me "A funny song," and a large group of them sang very loudly:

Mummy Mummy Mummy!
There's something in my nappie
It's big and brown
I can't sit down
And if I sit and squash it
You will have to wash it
It's not a joke
The washing machine's broke
There is no soap
My dolly's head's broke.

This song is funny because of the reference to shit-filled diapers, the "big and brown" "something in my nappie." It is also an exercise in control, with the child, in the nappie, lording over the mother the fact that "if I sit and squash it, you will have to wash it." The seriousness of that threat is exacerbated by the apparent poverty, or at least temporary down and out status, of their situation. "The washing machine's broke, there is no soap, my dolly's

head's broke" can be read not just as a statement of the way things are, but as a protest by the child of the conditions in which she has to live. She is clearly blaming the parent-in this case, the mother-for the situation, and is threatening to make it worse if it doesn't get better.

The issues of control over adults implicit in the text of this song were accompanied by the sense of control that the girls were clearly reveling in while they were singing this very rude song, very loudly, while standing in their classroom, traditionally the site where they are most assuredly not supposed to be singing rude songs. The performance was a triumph over perceived limits set by adult sensibilities, and an expression of solidarity amongst the girls against those who would censor them.

Children Challenging Adults

There is a distinct discourse within rude jokes concerning challenging authority, as embodied in a variety of different adult characters. The challenge comes not just the act of telling an inappropriate joke, but in the texts of the jokes themselves. Occasionally the jokes were relatively subtle, as was the case with one told by Carly, a 10 year old at P.S.2. She had been listening to a series of jokes told by 10 and 11 year old boys, and joined in at the level of obscenity that the boys had worked up to, after they had walked away for a few minutes.

> Right, Paddys Englishman, Paddy Scotchman, Paddys Irishman, seen this devil. So [laughs], Paddys Englishman goes, I betcha I can sit in his hand for 10 seconds. He goes, 1, 2, and then he jumps off. Then he goes, I'm away for a cold bath, because it was warm. Then he runs off, comes back, Paddys Englishman [sic], Paddy—said, I bet I can sit on it for 10 seconds, so he goes, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, and then *he* jumps off and says, I'm away for a cold bath. And so he goes into the cold bath and comes back again. Paddy Scotchman says, I'll be able to do it, so he got on, and he goes, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, and got off. Here they were, how'd you do that? And here he was, Chocolate melts in your ha—no, Chocolate melts in your mouth, not in your hand. [repeats it for my benefit, and to make the punch line that she nearly messed up more clear] Chocolate melts in your mouth, not in your hand.[28]

The listener has to think about the fact that the "chocolate" in the punch line is actually excrement.[29] That combined with the famous M&M's slogan, "melts in your mouth, not in your hands,"[30] allows Carly to indulge in a very round about way in the image of someone eating shit. At the very least, the joke involves someone who takes a shit in the hand of a devil, perhaps even The Devil, a powerful image indeed. Carly knows it is not obvious, and because I had a previous record of not always understanding their jokes on the first try, she "explained" the punch line to me by repeating it.

Jokes involving rude names for the main characters reveal a great deal about children's perceptions of hypocrisy in a social world that does not allow them to participate in the dirty discourses that they can clearly witness adults engaging in. It is indicated in the following pair of jokes told to me by a small group of P7 girls at C.S.1.

> Annie: Right, there was these three people, called Shutup, Manners, and [someone prompts her, "Dog's Dirt,"] Dog's Dirt, right? They were all walking along, and then Dog's Dirt falls down the hole, and then the policeman comes over, and then Manners goes to pick him up, and then here he goes—
> [her friend interrupts]—no, you go like this, he picks him up and then walks on, and then this policeman comes up, and he goes, what's your name, and he says, Shutup, and then the man goes, the policeman goes, I'll ask you again, what's your name, and he says [with more emphasis] Shutup! And then he says, where's your Manners, and then Shutup says, um, down the hole, picking up Dog's Dirt.[31]
> [laughs]
> DML: And where did you learn that one?
> Annie: [someone] told me it.
> Mary: Right this jokes called Sit down, Dick out, Pee in the Corner
> [shocked laughter]
> Mary: Right. [there were three kids. . .] one called Sit, one called Dick, and one called Pee, right, and they were all in school, and they were all throwing papers at each other and being mad, and the teacher comes in, and goes, right, Sit Down, Dick Out, Pee in the Corner!
> [some silence]
> Pee in the corner! [for emphasis]

