Contemporary
Homo Ludens

Contemporary
Homo Ludens

Edited by

Halina Mielicka-Pawłowska

Contemporary *Homo Ludens*

Edited by Halina Mielicka-Pawłowska

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

CONTENTS

Part 2. Play in Literature and Art

Part 3.Play and Tradition

Part 4. Play as an Entertainment

Part 5. Play as an Educational Activity

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

HALINA MIELICKA-PAWŁOWSKA[1]

Modern culture is dominated by a popular tendency to fulfil one's hedonistic needs, reflecting the dominance of play in many aspects of human life, no matter the person's social status. In traditional culture, it was children who had the right to play. Nowadays, play is an obligatory part of adult life. Its main manifestations can be seen as individual (virtual), collective (local), national, and even global, when cultural or sports activities make people emotionally engaged, despite their ethnic background.

Play and its behaviours are becoming the research object for different scientists. This issue is interesting for the representatives of humanistic and social sciences, especially educators, sociologists, and anthropologists of culture, as well as historians of culture, ethnologists, and ethnographers. Play was, is and most probably will be treated by the researchers as one of the most important manifestations of human activity. As observed by Johan Huizinga, play behaviours existed "before culture," and indicate human uniqueness when seen as a creative and multidimensional being. It is play that enables the arousal of imagination and can be treated as the cause but at the same time a consequence of the existence of culture. What is more, the multi-aspect nature of play—as one of the many dimensions of reality, one of the many worlds the human is living in—becomes the point of interest to the researchers. The modern times enable such a situation thanks to the technical possibilities of making human imagination real. It should not be surprising that the scientific research is directed at searching for human uniqueness through its capabilities to create a world out of touch with reality, and therefore one full of play.

The fact that the problem of play is one of the most complicated modern research issues is supported by the research results presented in this work. Johan Huizinga treats play as a specific kind of activity undertaken by a human, aimed not only at confronting the nature of reality but also the means for creating culture. According to Huizinga, play

---

[1] Translated by Kinga Adamiec-Matysiak.

shapes the human, but at the same time, when playing, the human decides upon the world they are living in. Because of that, its element can be found in every aspect of life. Modern culture particularly, described as a postmodern mass or popular culture, consists of many different forms of play that, to a lesser or greater extent, contribute to the idea of a happy life without everyday problems. The issues discussed by authors quoted in this work show the broad spectrum of questions when play and fun become the nature of scientific research.

In terms of topics, the articles of this volume are grouped in such a way as to capture the differences between the theoretical orientations and interpretations of empirical material as seen by the authors. The diversity of authors' approaches is also visible in the adopted methodology of quantity and quality research. This helps the cognitive, explorative, and explanative aims of the work and shows the depth of the research problems.

The proposal of this collected work consists of five parts. The topic sections signal those cultural aspects where play seems dominant in human behaviour. This means that not all problems are discussed and not all forms of playful behaviours are listed. The main point is the problem of play and its behaviours, as seen through Huizinga's conception from his book *Homo Ludens. A Study of the Play-element in Culture* (1938). Although it has been 77 years since its first pressing, the thesis it discusses is still extremely inspiring to researchers of culture. The references to the theory of culture in Huizinga's book come up in almost every article in this work and make up the main theoretical reference for the authors of the respective articles.

Part one familiarises the reader with the Dutch historian of culture's concept from *Homo Ludens*. Léon Hanssen discusses Huizinga's scientific research and draws our attention to the fact that play in the postmodern society may show the existence of the permanent crisis of culture. Elena Reprintceva discusses the conception of Huizinga considering the theory of Vladimir Rozumniy, a representative of Russian science who stated that play is not an activity in real life. The comparison of the theories of these two great researchers of culture helps to see the problem of play from a different perspective in the context of the modern world. Bogusław Sułkowski takes into consideration five channels of symbolic communication and separates five basic levels of ludic behaviours. On the other hand, Tadeusz Paleczny shows that play requires a transgression and that cyber reality enables crossing the borders of reality.

Part two comprises articles describing ludic aspects based in the arts represented by creators of culture: writers, painters, and even craftsmen.

