



Provided by the author(s) and NUI Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Op weg naar Broxeele: the production of shared spaces
Author(s)	Emerson, Catherine
Publication Date	2015
Publication Information	Emerson, Catherine. (2015). Op Weg naar Broxeele: The Production of Shared Spaces. In Bill Richardson (Ed.), <i>Spatiality and Symbolic Expression On the Links between Place and Culture</i> (pp. 191-207): New York, Palgrave Macmillan. DOI 10.1057/9781137488510
Publisher	Palgrave Macmillan
Link to publisher's version	http://www.palgrave.com/us/book/9781137502896
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/6578
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9781137488510

Downloaded 2022-08-14T22:25:01Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



CHAPTER 9

Op Weg naar Broxeele: THE PRODUCTION OF SHARED

Formatted: Not Highlight

SPACES

Catherine Emerson

The collective spaces examined in this chapter are situated on the frontier between the concrete and the abstract zones: they are real places that take on imagined significance or, conversely, things that are not real space that we talk about using spatial metaphors and approach with a territorial mentality. These are the spaces that people create in communities, and it is worth lingering for a second on the creative metaphor. Spaces can be created, *produced*; this language does not disturb us because we are used to using the word “space” with both a concrete and an abstract meaning. Michel de Certeau contrasts geometric, geographical space with a poetic, anthropological experience of space, but he uses the same word, *espace*, to talk about both, arguing that the first is like the immutable text and the second is like the ephemeral reading. Concrete spaces are there to be discovered, but the way in which we discover them creates abstract spaces which that we invest with meaning. In this chapter we shall examine some very concrete spaces: a street corner in Brussels, a commune in northern France, and the inside of a moving coach that carries a group of people from one to the other. Reflecting on the way in which these are linked to form a territory of the imagination, which in media environments is treated as if it were a physical territory, we shall see the way in which these environments themselves, whether on the page or online, seem to take on spatial characteristics.

The starting point for our examination is the activities of a Brussels folklore society, the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis. Taking their name from that of the urinating statue topping a drinking fountain that stands on a street corner in the city center (see [Figure 9.1](#)), the Order is firmly identified with a particular spot in the physical world. Operating almost as a representative of the municipal council, the Order of Friends co-ordinates the multiple ceremonies that take place at the foot of the statue of Manneken-Pis, many revolving around the donation of clothing to the urinating statue. It is the Order ~~which that~~ welcomes donating organizations to the corner on which the statue stands, and ~~whose its P~~president acts as ~~M~~master of ~~C~~ceremonies.

[Insert Figure 9.1 around here](#)

So in the festive life of the city, the Friends of Manneken Pis have a very specific physical territory ~~which that~~ is considered theirs. Beyond this, as a not-for-profit organization with legal standing under Belgian law, the Order is obliged to nominate a concrete place that will serve as its headquarters. In December 2004, when the current statutes were drawn up, the headquarters of the organization was fixed at the address of a bar-restaurant called *La Légende* half a block down the street from the fountain, with the proviso that this could be transferred anywhere else in Belgium by a vote of the AGM. At the same time, the purpose of the organization was defined as follows:

To promote the cultural, tourist, philanthropic and commercial development of Brussels in general and more particularly to maintain the traditions surrounding the character of Manneken-Pis.

Commented [Q1]: TS: Insert "Figure 9.1" near here.

Formatted: Not Highlight

This was a reversal of the priorities of the organization ~~as~~ when it was originally constituted in April 1958; ~~where~~ research and dissemination of information about the statue were the primary purpose of the then Friends of Manneken Pis, while the wider culture of Brussels and the Brabant region were secondary objects of study.⁵ In that earlier constitution, the headquarters of the organization could also be moved away from its original legal address in the Brussels World Fair, but not outside the greater Brussels area. With the passage of time, the physical restrictions on the association seem to have relaxed somewhat, along with a broadening focus on the culture of the region as distinct from just the statue. Nevertheless, the spatial focus—the statue, the street corner, the city, and the region—~~has~~ haves remained integral to the way that the association has defined itself over more than half a century.