On the face of it, the kids seemed to enjoy telling these jokes because they provided the opportunity to engage in forbidden, obscene language, and to make their peers laugh simply for that reason. The girls described the jokes to me as "dirty," and they were learned in this case (I found out later) from an older, male cousin. But a closer look at their content reveals further elements that may feed kids' interest in and enjoyment of these narratives. In the first joke, the policeman, a convenient symbol for parental authority, questions the children about what they are doing, and is rewarded by what could be interpreted as a string of obscene words and images, that is, the children's answer. However, that string of words is also a very accurate description of what is going on. Herein lies the children's dilemma. When asked, they are perfectly capable of representing the world as they know it, warts and all. Frequently, however, the adults in their world either do not know or do not want to know about this level of awareness among their children. For a child to rupture this parental illusion is to invite a variety of potential punishments, from simple silencing ("You mustn't say that"), to actual censure ("You're a bad girl for saying that"), and occasionally physical reprimands or threats ("You say that again and I'll give you a smack."). In the jokes above, however, the adult is never allowed to punish the children; the joke ends before that is possible, and the punch line is the child getting to say what is really going on.

In the second joke, the adult, this time a teacher, is forced to be obscene when she punishes the children, Dick and Pee. In engaging in an activity that usually warrants punishing (saying obscene words or phrases), while in the act of punishing, the teacher reveals herself to be like many adults who tell children to do one thing while they themselves do another.

The jokes that kids tell are told in very particular contexts, usually within a body of other jokes, and the sequences that build up are especially revealing. In one session, at P.S.2, girls segued smoothly from telling jokes about big phones (adults) telling wee phones (children) what to do, to a mildly obscene knock knock joke, therefore doing and saying something that probably wouldn't be approved of by an adult, inspired by the prior jokes concerning older figures forbidding younger ones from doing things. Older boys at P.S.2, during the same session, continually upped the rude

ness ante with each successive joke, building on the jokes told before, and clearly inspired by them, too. This sequence of jokes also reveals the implicit association of the violent with the dirty, a theme I will return to later on.

One finds frequent representations in jokes and rhymes of older/bigger people/objects telling younger/smaller people/objects what to do. The following two Wellerism jokes are about "big and wee" conversations.[32] They were told to me in the context of an extended joke telling session with a number of kids, ranging in age from 8 to 11, at P.S.2, after school. William and Mike floated in and out of the session, as they were frequently distracted by the indoor football game that was happening nearby.

> William: What did the wee [his cousin Mike cuts in, and they both say] What did the big chimney say to the wee chimney?
> DML: What?
> Both: You're too young to smoke.
> William: [fast on the heels of the last punchline]: What did the big phone say to the wee phone?
> [he answers himself] You're too young to get engaged!

These jokes reference notions of what you should do (I knew at least one of the boys telling the chimney joke to smoke regularly), and being told that by adults (the big chimney, etc.), told in the face of what they actually do—smoke, act as though they are "engaged" –or at least, sexually active (or acting as though they are). These jokes also invoke adults saying that children shouldn't do things that they (the adults) themselves clearly do. The chimney is a thing that by definition smokes, the phone is a thing that by definition becomes engaged (in use); the implication of the characters in these jokes is that they are going to, and indeed have to, do precisely what they are told not to. This is more than simple resistance, but a complex representation of a certain sense of inevitability held by both parents and children: people in Northern Ireland do have families (if not get engaged) young, they do smoke,[33] also starting quite young. In so doing they are reproducing their own parents' patterns of behavior, something that makes it that much more difficult for a parent to condemn the behavior, however much they might wish their children would do differently.

Ambivalence and concern about authority are displayed particularly well in a series of jokes about doctors. When told by adults, they undoubtedly plug into a series of anxieties around health, the authority of doctors, and the National Health system, but with children there is additional resonance in the fact that doctors are another kind of adult, telling them what to do.[34]

Doctor Doctor, everyone thinks I'm a liar[35]
I don't believe ya'

Doctor Doctor, I can't get to sleep at night.
Well, lie at the edge of the bed, and you'll soon fall off.

Doctor Doctor, I feel like a pair of curtains.
Pull yourself together!

Doctor Doctor, I feel like I'm invisible.[36]
Next, please!

Doctor Doctor, I feel like a dog.
How long have you felt like this?
Since I was a puppy.

Doctor, Doctor, I feel like a bridge.
What's come over you lately?
Two trucks and a car.

There was this man who went to the doctor's, and he said, "Doctor, Doctor, I keep fartin' and I'm stinkin'!" The Doctor goes out and comes back with a pole with a hook on it, and the man says, "Doctor, Doctor, what's that for?"
"T'open a window, you're stinkin'!"[37]

Frances: Doctor, Doctor, I feel like a deck of cards.[38]
Shut up and I'll deal with you later.