The play aspect is present in many forms of art. The articles in this part only symbolically show the blank pages in research made by the historians of art, literature, and others of the so-called "high culture." Adam Bžoch, taking into consideration the concept of Johan Huizinga, analyses the aspects of play output in Slovak culture, drawing our attention to the political background of the Socialism era. Play before the changes in the system was anti-political, and as a result was a grassroots way of fighting for democracy. Marta Bolińska, by analysing the works of Dorota Terakowska, a Polish writer, finds the simplest play forms (*paidia*) that enable the introduction, within different models of human life based on the novel, of three patterns of *arche*, based on the themes of journey, encounter, and the pursuit of perfection. Katarzyna Błoch analyses play pieces represented in the form of eighteenth-century tiles. Michał Mazurkiewicz looks for play aspects in the works of British and American painters.

Part three, entitled "Play-element Versus Cultural Tradition," includes topical papers referring to the problems of traditional culture seen as the ethnical and national background of modern culture. Ethnographical research shows that cultural tradition can be extremely inspiring and motivating for play. Play as a form of celebration has always been an important source of cultural diversity and a guarantee of ethnical distinctiveness. Even if it is not a "live tradition" but a directed performance aimed at getting back to the past, playing tradition or having tradition in the background has an important function of the integration of national and ethnical collectivity as it strengthens the sense of cultural community. In a dynamically changing postmodern world, pan-generational memories not only give the opportunity for reaching the local tradition but also have a clear tendency to treat customs as an amusing "playing the past."

The folkloristic articles presented in part four show the foundation of modern culture. Barbara Klasińska discusses the traditional play forms that have educational and socialisation-like values. In the Polish folk culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, play accompanied people at important moments of their lives (for instance childbirth and getting married) as well as the festivities subordinated to seasons of the year. Michał Grabowski discusses ludic forms of participation that can be organised in ethnographical museums with educational functions. Anna Boraczyńska stresses the ludic character of food festivals that not only attract mass parties but also support regional cultural traditions. Małgorzata Strzelec discusses play forms of kerness festivities organised annually on Saint Roch's day, the patron of breeding animals. Magdalena

Szalbot shows how play is linked with commercialism through her article about toys that help the owners of pets lose the interaction between them, but on the other hand show the anthropomorphisation of pets.

Part four features description of the research results conducted within the lovers and participants of play forms organised in local communities and more or less closed collectives. The behaviours of football fans are discussed by Marta Wilk. Tomasz Michalewski writes about the play forms of students. Andrzej Jopkiewicz and Jacek Gawron analyse the recreational activity of elderly people that is not only fun but also a form that enables them to stay healthy and fit. Currently popularised forms of sports activities are aimed not only at "having fun times" but also at the social integration of people who prefer a chosen form of ludic behaviour.

Part five features pedagogical discussions about play. One of the main problems discussed is the education and upbringing of children through play. Upbringing through fairy tales and teaching through dancing and singing are commonly used didactic means, aimed at the skills development of kindergarten and primary school children. This issue is discussed by Beata Sufa. The pedagogical functions of fairy tales are discussed by Sławomir Chrost. Bernadeta Kosztyła discusses the teacher's work in the kindergarten and the first years of primary school, which are about using dance as didactical means. What is more, the work the pedagogues do with children is seen in the three articles closing the educational part. Ryszard Błaszkiewicz makes parents sensitive about computer games that can make children's personalities socially unacceptable. Wioleta Adamczyk-Bębas discusses the significance of computer games, and Sylwester Bębas shows their negative and positive aspects.

The problem of computer games, as the newest toy popularised at the beginning of the twenty-first century, is that the computer can be an extremely effective educational tool but extremely unreliable at the same time, because children can learn socially unacceptable behaviours. Individualism, media experience and the interactivity of social contacts formed through the internet are social problems of the modern world. Pedagogical analysis involves the process of upbringing, which in essence is the pursuit of the intentional shaping of a child's personality, which means the learning of socially acceptable behaviours. It should not surprise us then that the pedagogues are concerned about the impact of computer games on children's personalities.

This whole volume, because of its topical variety, can interest not only the representatives of the humanistic and social sciences but also more or less careful observers of everyday life. In the modern world, play is not