The redefinition of the Friends of Manneken Pis as an Order places the organization in a particular socio-historical context, one that looks to the guilds of the late ~~m~~ Middle ~~a~~ Ages for its legitimacy. Like many Belgian associations organized around the general principle of “folklore,” the Order of Friends has adopted some of the external trappings associated with Low Countries craft and devotional guilds. For some associations, these trappings include the use of Latin in their ceremonies or the wearing of specific robes or headgear. For the Friends of Manneken Pis, their membership of an order is signaled by the wearing of a collarette in the red and green heraldic colors of the city of Brussels from which hangs a medallion depicting the statue. In this way, the members of the Order signal that they belong to a particular sort of association, conceived as a brotherhood with a common purpose. By calling themselves an Order, the Friends of Manneken Pis bring into play historical associations with orders of chivalry and religious orders, both of which, like the devotional guilds of the late ~~m~~ Middle Ages, had a spiritual dimension as well as a professional one. Through their name and their dress, the Friends

of Manneken Pis signal their adoption of a devotional relationship with the fountain ~~which~~that as their patron. Their dress also signals their identification with a place, Brussels, whose heraldic colors they wear. While the Friends remain in the city, this seems to denote a relationship of pride in their environment; and provides representative local color when they greet visitors from outside, but this relationship changes when the Friends travel.

And travel they do, as is demonstrated by sequences of short videos that they upload to the video-sharing website YouTube. The title of the current chapter is that of one of these videos, the first of a sequence of nine, uploaded in June 2011. The sequence documents the journey made by the Order to a small village in Northern France, Broxeele, where they attend a ceremony inaugurating a replica urinating statue, dancing to the strains of a brass band, before returning to their coach and travelling back to the Belgian capital.⁶ In this, and in other similar sequences of videos, the uploader, styled *mannekenpismascotte*, is anxious to demonstrate not only that the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis is involved in activities outside of Brussels; but that they travel physically to do so. The third video in the Broxeele sequence is typical of the sort of clip that does this. Like the two videos that precede it, and the final video in the sequence, it is shot from a moving coach, demonstrating to the viewer that the group are moving collectively from their habitual location to a foreign space.⁷ The emphasis is on the foreign landscape moving past the coach window, signaled by the visual cue of the bilingual emergency exit sign on the glass. The fact that it is in French and Dutch indicates that the bus is Belgian, just as the tricolor sash worn by the mayor in the next video in the sequence demonstrates that the group are now in France.⁸ For much of this clip the travelers themselves do not appear; only their voices are heard, and we occasionally see the backs of their heads. What we hear again underlines the foreignness of the territory being explored, as

occupants of the bus comment on the statue of the Virgin that they see outside, with one woman remarking that she knows she is abroad now. The comments made by the occupants of the bus demonstrate that the members of the group are approaching their travel from the point of view of the paradigms that we commonly associate with tourism. As they travel through the French countryside, they are selecting objects for their gaze that are, for them, emblematic of the idea “French countryside.” The statue of the Virgin is one, and so too is a cow, which we as viewers do not see, but which one of the voices off tells us is there.⁹ Toward the end of the video, a female voice identifies the church and tells us that it is “her” church, by which she means the church that she is using as a landmark to locate the party’s final destination.¹⁰ She has appropriated the local landmark and invested it with her own meaning.

These are the practices of tourism, but the purpose of the group’s travel is not straightforwardly touristic, in that the end objective of the trip is not the simple fact of having travelled. An alternative model of mobility that might suggest itself is that of pilgrimage, reminiscent of the devotional guilds of the later Middle Ages on which the Order of Friends seems to be modelled. Like the journey of the Friends of Manneken Pis, the pilgrimage is teleological: it has an end-point, which justifies the journey, and an encounter with the Other, which gives the trip meaning. The Order of Friends of Manneken Pis has adopted the trappings of the medieval guilds in the service of an apparently secular patron.¹¹ It therefore follows that their travel could be regarded as a secular reinterpretation of the religious practice of pilgrimage for the twenty-first century, in the manner that Justine Digance defines the latter as “undertaking a journey that is redolent with meaning.”¹² It is noteworthy that in presenting this definition, Digance places as much emphasis on the journey as on the destination.

Although the journey has a goal, there is a sense in which the journey itself is the goal, as the pilgrim perceives travel toward the goal in terms of a quest. This travel then becomes ritualized; as Digance comments, “the pilgrim’s route is preordained through the annals of time so that to deviate in any way would be to undermine the authenticity of the experience.”¹³

The journey is as much a part of the pilgrim experience as the destination and this was as true of medieval pilgrimages as it is today. The wife in the eighth episode of the late fourteenth- or early fifteenth-century *Quinze joies de mariage* torments her husband to allow her to go on a pilgrimage because of the opportunities for flirting on the way and for talking about her experiences when she gets back.¹⁴ Although she is implicitly criticized for her lack of respect for the religious solemnity of her journey, the work is a piece of social satire, so it seems clear that the anonymous author intended the attitude portrayed to be recognizable among his contemporaries. Medieval pilgrims profited from the social aspect of their peregrinations but they also invested them with ritual significance, as the number of documented pilgrim routes in Europe attests.