Doctor Doctor I feel like a spoon.
Sit down and don't stir.

Note that the Doctor's responses are singularly unhelpful. The patient (child) is asking for help for frequently serious conditions,

some social, some physical-not being able to sleep, being stigmatized as a liar, smelling awful because of uncontrollable flatulence-but the doctor (adult) is flippant and uncaring, making a joke at the patient's expense. In several of the jokes, the patient/child likens themselves to an inanimate object-a pack of cards, a bridge-something to be played with or run over by cars, a thing without agency, without exercisable power. The Doctor/adult answers with a line confirming the patient/child's initial feeling: "I'll deal with you later," to the pack of cards. While the laughter generated by the joke is frequently at the patient's expense, occasionally the joke does seem as if the patient is getting back at the doctor, as in the case of the patient who feels like a dog, and has done since he "was a puppy." The doctor looks foolish here: if he had been thinking, of course, he would have known that the patient who is a dog now would have been a puppy when young.

The unhelpful advice from the doctor is in contrast to the advice given in the following rhyme, which was used in this case as a counting-out rhyme. The kids are directing advice and sanctions of their own to adults, and even seem to be assuming the voice of a doctor.

> Put your fags in the box sir[39]
> Yes sir
> Let me hear you cough sir
> [cough cough]
> Very bad indeed, sir
> And you are not on it for the rest of the game.

Here the child performing the counting out rhyme takes over the role of doctor, and the reference to "Sir" indicates an adult is being addressed. The doctor appears to be giving "Sir" a physical; the "let me hear you cough" line suggests the "turn your head and cough" portion of a male physical, wherein the testicles are held by the doctor; for the purposes of the rhyme, this gives the child/doctor even more power over "Sir"/the adult.[40] At the end of the counting out, the person identified as the smoking adult is not on it for the game. The child thus gets to put the adult in his place, controlling "him" physically, and judging "him" (I observed this counting out rhyme as performed by girls), and not only for the unhealthy practice of smoking. Ultimate playground power is finally exercised by not allowing "Sir" to play the game.

Persistent Association Of Rudeness With Violence

Contrary to the argument presented by G. Legman in his introduction to Sandra McCosh's work, the association of obscenity with violence is in the kids' performances of folk materials; this is not just an adult injection of violence as a substitute for sex, as Legman suggests, but an actual association made by the children, most often in their following a sexual piece with a violent one during a performance, or vice versa. The kids I observed were fairly consistent in following an obscene reference with a violent one. For example, the C.S.2 version of "Ip Dip Dog Shit" (cf. above) was swiftly followed by a version of:

My mummy and Your mummy[41]
Were hanging out the clothes

My mummy hit your mummy
A punch on the nose
What color was the blood?
[the person picked says:] Red
R-E-D spells Red
And you are not on It
For the Rest of the Game

Violent and dirty references were also occasionally united in the same piece of folklore. For example, the following was sung' by a large group of girls at C.S.2. The giggling when they say "underpants" indicates that they know they're not supposed to be saying anything about it, but they can do it in groups and it will be safer.

My boyfriend gave me an apple[42]
My boyfriend gave me a pear
My boyfriend gave me a [kiss noises, hand to mouth as if blowing
a kiss, three times]
And he kicked me down the stairs
[I kicked him]
1 kicked him over London
1 kicked him over France
1 kicked him over U-S-A

And he lost his underpants! [giggles]
I made him do the dishes
I made him do the floor
I made him do the baby's bum
And I kicked him out the door!

Starting after "underpants," the two P3s who started the rhyme were joined in their singing by 5-6 other girls, who lent their voices—loudly!—to the last part of the rhyme, even though they were not clapping. There was also some dispute over whether the boyfriend was doing the kicking, or being kicked (indicated in brackets, above); some girls sang one version, and some sang the other. The version where the girl is kicking her boyfriend took over at the next line.

Also at C.S.1, the girls sang the following parody right after their lusty rendition of "Mummy Mummy Mummy," (cf. above) just as the bell was ringing for them to return to class activities. The fact that it concerns a television show, "Barney and Friends," that is explicitly intended for children,[43] and is insistent in its emphasis on love and sharing, makes the parody even more striking in the mouths of the very children supposedly targeted by the show.

I hate you[44]
You hate me
Let's get together and kill Barney
With a big axe through Barney's Head
Aren't you glad that Barney's dead?