limited to elitist behaviours and is not associated with high classes of society. The democratisation of play is so big that everyone has a right to it, no matter what their economic situation is. Millions of people, as users of the internet and computer games, have fun individually, but the virtual world is for them the real participation in reality created by the media. Thousands of people actively take part in different kinds of cultural and sports activities, mass parties, festivals, and festivities open for everyone. By having fun together, they create the audience engaged in experiencing these events. Thanks to the media, the local audience becomes global when the transmissions create interest between people geographically scattered but emotionally engaged, and as a result a new, postmodern canon of culture withdrawn from time and space is created. This third kind of culture—pan-local and pan-national—becomes the symbol of postmodernism, and pan-ludism is its main feature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The volume presented here is the result of a conference that took place on March 19–20, 2015 in Kielce, Poland. The leading topic was the idea of play as discussed in Johan Huizinga's *Homo Ludens*, first published in 1938 and later translated into German, English, and many more languages (including Polish). This book attracted the attention of historians of culture, but also ethnologists, anthropologists of culture, sociologists, psychologists, and representatives of other disciplines within human and social sciences to the aspects of playful behaviours. Despite the fact that the book was published 77 years ago, the theses stated by the Danish scientist are still incredibly inspiring, proven by the articles and scientific dissertations, and ethnographic and factual material related to the concepts developed by this outstanding Danish historian of culture included in this work.

The organisers of this conference were the Department of Sociology within the Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology at the Faculty of Pedagogy and Arts of the Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce together with the Museum of Toys and Play in Kielce. It was the help of the museum director, Maciej Obara, and the museum employees that had significant meaning, as without their engagement and organisational support the conference would not have gone so smoothly.

The participants of the conference were 28 lecturers, the representatives of various academic hubs from Poland, Denmark, Slovakia, and Russia. Polish universities represented during the conference were: the Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, the Radom Academy of Economics, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, the University of Opole, the University of Gdańsk, the Pedagogical University of Kraków, the Jagiellonian University, the University of Silesia in Katowice, the Tadeusz Kościuszko Land Forces Military Academy in Wrocław, the University of Social Sciences in Łódź, the Historical Museum of the City of Kraków, and the Marek Mazurek Foundation for the Development of the Education of the Deaf in Kraków. The foreign academic hubs represented during the conference were: the Tilburg School of Humanities, the Slovak Akademy of Science, the Catholic University Ružomberok, and Kursk State University.

I would like to give my thanks to all the people engaged in the conference, those who gave talks, and those who wrote the articles included in this volume.

Introduction

Play as a Source of Postmodern Culture[1]

Halina Mielicka-Pawłowska

Reflecting on the changes taking place in culture at the turn of the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries, researchers are forced to ask some fundamental questions. From an anthropological perspective, a human being does not change. On the other hand, the world in which a human being lives changes in a remarkably dynamic way. Human nature is invariable and the element that changes the definition of this nature is relative, and therefore results in a variety of discourse written by the representatives of social and humanistic sciences. One of these is the thesis of Johan Huizinga, which states that play is the source of culture as it belongs to human nature. It is worth looking closely at this thesis in light of the features of the postmodern society.

Play as a Human Nature

In his book, first published in 1938, Huizinga writes that: "even in its simplest forms on the animal level, play is more than a mere physiological phenomenon or a psychological reflex. It goes beyond the confines of purely physical or purely biological activity. It is a significant function—that is to say, there is some sense to it. In play there is something 'at play' which transcends the immediate needs of life and imparts meaning to the action. All play means something. If we call the active principle that makes up the essence of play, 'instinct,' we explain nothing; if we call it 'mind' or 'will' we say too much. However we may regard it, the very fact that play has a meaning implies a non-materialistic quality in the nature of

the thing itself" (Huizinga 1985b 12).[2]

   According to the above quotation, play is a part of human nature, but it is difficult to assess how much is instinct as it does not satisfy the physiological needs of the organism. If we make an assumption that everything that makes a human being exceptional in the world is nature, then play "goes beyond the confines of purely biological activity," as it not only gives sense to activities but also allows a human being to remain separate from what is dangerous like wildlife, which is untamed and unpredictable due to the ruling laws of nature. According to the theory of cultural universalism (Majcherek 2009, 7–34), structurally and cognitively, human nature is the feature of the mind that implies a set of terms for the existing reality (Whorf 1981, 285). The way of thinking, thus setting the meaning, allows a human being to create both the world of nature and the internal world of interpretation compliant with the accepted canon of phenomena categorisation. According to Huizinga, it is difficult to call it a "spirit," but it could be made a "source of culture." Symbolic thinking not only settles reality through being "its feature of mind," but also helps this reality to be given both instrumental and imaginative senses.