The Order of Friends of Manneken Pis demonstrates a parallel attitude when its members display videos of their journeys online. Anxious to both show the activities at the end-point of the journey and document the journey itself, they are re-creating the paradigms of travel of the medieval devotional guilds. They are also making manifest their understanding of the physical geographical space to which they are related and in which they move, and of the abstract meanings that they attach to it. In these videos the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis are not merely travelling to a destination but also displaying publicly that they have made the trip. Individual members are marked with visible signs of their origin, wearing ribbons in the red and green civic colors of Brussels, which reveals their foreign origin when they are away. The fact of

making the journey unifies them as a group: when they meet in Brussels they travel separately, participate in Manneken-Pis-related activity, and then return home. When they gather to go somewhere else, the group nature of their activity extends not only to the actual event, the focus of their folklore mission, but also to the journey to and from the place where this occurs. Geographical displacement also has the effect of changing the representative nature of the group. In Brussels, the Friends of Manneken Pis stand for the statue because this is what marks them out as different from other Brussels folk groups. Outside of Brussels, they come to represent their city and, when they cross a border, their country, aided by the colored regalia that marks them out as coming from Brussels. In the classic paradox of movement, then, the Friends of Manneken Pis only really enact their association with a physical location when they leave that location.

That this should be true of a group dedicated to Manneken Pis is even more paradoxical, given the complex relationship that statue has with questions of physical location and community identity. The urinating statue standing on a street corner in what was once the extra-mural suburbs of medieval Brussels has served as a marker of place since at least the mid-fifteenth century. Then, in the first unambiguous mention of the fountain, it appeared as one of the landmarks that marked the boundaries between administrative districts of the city outside the then city walls.¹⁵ Perhaps there was a certain amount of humor in this, given that many animals mark their territory by weeing, but it is a fact that the statue is—and always has been—very firmly associated with the street corner on which it stands. Because it is a statue, it does not easily depart physically from the position in which it has been placed and this means that it can serve as a permanent marker of that place.¹⁶ Indeed, the rare occasions when the statue has been moved by human agency appear to have been prompted by the close association between the fountain and its particular spatial location. Repeatedly stolen, especially

Commented [Q2]: AU: Please check the sentence for sense.

in the period following the Second World War, Manneken Pis was the target of student associations from rival towns seeking to establish their reputation over that of Brussels. When, for example, the Antwerp Vikings made off with the statue in January 1963, the success of their escapade depended upon the fact that the public expected to see the urinating statue at the corner of rue du Chêne and rue de l'Étuve, making its removal anywhere else a demonstration of the prowess of those doing the removing. Similarly, it is believed that the statue was removed by the residents of Brussels for its own protection when the city was in a state of siege in 1695.¹⁷ If this is true, it indicates once again that the statue's place on that particular street corner was one that held such importance for residents of the city that extraordinary measures were required to preserve it in a time of war. Certainly the frequency with which the story is retold, together with the repeated attempts by student to kidnap the statue, reveal that by the twentieth century, the concrete location of the statue had been invested with such significance that its absence from that place was read as emblematic of extraordinary circumstances.

In the normal course of affairs, then, Manneken Pis does not move and this permits its secure identification with a number of spatial entities, a particular part of a particular city, and then, in a series of metonymical relationships, with various larger entities: the city itself, the nation (Belgium) of which Brussels has become the capital, and the supranational geographical unit of the European Union. One need only look at Bernhard Müller's 1992 essay *Manneken Pis: Der gefährliche Gang der Schweiz nach Europ*, to see that the statue can be used to discuss any question that the speaker associates with the topic "Brussels."¹⁸ In the event, Müller is writing about his feeling that his native Switzerland's independence is threatened by the European Union, which he compares to Manneken Pis on the basis mainly that because the

Commented [Q3]: AU: Please clarify if this should be "students"

statue is in Brussels, the political capital of the EU, but also because both the fountain and the supranational body are cute and beloved of Americans but irresponsibly young and ~~naïve-naive~~ (in the case of Europe, economically so). The comparison works precisely because Manneken Pis is immovable and therefore firmly geographically situated. However, it is a comparison ~~which-that~~ can only be made from an external perspective. A Brusseler who views Manneken Pis as representative of a specific corner of a specific pair of streets would never arrive at the metaphor that Müller develops. Just as the Friends of Manneken Pis are very parochial if they remain in Brussels, but take on a grander significance when they travel, so the statue itself can be made to symbolize a wider geographical entity when it is viewed from the perspective of the outsider.