On the surface, I think that this association is in the folklore, and made by the kids in their performance of the materials, because obscenity and violence are clearly things not approved by adults for children. If they are going to indulge in one, it is a small enough leap to indulge in the other as well. On a deeper level, I think that obscenity and violence, while perceived by the adults in their society as dangerous and anti-social, are being used by the kids as a kind of social glue. Those who choose to participate in the obscene or violent moments, in word or in deed, are united in their shared defiance of adult edicts concerning appropriate thoughts and behavior.

This is not unique to children, of course. Violence within the frame of play is frequently cited as an arena for male bonding in

Western European societies; in Northern Ireland, as in much of Europe and in the United States, this occurs at football, rugby, and other team sporting events. Using casual obscenity among friends is a way of indicating your level of comfort with them, and is characteristic of the "joking relationship" much cited by anthropologists in their descriptions of behavioral roles and expectations, especially among family members. So in one sense, children are no different from adults; they indulge in obscene and play-violent behavior as a way of bonding with particular groups of friends. On the other hand, they are still learning just where the boundaries of obscenity and unacceptable violence lay, and the variable nature of standards of obscenity, depending very much on social context. It is in the testing of these boundaries and standards within the frame of play that we can see that learning process taking place. I observed cases on every playground where the play violence shaded into actual violence; the nearly universal condemnation of such a shift by the kids who observed and were victimized by it speaks to the consensus among children that play violence is, in fact, "only playing." They know the minute it stops being "play," and when it becomes unacceptable.

Perhaps what disturbs adults the most is the revelation in their folklore of potentially violent behavior in children, especially boys. Adult concerns about children engaging in violent acts came out in the complaints of a group of playground supervisors at P.S.1; they were all mothers with children at the school. They remarked about the older boys, that "all they ever do is fight" if they don't have a football to play with. Even then, the suggestion was made that boys would fight over football games if the supervisors did not intervene. While I did see conflict over scoring and rules among the older (P6-P7, mostly) boys at P.S.1, the most violent conflicts I saw were a result of interactions between the supervisors and the kids themselves. When one supervisor took a child out of play, and the child resented the reasons (or simply resented being taken out in the first place), that kid would frequently re-enter the game, against the commands of the supervisors, thus generating a verbal tug of war that frequently ended in the kid being banned from playing at all. That kid would then act up on the sidelines, throwing things at those still allowed to play, in protest. Many times, adult worries about violence, and a reluctance to let the kids work

it out for themselves because they perceive the kids to be at risk, seemed to do more harm than good.[45]

Conclusions

It is this implicit association of rudeness with violence, seen so clearly in the folklore materials, that appears to feed much adult anxiety about "dirtiness" among children. This is particularly pointed in a society like that in Northern Ireland, where children are only too likely to have quite personal experiences with violence. Parents may wish to protect their children, in limiting their exposure to forbidden language and folklore, because of this perceived link with violence. At the very least, parents can try to maintain the illusion that they are protecting their children from the one (violence), by limiting their children's expression of the other (dirty materials). Dirty words themselves are potentially violent; if they are used to hurt or insult others, they can have an impact often just as severe than physical violence. Children fling words at each other far more often than their bodies, and are aware of the power they have to make each other feel bad, simply with words. In this case, conventional rudeness doesn't even have to be used-intent is key, and if someone wishes to hurt another person, they can call that person a "melon" and have it hurt, because hurt was intended.

Adult anxieties about child obscenity are not simply a result of generalized cultural constructs dictating proper childlike behavior, of course.[46] Parents in particular can be concerned because such words can be interpreted as "fighting words," and lead to violence. In a place like Northern Ireland, where the threats to people from violence are quite real, and violence frequently impacts children both directly and indirectly, such worries are not idle, and are very much reflective of actual dangers. It is this adult impulse to protect children from violence, and to prevent their participation in it, that is also behind adult censure of child rudeness. It is more than just a violation of some abstract model of a proper childhood, but a very real warning sign that children might not be as safe as adults would like them to be.

NOTES

1. I carried out this research thanks to funding from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, the U.C. Berkeley Vice-Chancellor for Research grant, the U.C. Berkeley Humanities Graduate grant, and Lowie/Olson funds from the Department of Anthropology, U.C. Berkeley.

2. I am grateful to Professor Nancy Scheper-Hughes for this insight.

3. JoAnn Conrad points out in her article, "Lost Innocent and Sacrificial Delegate: The JonBenet Ramsey Murder," that Americans in particular continue to struggle with notions of child sexuality.

4. Such silencing also happens when children bring up other topics adults would rather they not discuss, in particular issues surrounding the Protestant/Catholic divide in Northern Ireland.