   Regardless of which definition of culture is quoted here, we can generally assume that this term means an artificial environment made by a human being to oppose nature. Culture is a "construct of mind," and at the same time a device for perceiving the world, so giving sense to anything subject to perception. According to Clifford Geertz, "what the eye sees and the ear hears is not the same as what the mind perceives" (2005, 155).[3] Due to this, the world of nature is "constructed" as dangerous, impossible to understand, and unpredictable. A human being makes this world safe, predictable, and reasonable through engaging in activities and interpreting them. If the interpretation of Huizinga's thesis is correct, play is not only a way of grasping the boundaries that separate instinctive behaviours from deliberate ones, but also an emotional system of values, and an internal experience of what gives life sense. Culture understood as a system of values belongs to the spiritual area in the way that is an immaterial element of the world where a human being lives. In this case, could we speak of pan-ludism as play transferring to all spheres of human activities labelled as culture?

---

[2] Translator's note: original text from Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens. A study of the Play-element in Culture* (London, Boston and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949), 1.
[3] Translator's note: quotation from Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 150.

Pan-ludism and Popular Culture

The idea of pan-ludism, discussed in the works of Huizinga devoted to postmodern culture, became an explicit attribute of popular culture. Anthony Giddens therefore treats popular culture as a result of globalisation, meaning that: "images, ideas, goods and styles spread faster than before. Trade, new technologies, international media and global migrations contribute to the fact that cultural content moves across country borders" (Giddens 2004, 85). The globalisation of culture threatens the "cultural imperialism" of the Western world (including the United States of America), its values and lifestyle becoming a globally governing canon. On the other hand, local traditions gain new values as subservience to globalisation strengthens the cultural identity of local, traditional, ethnic, and national societies. Globalisation, however, leads to the unification of lifestyles and systems of values belonging to particular cultures, but does not cause their extinction. According to Zygmunt Bauman, "glocalisation" is a defence against globalisation, and a value which is particularly protected due to cultural identity diversified by tradition. Globalisation leads to the fragmentation of tradition and syncretisation of lifestyles, which in turn break the cultural unity of traditional societies into a "hybrid identity" of people who are not rooted in their own culture of contemporary, unattached people (1997, 61). "The global ecumene" of the world's cultural system consists of: "dense, intense relations and dependencies on a supra-local scale" (Sztompka 2002, 593), which construct a network of connections constituting a "network society" (Castells 2008, 468; Urry 2006, 702) and a type of culture dominated by the system of values promoted in the media. It does not, however, translate into the end of tradition or the extinction of regional culture. According to Dean MacCanell: "tradition remains embedded in modernity but in a position of servitude: tradition is there to be recalled to satisfy nostalgic whims or to provide coloration or perhaps a sense of profundity for a modern theme" (2002, 53).[4]

It is difficult to determine precisely the intricacies of global postmodern culture, but we can assume that it is a type of virtual community created by the mass media as: "an idea of pan-human consensus around common values and ideas" (Sztompka 2002, 597), which forges a global system determining the world image constructed by its members. The popular culture, dominating and omnipresent in the media, is a product of this system. It is characterised by a vast diversity of the content transmitted to

---

[4] Translator's note: extract from Dean MacCanell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 34.

diverse recipients who have extremely varied needs conditioned by multiculturalism and membership in various social groups, but also by contradictory expectations towards the content presented in the mass media. This diversified, scattered audience of popular culture members has its preferences that lead to the construction of a type of "imagined community" (Slevin 2008, 597). One is its virtual character, understood as being immersed in the media reality that transcends dailiness and the other reality, the latter seeming hopelessly monochrome and senseless without it.

The virtual nature, as an aspect of popular culture and at the same time the creation of the network society, is, according to Manuel Castells: "a system where the reality itself (i.e. material/symbolic human existence) is fully captured, fully immersed in the virtual arrangement of images, in the world of 'imagine that' where appearances are not only projected on the screen through which experience is communicated, but they become the experience itself" (2008, 378). As much as the reality of life is determined through personal experience, popular culture is a result of experiences derived from mass media. Pleasure—or more specifically the feeling caused by world constructs based on images, the so-called "imagine that"—results in a feeling of joy, but also helps to "void" dailiness, or substitute it with a system of symbolic appearances. Simultaneously, it should be emphasised that sensual experience is always an individual matter and diversifies the imagination and feeling of pleasure, making it an internal experience. As pleasure can be experienced through immersion in virtual culture, we can risk an assumption that its transcendence beyond the reality experienced by the senses is a form of voiding the materiality of the world, and as such it belongs to the spiritual realm. According to Huizinga, it is nevertheless too much to describe the natural human predisposition towards symbolic thinking in this way. On the other hand, this realm has an imaginary character and could be attributed to the framework of cultural phenomena.