In a metaphorical sense, then, it is necessary that Manneken Pis travel in order for it to be able to assume the full range of abstract meanings associated with its fixed physical location. Only when viewed out of its spatial context does Manneken Pis achieve the wider representative functions that unite social groups around it and ideas of nationality and community. If we talk about space as something that can be produced, this is what the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis are doing when they display the rituals of the journeys they undertake to represent the statue in other locations.

There is another sense, however, in which the collective identification with physical location can take on an abstract significance that transcends the concrete geographical space, and again this can be illustrated using the example of Manneken Pis. The statue is frequently claimed as representative of the working-class Brussels district of the Marolles. In 1946, the Royal Racing Club de Bruxelles, a local soccer club, donated a goalkeeper's outfit to the statue of Manneken Pis, explaining that, in this costume, the statue would be able to play for the under-12

Marolles side and would even be able to relieve himself during the match, such was the overwhelming superiority of the side.¹⁹ The gifting of costumes to cement a relationship between the city and the donating agency is a practice that arose after the First World War and became more popular after the Second World War, and so the fact that one of the city's football teams gave a costume to the fountain is not in itself exceptional. However, the fact that it explained the gift in terms of an imagined Marolles youth side is interesting from a number of perspectives. Firstly, neither the Royal Racing Club de Bruxelles nor Manneken Pis has any geographical relationship with the Marolles. The Marolles is a working-class area of Brussels whose boundaries are well understood. Although the area is not always precisely defined, it is close to the corner on which Manneken Pis stands but is never claimed to include that corner.²⁰ Similarly, although the Royal Racing Club moved between venues in its 69-year history, it never played in Marolles. Why, then, should the football club claim a Marolles identity for the statue dressed in its strip? The answer lies in the nature of spatial identities, which are at once firmly linked to localities and physically independent of them. The Royal Racing Club is not alone in claiming Manneken Pis as a citizen of the Marolles, but it does so not because it believes, wrongly, that the fountain is on a street corner in that district, but because there are values and identities ~~which that~~ are associated with both Manneken Pis and Marolles.

Marolles is an archetypal inner-city working-class area traditionally associated with a characteristic dialect ~~which that~~ combines features of both French and Dutch and an impish sense of humor exhibited especially by the street boys, known (in both French and Dutch) as *ketje*.²¹ Perhaps because it is working class and bilingual in a city ~~which that~~ is officially bilingual (though with varying degrees of fluency), it is often considered to be the location of the authentic

Formatted: Font: Italic

“old” Brussels.²¹ Manneken Pis, too, is demonstrably old and disturbingly vulgar, to the extent that public urination breaches the acceptable norms of behavior. Of course, this vulgarity is mitigated somewhat by the fact that the statue represents (or rather, appears to represent) a small child, and it can be mitigated even further by reference to the cultural trope of misbehavior associated with the “ketje” and located in Marolles. There are, of course, class implications in this association: “vulgarity” is, as the word’s etymology suggests, a characteristic readily attributed to the lower social orders; thus, a kid from the Marolles weeing on the street is to be excused on grounds of both age and social mores. Saying that Manneken Pis is from Marolles, therefore, is not really falsifying its geographical origin but rather aligning it with a set of characteristics associated with an identity of which geography is only one component. And, of course, outside of Brussels, the distinction between Marolles and the city as a whole is far less clear-cut. To the extent that the Marolliens are regarded as representative of Brussels, then every Brusseler is a Marollien, once he or she leaves the city. Once again, it is the journey that concretizes the identification between the statue and the place.

It is a fact that has been officially recognized by the City of Brussels. And, indeed, this recognition is the reason that the Friends of Manneken Pis made the journey from Brussels to Broxeele in June 2011. *Broxeele*, as its name suggests, is the same sort of place as Brussels. Or rather, it originally had the same natural advantages, or disadvantages, as the Belgian capital, both names arising from an Old Dutch phrase meaning “home in the marsh.” This situation has been something that both Brussels and Broxeele have had to contend with over the centuries: each town is caught beside a river that is prone to flooding. However, whereas the French village is a tiny settlement of around 200 people, the Belgian capital has thrived. When, in 1979, Brussels celebrated its millennium, a decision was taken to present a replica Manneken