5. Paul Willis presents an economic view of the perpetuation of working-class perspectives among a small group of secondary school boys in Britain in *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs.*

6. Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Carol Sargent address this issue in their edited volume *Small Wars: The Cultural Politics of Childhood,* continuing a discussion laid out in Sharon Stephens' *Children and the Politics of Culture.* JoAnn Conrad summarizes much of this in her article, "Lost Innocent and Sacrificial Delegate."

7. For more on the apparent disqualification of children from Childhood, because of their violation of the standards of innocence and dependency, see especially Allison James and Chris Jenks' article, "Public Perceptions of Childhood Criminality."

8. The folklore materials in this article are annotated in notes, by, indicating other collections of children's folklore where these materials, or variants of them, can be found. This particular rhyme is also found in McCosh's collection (202-3).

9. For a detailed discussion of definitions of obscenity, especially regarding legal definitions, see Harry M. Clor's *Obscenity and Public Morality.*

10. Also observed by Iona Opie (32).

11. McCosh (134) suggests a similar phenomenon around jokes; that is, that jokes can reveal children's attempts to escape from often adult-imposed ignorance of matters intellectual, sexual, and physical.

12. In their collection *One-Potato, Two Potato...* : *The Secret Education of American Children,* Mary and Herbert Knapp record a shorter version of this: "Dog shit you're it. *Out!"* (26). In the course of her dissertation research, Jane Hubbard encountered a different variant in Derry that she calls in the first volume of *Children's Play, Songs and Games in*

Derry, "more typical of a *boys'* choosing rhyme: Icky dicky dog's dicky, out pops piss!" (170).

13. Jane Hubbard also recorded this strategy of simply falling silent where the dirty word came in the rhyme.

14. Alison Lurie discusses this substitution of words for action as children get older in her essay "The Folklore of Childhood."

15. The joking relationship was first defined by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown in his article "On Joking Relationships" in 1940. Keith Basso discusses the phenomenon at length in *Portraits of "The Whiteman": Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache* (67-75).

16. McCosh (129) makes the same point regarding jokes, especially rude ones. McCosh also gives several examples of tricks and catches (21722), as do Knapp and Knapp (92-99).

17. My colleague Jay Dautcher suggested to me that the knickers bust because of menstruation, and that's why people are disgusted. I think it more likely that Cinderella's knickers bust because of her expanding belly; she is pregnant because of going upstairs to "kiss" her fellow, and people are disgusted at her state.

18. For other Cinderella dressed in colors other than "Yella" rhymes, see Knapp and Knapp (125-26).

19. This was also recorded by Simon Bronner (105-6), and Iona Opie (31).

20. This was a mixed group of boys and girls, and while boys were leading most of the songs, the girls present were singing just as loud.

21. Knapp and Knapp recorded a version of this as well (213-14). When I recorded this in Belfast, the Addams Family movie had just been shown on television.

22. This is Manchester United, the football team, and one of the favorites of kids from all schools.

23. This rhyme and variants of it also recorded in America by Bronner (53) and Knapp and Knapp (25), and in Northern Ireland by Hubbard (vol.1, 172, vol. 2, 62,106), and by Maurice Leyden, in his book *Boys and Girls Come Out to Play* (106).

24. Hubbard collected several versions of this (e.g., in vol.1, 174) without any mention of knickers: ". . . bring your own cup and saucer and your own cream bun. [name] will be there with ribbons in her hair. . . "

25. Also in Bronner (155), McCosh (241), and I. Opie (24).

26. Also Bronner (156) and McCosh (242-43).

27. Also see Bronner (141).

28. Notice that this is a Protestant child in a school within a neighborhood with a heavy paramilitary (UDA/UVF) presence. Paddy Irishman is in the first line, but is effaced in the body of the joke. The Scotsman is the hero here, which resonates well with some Ulster Protestant affinities to and for, Scotland as a prime site for heritage and allies.

29. As in the rhyme "Milk, milk, lemonade, around the corner fudge is made," the symbolic equivalence of things that are brown and potentially mushy makes chocolate a convenient stand-in for shit.

30. Bronner (142) records a similar joke told about a black man. In that case, however, the man himself was "chocolate" due to the color of his skin.

31. Also in McCosh (281) and I. Opie (14).

32. Also in McCosh (212-13), Bronner (117), I. Opie (13, 111), and Opie and Opie (81-82).

33. Northern Ireland's consumption of nicotine and caffeine products outstrips the consumption of alcohol.

34. These jokes are usually started and ended by the same person, making them rather more like couplets than the more regularly encountered riddling question. Examples can also be found in collections by McCosh (214-16) and I. Opie (14).