Dailiness is also a feature attributed to popular culture, as it is an obvious,[5] dominating, and omnipresent type of culture anywhere where there is a technical possibility of accessing media coverage. The press, radio, and television are global, as they cover a large and diverse number of recipients. Regardless of the medium, the content is: "easy to receive, often very conventional and … entertaining and therefore … [attracts an] extensive audience" (Golka 2007, 146). Similarly, the internet creates a

---

[5] The problem of cultural obviousness as a trait attributed to popular culture needs a separate discussion.

global network of users taking advantage of the technical functions of a personal computer. The everyday lifestyle of these users includes time spent on participating in the "virtual culture," and they sometimes adjust their daily schedules, work, or family and social lives to take advantage of the pleasures resulting from the use of these media. Everyday life becomes subordinated to the pleasures of using mass media, which leads to a situation where the obvious and governing dailiness is interrupted by participation in popular culture.

Due to the fact that pleasure becomes an obligation, popular culture is full of ludic behaviours as they evoke a state of mind that transcends human existence into a different reality to the experienced dailiness. There is nothing else except for the pleasure that could not be incorporated under the term "play." Eudaimonism is the individual dimension of ludic behaviours. According to Huizinga, play is: "a well-defined quality of action which is different from 'ordinary' life" (1985b, 15) by being "superfluous." The need of play becomes: "urgent to the extent that the enjoyment of it makes it a need" (Ibid., 20–1). This is the feeling of enjoyment, understood as an emotional state of experiencing freedom without constraint that makes play meaningful for both children and adults. Pleasure understood in this way leads to the feeling of happiness. It would be logical, then, to state a thesis that it is play that satisfies the need of pleasure, which in turn is a way to reach happiness.

According to the above quotation from Huizinga's book, if anything justifies the usefulness of play it is the pleasure of stepping outside of the conditions of dailiness. What is more, pleasure evokes the feeling of happiness, which belongs to the emotional state defined as primal, or even the fundamental motivator of human actions. Following Jonathan H. Turner and Jan E. Stets: "emotions are the result of a complex interplay among cultural, social, structural, cognitive, and neurological forces" (Turner and Stets 2009, 23).[6] Experiencing emotions has an intrinsically neurological basis, whereas culture and social structure strengthen it, at the same time weakening the representation of emotions through the control and regulation of an individual's ability to manifest them. Culture channels sensations, pointing to situations when these inner experiences defined as pleasure could be manifested in interactions. Therefore, "humans experience and employ a wide variety of emotions that mobilize and push them to respond to each other and to situations in particular ways" (Ibid., 25).[7] Pleasure as an emotional state generated by biological processes is

---

[6] Translator's note: quotation from: Jonathan H. Turner and Jan E. Stets, *The Sociology Of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 9.
[7] Ibid., 10.

"anterior to cultural," which means it is primal towards culture. But what helps us determine internal feelings as emotions is the creation of culture conditioned by language structures and cognitive processes mastered by an individual in the process of socialisation. Emotions are an indispensable element of behaviours: they motivate people to act, and aim to satisfy both individual and social needs. On the other hand, these cultural behavioural patterns, acquired in the process of socialisation, help individuals to define their own experiences, and in this way understand other people's emotional states. Participating in communal activities that engage an individual emotionally and which are defined as pleasurable gives people the feeling of happiness, motivating them to think in categories of cultural values. Without the pleasure of direct contact with others, there would be neither culture nor society. And without the understanding of the emotional state determined as pleasure, there would be no play. If pleasure is really a distinctive feature of play, then any acquired way of reacting to socially meaningful situations is secondary, and symbolic situational contexts therefore become stimuli evoking socially acceptable emotional reactions. In this way, any social situations that evoke a feeling of happiness are established within a system of culture and verbalised as a cultural obviousness that motivates the undertaking of communal activities. Returning to Huizinga's concept, one could risk an assumption that the main thought of *Homo Ludens*, included in the subtitle and stating that play is the source of culture, indicates emotional states that are primary to culture, and at the same time are shaped by culture. If we therefore assume that the essence of play is an emotional, neurologically conditioned state, then the contemporarily governing culture takes a pan-ludic form. This thesis is even more justified if the primary emotional state is governed by striving for pleasure and the secondary one is culturally reinforced, making happiness a lifelong purpose.