Formatted: Font: Italic

Pis to its French namesake, in recognition of their common heritage. It was this statue that the Friends of the Brussels Manneken Pis were visiting in 2011. To celebrate the thirty years of the Broxeele Manneken Pis, they came with a second statue of Manneken Pis to present to the French town.²² Indeed, they came with two replica statues of Manneken Pis, since the Order has acquired a mobile fountain with which it travels, and which also mingles with the crowd in events held at the foot of the Brussels fountain, spraying people with water to enliven the occasion.²³ This mobilizing of the apparently static statue can also be found in official discourse surrounding the fountain: as well as presenting the gift of the Broxeele fountain as part of Brussels' millennium celebration, the occasion was marked by the creation of a diplomatic post for an effigy of Manneken Pis, which circulated, bearing letters of accreditation, to the capital cities of each of the then eight countries of the European Economic Community in turn.²⁴ Although the event was clearly playful, it illustrates the extent to which, in official discourse as well as in community festivities, Manneken Pis is regarded as the representative of the Belgian capital.

Fifty years previously, too, a replica of the fountain was used to cement relationships between Belgium and the Alsatian town of Colmar, accompanied by the claim that the people of both regions had suffered under the German occupation of the First World War and had maintained their good humor. Here, the statue is associated with shared values of persistent cheerfulness and disrespect for (German) authority and, in doing so, the fountain strengthens relationships between regions that define themselves as having been unjustly occupied.²⁵ The Brussels Manneken Pis transferred to Colmar is still recognizably the property of the Belgian capital, as is the replica statue ~~which~~ ~~that~~ arrives bearing letters of diplomatic accreditation; but its appearance outside the context of Brussels gives it an added

significance. In travelling away from the street corner to which it is fixed, Manneken Pis creates and reinforces political, ideological, and etymological relationships between that street corner and other places. In each instance, the movement of the statue has meaning especially because of the locatedness of the fountain's identity, and this is developed by the way that the statues ~~which~~ that travel are accompanied by explanatory texts, displayed beneath the gifts to Colmar and Broxeele, travelling with the Manneken Pis ambassador, which affirm that the statue is from Brussels and that its journey has a particular meaning in terms of consolidating community relations. For this reason, it is significant that the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis post videos of themselves on the way to Broxeele. The meaning of the gift—and its associated message—that they transport can only be fully understood if it is recognized that the Brussels fountain has a very precise spatial location and that it has moved outside this location to illustrate a point about community and connection between one place and another. The journey between the two locations can be understood in terms of Turnerian liminality: it is not one place nor the other, but it makes the physical connection between the two places and invites the spectators to make the mental comparison.²⁶ Brussels is like Broxeele because the two are linked by the journey of the partisans of one statue to pay homage to the other. Brussels is like Colmar for the same reason.

In terms of abstract spatial understanding, these symbolic journeys have a further, unexpected, implication, in that they are treated in the media as if they were territories in their own right. Collective subjects of discourse become places. An example of this can be seen in how the Belgian newspaper, *Le Soir*, reported on the gift of the Manneken Pis replica to Colmar in 1922. The journalist Louis Piérard, who reported from the journey to Colmar and the resultant ceremony, was named in his by-line as *“notre envoyé spécial”*.²⁷ At the same

Formatted: Font: Italic

time, businesses based in Brussels contributed Colmar-themed advertisements to appear alongside reports from Colmar. For a short period, the pages of the Brussels press devoted to the event became a section of the newspaper. As Benedict Anderson has observed, the Belgian press, like the press throughout the world, is conventionally laid out along territorial lines in the news section of the newspaper: Belgian national news, international news, and news from the Belgian regions.²⁸ Creating a separate but comparable section for news of Manneken Pis in Colmar makes a territorial claim for this subject: Manneken Pis in Colmar is a “country.”

Abstract ideas are spaces. In travelling to Colmar with a replica statue of Manneken Pis, the three anti-German satirists who had initiated the gift were staking a territorial claim over the Alsatian town, arguing that it was a place like Brussels and unlike Germany. This was a community appropriation of a concrete space, backed not only by their satirical newspaper, *Pourquoi Pas?*, but also by the mainstream press, as represented by *Le Soir*. At the same time, *Le Soir*'s treatment of the subject demonstrates that the appropriation is taking place simultaneously in the physical territory of the street corner and in the ideological territory of the newspaper page. Colmar is a real place, but Manneken Pis in Colmar is a separate abstract place.