35. Two jokes from P.S.2, P6es and P7s.

36. Four jokes from C.S.1, P6s

37. From P.S.2, P7s

38. Two jokes from C.S.1, P6es and P7es

39. From C.S.1, P4s; Bronner (68) collected a "Sir" rhyme that has him with a cold, caught while hunting polar bears at the North Pole. Variants can also be found in Roger Abrahams' *Jump Rope Rhymes* (60), in Eilis Brady's *All in! All in!* (64), in the second volume of Hubbard's collection (75), as well as in Leyden's (116,133).

40. Thanks to Professor Alan Dundes for this insight.

41. Also collected by Abrahams (133), Bronner (56), Hubbard (vol. I, 173; vol.2, 40,63, 105, 138), Knapp and Knapp (26), and Leyden (1056).

42. Hubbard (vol. 1, 179, vol.2, 78,125) records the gifts of the boyfriend as apples, pears, and then Opal Fruits (a chewy fruit candy similar to Starburst in America) rather than kisses; this rhyme is also found in Brady's collection (37-38) as well as Leyden's (147).

43. While Barney the big purple dinosaur and his television show had already had their heyday in the United States before I entered the field, the show and the characters within it, especially Barney himself, and his little green friend Baby Bop (a girl dinosaur in frilly clothes), were still quite popular among some younger (4-6 years old) children in Belfast during the time I was there. As was the case in the United States, many older children and adults were disgusted or annoyed by the treacly show, and such sentiments are clearly present in the parody song given here.

44. Josepha Sherman discusses this rhyme and variants of it in an American context in her article "Gopher Guts and Army Trucks: The Modern Evolution of Children's Folklore Rhymes" (22-23).

45. In her article "Trashy Talk Makes Educators Cry Foul," reporter DeNeen Brown, in the May 12, 1998 edition of the *Washington Post,* reveals that in the local schools, the link between rude language and violence is made explicit in their conduct codes. One 17 year old was quite clear in noting how contextual language is, suggesting an awareness that "violence" in language is not an absolute, any more than rudeness or obscenity is.

46. Thank you to Professor Nancy Scheper-Hughes for stimulating this line of thought.

REFERENCES

Abrahams, Roger D. *Jump Rope Rhymes: A Dictionary.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969

Ardener, Edwin. "Belief and the Problem of Women," In *The Interpretation of Ritual.* J. La Fontaine, ed. London: Tavistock, 1972.

Aries, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life.* Robert Baldick, transl. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1962.

Basso, Keith H. *Portraits of "The Whiteman* ": *Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache.* Illus. by Vincent Craig. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1979.

Bateson, Gregory. "A Theory of Play and Fantasy," In *Steps to an Ecology of Mind.* New York: Ballantine Books, 1972. 177-93.

Beck, Horace. "Say Something Dirty!" *Journal of American Folklore.* 75(1962): 195-99.

Brady, Eilis. *All in! All in!: A Selection of Dublin Children's Traditional Street-Games with Rhymes and Music.* Dublin: Cohmairle Bhealoideas Eireann, An Colaiste Ollscoile, 1984.

Bronner, Simon J. *American Children's Folklore.* Little Rock: August House, 1988.

Brown, DeNeen L. "Trashy Talk Makes Educators Cry Foul," *Washington Post.* Washington, D.C., Tuesday, May 12, 1998. A01.

Clor, Harry M. *Obscenity and Public Morality: Censorship in a Liberal Society.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1969.

Conrad, JoAnn. "Lost Innocent and Sacrificial Delegate: The JonBenet Ramsey Murder," *Childhood* 6 (1999): 313-51.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* New York: Praeger, 1970 [1966].