The most basic understanding of the feeling of happiness translates into experiencing satisfaction, joy, or even euphoria or enchantment with something incredibly positive, valuable, and that anticipates excitement. Aristotle regarded happiness as fulfilment, meaning a state of achieving completeness in development and action. Plato, on the other hand, regarded virtue as perfection and a basic condition leading to the cognition of truth. The good reduced to pleasure becomes an experience of ideal order and the true completeness of existence. According to ancient philosophers, ethical hedonism combines the good with happiness and sets the course of human behaviours. People should therefore strive for their own happiness as well as the happiness of other people, because this is ethically good. The striving for happiness is an individual lifelong purpose

that becomes impossible if other people suffer: "Happiness is a durable, complete and justified satisfaction with life." Moreover: "happiness (eudaimonia) is the highest value and the purpose of human life" (Czupryna 2009). Individual happiness is a moment of pleasure that brings bliss, but is at the same time insatiable in its variability. This is the happiness felt in brief episodes that bring a smile of complacency to the face. The happiness of multiple people is more important, because individuals can only be entirely happy when their happiness is simultaneously the pleasure of making others happy.

A question arises as to why play causes complacency, joy, and pleasure, which could be described as happiness. To answer it, we may assume that playing brings happiness because: (1) only when playing can an individual plan communal activities in a way that brings sense to life; (2) playing lasts long enough to project life satisfaction outside of playing; (3) playing brings smiles, complacency, and joy, which are interpreted as achieving the purpose; (4) only playing "has an unrealistically high intellectual level" (Annas 2008, 969), because it is a contradiction of the everyday reality.

(1) Participating in play brings a feeling of happiness because it is done together with other people, which consequently brings them pleasure. Regardless of whether everyone in the postmodern society is entirely convinced that they are responsible for their lives, various unexpected circumstances can sometimes be obstacles to pursuing life aims. The internal belief that an individual is the only one that decides who they are and will be stems from individualism, which was determined as a postmodern value by Michael Foucault (1993). Both Bauman and Giddens strongly emphasise that individualism has a significant meaning as a personality feature of people living in the postmodern era. Individualism is demonstrated as a ubiquitous rivalry, the objectified treatment of others, and the conviction that one can achieve anything if they want it enough. The risk society comprises a group of people who promote themselves so intensively that other people are regarded as being in the background or competitors in the fight of achieving highest values, so anything could bring happiness. Fighting for one's successes, becoming an ideal person who is complacent in life as they have achieved it all, comprise a postmodern personality pattern of a loner fighting for their right to victory. Just like a computer game hero, a postmodern human being must fight for their right to achievements as they encounter obstacles that require supernatural skills and the extraordinary talent for overcoming problems that appear and endanger their existence. Undertaking ludic behaviours, on

the other hand, brings the immediate completion of intentions, but only in the imaginary reality. This is, however, enough to taste victory, and in this way also feel complacent with one's life. Play mitigates the risk of unpredictability as it states the rules that all the participants need to follow. Randomness related to a change of rules disappears, so the predictability of events is clear. Moreover, there is no play that breaks the rules of community, so "a lonely hero" has no chance to have fun and nobody to celebrate victory with. The pleasure experienced when playing equals the chances of all participants and guarantees that nobody will be disadvantaged.

Activities undertaken when playing have no sense because they bring no benefit, except for escaping from everyday life. However, the consequences of playful activities can bring sense to dailiness. This sense can be either psychological (strengthening one's own personality), social (bonding with old friends and making new ones), cognitive (related to experience), or mental (changing the hierarchy of values), which can lead to complacency.

(2) An incredibly important element of playing is its temporary character. Play should last as long as it brings joy. It is not possible, however, for play to substitute everyday life. When playing, one cannot satisfy their existential needs. One can live without play as it is not instrumentally useful, at the very least in the case of adult needs. Everyday life is limited in time, but its duration is unpredictable. On the other hand, play is subject to limitations, because without being able to satisfy existential needs it is difficult to imagine that play itself would be present in people's lives. If we however assume that limiting play in time is directly related to the feeling of pleasure, playing lasts as long as its participants feel joy from it. Boredom and routine, responsibility and constraint—the characteristics of dailiness—are the elements that impact eagerness to play in a negative way. Doubts emerge when the decision over what is regarded as play and what is not is taken based on individual pleasure.