Dundes, Alan. "Couvade in Genesis," In *Parsing Through Customs: Essays by a Freudian Folklorist.* Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1987. 145-66.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction: Volume 1.* New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
Freud, Sigmund. *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality.* New York: Basic Books, 1962.
Gomme, Alice Bertha. *The Traditional Games of England , Scotland, and Ireland, with tunes, singing-rhymes, and methods of playing according to the variants extant and recorded in different parts of the Kingdom.* 2 vols. London: D. Nutt, 1894-1898.
Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. *He-said-she-said* : *Talk as Social Organization among Black Children.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
Hubbard, Jane Anne. *Children's Play, Songs and Games in Derry: A social Anthropological Study, Volume 1*. unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Social Anthropology. Belfast: Queen's University, 1995.
_______. *Children* s *Play, Songs and Games in Derry: A Social Anthropological Study, Volume* 2. unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Social Anthropology. Belfast: Queen's University, 1995.
Hunt, Lynn, ed. *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800.* New York: Zone Books, 1993.
James, Allison, and Chris Jenks. "Public Perceptions of Childhood Criminality," *British Journal of Sociology* 47 (1996): 315-31.
Knapp, Mary, and Herbert Knapp. *One Potato, Two Potato...* : *The Secret Education of American Children.* New York: Norton, 1976.
Legman, G. "Introduction," In *Children* s *Humor: A Joke for Every Occasion.* S. McCosh. London: Panther Books, 1979. vii-xlix.
_______. "Introduction," In *Roll Me in Your Arms: "Unprintable" Ozark Folksongs and Folklore.* Vance Randolph. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 1992. 1-31.
Leyden, Maurice. *Boys and Girls Come Out to Play: A Collection of Irish Singing Games.* Belfast: Appletree Press, 1993.
Lowenstein, Wendy. *Shocking, Shocking, Shocking: The Improper Play Rhymes of Australian Children.* Prahran, Vic.: Fish and Chip Press, 1974.
Lurie, Alison. "The Folklore of Childhood," In *Don't Tell the Grown Ups: The Subversive Power of Children* s *Literature.* Boston: Back Bay Books, 1990. 189-204.
McCosh, Sandra. *Children* s *Humor: A Joke for Every Occasion.* London: Panther Books, 1979.
Mead, Margaret, and Martha Wolfenstein, eds. *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1955.
Opie, Iona, and Peter Opie. *The Lore and Language of School-Children.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967.

_______. *Children's Games in Street and Playground.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.
Opie, Iona. *The People in the Playground.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. "On Joking Relationships," *Africa* 13 (1940): 195-210.
_______. "A Further Note on Joking Relationships." *Africa* 19 (1949): 133 40.
Randolph, Vance. *Roll Me in Your Arms: "Unprintable" Ozark Folksongs and Folklore.* Edited with an introduction by G. Legman. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 1992.
Scheper-Hughes, Nancy, and Carolyn Sargent, eds. *Small Wars: The Cultural Politics of Childhood.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1998.
man, Josepha. "Gopher Guts and Army Trucks: The Modern Evolution of Children's Folklore Rhymes," *Children's Folklore Review* 21:2 (Spring 1999): 17-24.
Stephens, Sharon. "Introduction: Children and the Politics of Culture in 'Late Capitalism,'" *In Children and the Politics of Culture.* S. Stephens, ed. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995. 3-48.
Thorne, Barrie. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1995.
Van Rheenen, Derek. "Boys Who Play Hopscotch: The Historical Divide of a Gender Space," *Children* s *Folklore Review* 12: 1(1998): 5-34.
Whiting, Beatrice. *Six Cultures: Studies of Child-Rearing.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.
Willis, Paul. *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs.* New York: Columbia UP, 1977.
Wolfenstein, Martha. *Children's Humor: A Psychological Analysis.* Fore word by Alan Dundes. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1978 [1954].

E-CONTRIBUTIONS

In response to Elizabeth Tucker' article, "'I Hate you, You Hate Me': Children's Responses to Barney the Dinosaur," *CFR* 22.1 (1999): 25-33, Judy McKinty sent the following from Australia.

> I was very interested to read Elizabeth Tucker's article. The first time I came into contact with the Barney song was when I visited England in 1998. It went like this:
>
> I hate you, you hate me,
> Let's shove Barney up a tree,
> With a stick up his bum and a bullet through his head,
> Sorry kids but Barney's dead.
>
> I heard it again later in the day, but the words had been changed and the song was about the Teletubbies. There were two versions:
>
> I hate Po, Po hates me,
> Come on, Tinky Winky,
> Let's go kill Laa Laa with a dagger in the head
> Uh-oh Dipsy, Laa Laa's dead.
>
> I hate Po, Po hates me.
> We're not a happy family,
> With a dagger in his back and a bullet through his head,
> Uh-oh Laa Laa, Dipsy's dead.
>
> I was fascinated at the time, because the *Teletubbies* program was the latest introduction to Australian children's television, less than two months old.
>
> Judy McKinty

CFS: 1999 ANNUAL MEETING

President Bill Ellis called the breakfast meeting to order at 7:00 AM on 23 October 1999 in the Barclay Room of the Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee. A quorum was present.

REPORTS

President

Bill Ellis reported that he had attended the Conveners meeting and that (1) communications between the Sections and the Executive Board of the American Folklore Society and communications among Section members needed to be increased and (2) that to facilitate the latter Sections might want to investigate setting up listserves.

Treasurer

Joe Edgette was unable to attend the meeting, and there was no treasurer's report.

CFR Editor

Chip Sullivan reported that East Carolina continues to provide $3000.00 in support funds per academic year and that that has allowed him to continue printing the *Children's Folklore Review* on the quality paper used for the 20th anniversary issue. Sullivan also encouraged people to submit articles to the journal and to encourage their colleagues to submit articles.

Newell Committee

Chip Sullivan reported that the Newell Prize Committee had selected two papers for the 1999 Newell Prize:

"Bare Bums and Wee Chimneys: Rudeness and Defining the Line Between Child and Adult," Donna M. Lanclos, University of California at Berkley.

"Playing with Networks: An Ethnography of the CSU-MUN Daycare Based on Network Analysis," John M. Bodner, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Aesop Committee

Sean Galvin reported that 145 titles from 36 publishers were submitted for the 1999 Aesop Prize. Although this was not a banner year for titles, Galvin reported, the committee agreed that more books were being submitted that did conform to the Aesop eligibility criteria.

1999 Aesop Prize

Trickster and the Fainting Birds. Written by Howard Norman and illustrated by Tom Pohrt. Harcourt Brace/Gulliver Books, 1999

King Solomon and His Magic Ring. Written by Elie Wiesel and illustrated by Mark Podwal. Greenwillow Books, 1999.

1999 Aesop Acolades

The Deetkatoo: Native American Stories about Little People. Written by John Bierhorst and illustrated by Ron Hilbert Coy. Morrow Junior Books, 1998.

The Donkey and the Rock Written and illustrated by Demi. Henry Holt & Co., 1999.

The Hatseller and the Monkeys: A West African Folktale. Written and illustrated by Baba Wagué Diakité. Scholastic, 1999.

Why Leopard Has Spots: Dan Stories from Liberia. Written by Won-Ldy Paye and Margaret Lippert and illustrated by Ashley Bryan. Fulcrum Books, 1998.

Galvin also reported that the new Accolade stickers are selling with some success and that Judy Sierra has taken over production of the Aesop certificates.

NEW BUSINESS

Elections

JoAnn Conrad was elected President-Elect
Cherry Levin was elected to the Aesop Committee

CFS at AFS 2000

There will be a call for papers and/or panel members in the AFS Newsletter. Proposals thus far include (1) Teaching Children's Folklore and (2) Folklore and the Adolescent Experience

Officer's Duties

The membership voted that the Past President will become the Communicating Secretary, taking over that function from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Special Projects

As possible follow ups to *Children's Folklore: A Source Book,* now available in paperback from Utah State University Press, the membership is asked to consider the following as topics for collections of essays: (1) material lives of children, and (2) adolescent lore.

President Ellis adjourned the meeting at 8:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
C. W Sullivan III
Secretary du jour.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Children's Folklore Section of the American Folklore society annually offers the **W.W. Newell Prize** (which includes a cash award) for the best student essay on a topic in children's folklore. Students must submit their own papers, and published papers are eligible. Instructors are asked to encourage students with eligible papers to enter the competition.

Papers must be typed, double-spaced, and on white paper. On the first page include the author's name, academic address, home address, and telephone numbers. Deadline for each year's competition is September 1st.

Submit papers or write for more information:
Dr. C.W. Sullivan III, English Department, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC 27858-4353.

Children's Folklore: A Source Book, edited by Brian Sutton-Smith, Jay Mechling, Thomas W Johnson, and Felicia R. McMahon, originally published by Garland in 1995, was republished in the fall of 1999 by Utah State University Press. The collection of essays originated with members of the Children's Folklore Section, and all of the contributors were then (and many still are) members of CFS. Royalties from the book continue tofund the maintenance and expansion of the Children's Folklore section of the Utah State University Folklore Archives.

The Children's Folklore Section now has its own web site at the AFS website at: www.afsnet.org/sections/childrenl

CONTRIBUTORS

Donna M. Lanclos, an anthropologist and folklorist, has just completed her PhD in Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley. Her dissertation, "Under the Bramble Bushes, Down by the Sea: Folklore and the Formations of Identity on the Playgrounds of Belfast, Northern Ireland," discusses the ways in which working-class Belfast children create and explore aspects of gender, age, and sectarian (Protestant/Catholic) identities.

Judy McKinty is an independent folklorist/researcher with a special interest in children's play. She has a Graduate Certificate of Applied Science (Environmental and Heritage Interpretation), from Deakin University, Melbourne, and her last full-time position was Co-ordinator of the Children's Museum, Museum of Victoria. She has been closely involved with the Australian Children's Folklore Collection for over a decade, researching and collecting children's folklore. Her research includes an oral history project on Aboriginal Children's Play. She is on the Committee of the Victorian Folklife Association and is currently working on the development of a CD-ROM based on children's traditional games.