Annas, pondering the concept of happiness, denies common associations of happiness and smiling because a good mood or pleasurable episodes do not determine the essence of happiness. If happiness is a feeling that is displayed as being content with a symbolic smile, then: "happiness comes down to whatever you like at the moment" (2008, 961). Every activity undertaken by a human being, as it brings the feeling of happiness, could be regarded as play. Regardless of whether this is an individual or group activity, whether it is socially meaningful or defined as work, if it is a responsibility towards others or a constraint to satisfy existential needs, it

is important that it brings joy and is accompanied by pleasure. In this way, play is defined through the feeling of pleasure and covers any activity that brings a smile. Therefore, what brings joy and what could be defined as play in this way depend merely on the individual and what they find pleasure in doing. Rules expressed in this way are an extreme attitude that introduces a division into good and bad play.

Taking a variety of criteria into consideration can lead to a situation in which play is attributed positive or negative values. Depending on the emotional state of complacency, each play that brings pleasure is fun. Anything that results in a feeling of being disadvantaged or causes a breaking of moral norms is regarded as "not fun." Pedagogical criteria regard good play as socially acceptable and serving an educational function for children and young adults. Socialisation through play is a widely used method of teaching children socially acceptable behaviours. According to this criterion, playing in a bad way results in a child learning behaviours that are far from the governing rules of social life. Generally speaking, any kind of play will be regarded as bad when it breaks legal, moral, and social norms, regardless of the age of the individuals who play.

(3) Achieving aims through play

According to Huizinga, a characteristic of play is that it is disinterested and "stands outside the immediate satisfaction of wants and appetites, indeed it interrupts the appetitive process" (1985b, 22). Play does not pursue any aims, as it has: "its aim in itself and [is] accompanied by a feeling of tension, joy and the consciousness [making it] 'different' from 'ordinary life'" (Ibid., 48–9). Following this, if we need to determine the aim of playing it would be a disruption of dailiness and the elimination of anything that is treated seriously and serves the function of satisfying existential needs. Unfortunately, playing does not solve everyday problems, and can only suspend them. It is a temporary feeling, binding while playing, which gives the feeling of happiness for just a few moments. Surrendering to the joy of play could have the therapeutic functioning of strengthening one's self-confidence or even a cathartic negation of daily problems. Play offers a temporary lack of problems and the episodic feeling of happiness, but it is not happiness itself. It is Annas who draws attention to this fact and points out that achieving what one would like to achieve is not happiness, as the desire of happiness motivates an individual to act more effectively than the completion of the aforementioned action. According to Annas: "perhaps the image of happiness as satisfying desires gives justice to the initial thought that it is subjective—disregarding obvious problems with interpreting the reason

behind a smile" (2008, 963). Due to the episodic character of individual happiness, it is crucial for human beings that it lasts longer. It is life as a whole that counts and pursues the ideal assumed in a cultural scenario of what is regarded by psychologists as "welfare" (Boski 2009). It is not about fulfilling desires but making life choices that result in achieving what would be difficult to even imagine. It is not cravings or temporary aspects of complacency that bring permanent happiness, but planning and postponing in time or even subordinating all life to an idea that organises future events in a way that this life becomes a value of a permanent welfare understood as happiness. Mastering the unreal does not make life happy. These are strivings to realise a vision of one's life that brings happiness. Therefore: "imagining happiness as an achievement is an unrealistically high intellectual level" (Annas 2008, 969), as it requires freedom from any conditioning or transcending reality, which leads to intellectual limitations. Play overcomes these limitations and is therefore unrealistic in its premise. It allows for the specification of the image of happiness to the extent that it becomes possible to really achieve it when playing.

Play as an unproductive sphere of activities has its semantic place in social structures. Thorstein Veblen, when analysing "the leisure class" of pre-industrial and industrial societies, made inactivity one of the features attributed to wealthy people: "From the days of the Greek philosophers to the present, a degree of leisure and of exemption from contact with such industrial processes as serve the immediate everyday purposes of human life has ever been recognised by thoughtful men as a prerequisite to a worthy or beautiful, or even a blameless, human life. In itself and in its consequences the life of leisure is beautiful and ennobling in all civilised men's eyes" (2008, 33).[8] The main activities of "the leisure class" were governing, warfare, sport, and religious rituals (Ibid., 35), and thus activities that spoke for the financial means of people who did not have to work to maintain themselves.

In a post-industrial society, this class, which is a contemporary middle class, was described by MacCanell as a modern leisure class whose lifestyle consists of unreasonable idleness. The lower classes—condemned to experience a lack of happiness and whose lives are overwhelmed with work, responsibilities, everyday problems resulting in their economic situation, a lack of work, marginalisation, and social exclusion—perceived the upper class as happy because they could spend their money in an

---

[8] Translator's note: extract from Thorstein Veblen *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, http://moglen.law.columbia.edu/LCS/theoryleisureclass.pdf.

unreasonable way. Representatives of classes who live on welfare do not need to strive for happiness as it has already been achieved together with their life purpose. Wealth and welfare therefore guarantee happiness.

(4) Play as the negation of reality

In the definition formulated by Huizinga, play is: "accompanied by a feeling of tension, joy and the consciousness that it is 'different' from 'ordinary life'" (198b, 48–9). Play as a defined notion: "seemed capable of embracing everything … We ventured to call the category 'play' one of the most fundamental in life" (Ibid., 49). According to the above definition, what separates play from other actions undertaken by human beings is included in the invalidation or suspension of dailiness, and more precisely in the specifically understood categories of time, space, and rules that let human beings escape from the reality. The negation of dailiness requires different criteria of time and space that allow "the wonderland" to become real life.

An additional factor of describing people as playful is their disinterestedness and the emotional state expressed through emotional engagement (joy), as well as the conscious escape from "ordinary life." Play, understood in the above sense, makes the reality unreal and leads to its negation. As observed by Wincenty Okoń, the state that accompanies play is a part of a: "reality different than the one of dailiness" (1987, 3). This requires a distinction between the reality of dailiness and play, but also a link between them, as: "play is the reflection of the regularities of a serious social life, be it directly or through negation … Games and fun always reflect a certain culture but are not always a simple mapping of social institutions of this culture. Sometimes it acts as a kind of a safety valve, a vent that sets us free from the heavy weights of social conformism" (Sułkowski 1984, 51).

Play not only establishes a different kind of reality but also introduces a perceptional state that changes the way of thinking about dailiness. Play has its own rules, makes its own regulations: "destroy the part of reality as such" (Stróżewski 1981, 286). When playing you need to: "say only y e s—if you want to live. But if you say y e s, you affirm that hostile world, waiting only to destroy the one who accepts the rules" (Ibid., 287). To paraphrase: saying "yes" to play as a voluntary action undertaken by a human being with pleasure and selflessness proves the existence of the dailiness reality that may lead to a renewed establishment of commonness order, but through its annihilation. In other words, play, enabling an escape from reality, proves the existing order and at the same time establishes a new reality. Provided that dailiness is a value, then play is an anti-value

made real through fake behaviours. If play is treated as value then dailiness takes a form of "the necessary evil" or even a drama of activities that are not acceptable or even negate the pursuit of a happy life. The reality of dailiness is the experience of categorical rules that govern "a serious life" full of problems and the necessity of taking the subservient attitude. Play is the freedom of self-decisiveness, the lack of limitations, and the negation of the feeling of "must." Play can function therapeutically, but transcends the reality into the world of imagination and happiness. As observed by Piotr Sztompka: "dailiness is the most obvious, the most real form of being imposed on our perception" (2008, 25). Play, on the other hand, is not that obvious as it assumes imagining the things that help us have a carefree life full of joy. The main point of play is that: "those who take part in a strictly social situation leave their 'serious' identities aside and enter the evanescent world of sham which is about prankish pretending that everyone is free of the burden of position, possession and desires that are their generic features. Everyone who brings the heaviness of 'serious' external issues undercuts a gentle art of pretending. By the way, this is the reason why strict conviviality is hardly ever possible, despite a group of equals, as it is too difficult to pretend" (Berger 1988, 146). What is most difficult in play is pretending that everyone is equal, and the categories of time, space, and rules strengthen this equality. It is hard not to see the social differences in dailiness as they are the "profoundly imposing" necessity of establishing social links. The requirement of play is "strict conviviality," understood as the selflessness of equals that makes them happy. Transcending dailiness reality during play makes it unique. Play, heavily based on social reality, is a negation of what governs the contacts with other people. Based on that, play is at the same time a different form of reality and a situation that evokes satisfaction, pleasure, and joy of being amongst people who are happy.

The Postmodern Dimension of Ludic Behaviours

The postmodern era, if we may describe the contemporary social reality using this term, governs itself in a way that play differs from the forms of behaviours determined by tradition. Regardless of what we call the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, it is determined by terms related to both the individualisation and globalisation processes. Individualisation, as a result of both the "society of choice" and the "risk society," is a process of making valuable anything that is unique and idiosyncratic, meaning the identity of an individual. Globalisation, on the other hand, is a process of unifying the axiological system on the global scale, therefore