Perhaps this should not surprise us, given the pervasive nature of spatial metaphors in our discourse. This is as true in new media as it is in older forms. Dan Hunter has illustrated the extent to which this metaphor is used in everyday life and specifically in the area of Internet communications, even though the law governing cyberspace relationships explicitly holds that cyberspace is not a place but rather is subject to other territorial jurisdictions.²⁹

Nevertheless, the fact remains that we continue to refer to our online lives as a life in *cyberspace* and there are numerous other spatial metaphors that are used to describe online relationships. This, then, throws new light on the actions of the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis in displaying

videos of their journeys on YouTube. The way that this video-sharing site works is itself capable of being understood in territorial terms, since uploaders are encouraged to group their videos under the heading of “channels” to which viewers can then “subscribe.” There is no money exchanged in this relationship, but viewers who subscribe to a particular channel will automatically see the videos made by that user when they visit the site. The idea is then that each user will be presented with an interface that reflects his or her personal interests, much as newspaper readers can negotiate their way round the publication by seeking particular rubrics. The difference is, however, that once the choices have been made, the site itself—and note again the spatial metaphor—appears differently to the user. In selecting the community that he or she will interact with, the individual user of YouTube physically changes the territory. Such developments toward individualization are viewed by Benedict Anderson and those who follow him as representing a fragmentation of the imagined communities which that emerged in the nineteenth century.³⁰ It is, nevertheless, a fragmentation that uses some of the same techniques of the appropriation of metaphorical space through media that constructed communities in the first place. And, indeed, it still serves to construct communities, although they may be transnational in nature, or, like the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis, very specifically located in physical space and serving a niche community of interest.

Uploaders to YouTube, including mannekenpismascotte, are making territorial claims to the attention of the community of YouTube viewers that they address. They do this whether they intend to or not, since the concept is inherent in the way that the site itself operates: selecting a video will prompt a display of similar videos for the user to pursue his or her viewing. These will be the videos contributed by the same “channel” or which that have a similar title. However, there are also practices of the YouTube community which that extend the spatial parallels.

Uploaders strengthen their community ties by posting videos as responses to those already on the site, and self-aware users regard this as a strategy for increasing their prominence among* their public.<xen>³¹</xen> In spatial terms, they are staking a claim to their own territory, in ways that can be interpreted as encroaching on the territories of others, or alternatively, as a form of collaboration where the common space is expanded by attracting a community of viewers with overlapping interests. The Friends of Manneken Pis do not do this. However, the way that they interact with the site demonstrates how they conceive of the communal space ~~which~~that they occupy. The uploader who has created the channel_ mannekenpismascotte, for example, uses the alias only to post videos of the activities of the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis, suggesting that this area of his or her life is regarded as separate from others. Indeed_ there may even be a number of people posting under the same “channel” since the descriptions of the videos appear sometimes in Dutch, more rarely in French_ and increasingly in English. We might therefore imagine that mannekenpismascotte is a community effort, reflecting the activities of the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis, both by documenting their travels and by providing them with a further opportunity for interaction. In their case, the interaction does not seem to go much beyond the group filmed, as their channel has no subscribers and their videos have not been frequently played. Nevertheless, their tentative steps into the virtual territories of online communities confirm that off_line groups reproduce themselves in the online space and that both concrete and abstract space are conceived territorially by communities who occupy that space and invest it with meaning.

NOTES

<en-group type=“endnotes”>

Formatted: French (France)

<en><label>1</label> Michel De Certeau, *L'Invention du quotidien I. Arts de faire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), p. 142.</en>

<en><label>2</label> A schedule of such ceremonies is to be found on the Friends' website: <http://ordre-manneken-pis.wikeo.be/> and a representative of the association sits *ex officio* on the council committee that decides whether a particular costume will be accepted. Ville de Bruxelles, "Garde-robe de Manneken Pis," règlement FR2005, stipulates that one of the six-person committee deciding on the donation of a costume should be someone with knowledge of the folklore of Brussels, such as a member of the Order of Friends of Manneken Pis or the Brussels Historical Society.</en>

<en><label>3</label> *Annexe au Moniteur Belge*, 2004-12-30/ 0181587. When *La Légende* closed, the legal address of the organization was transferred to 31–33, rue des Grands Carmes (*Annexe au Moniteur Belge*, 2013-04-24/0064376).</en>

<en><label>4</label> "L'association a pour but de favoriser l'essor culturel, touristique, philanthropique et commercial de Bruxelles en général, et plus particulièrement de maintenir les traditions se rapportant au personnage de Manneken-Pis." (*Annexe au Moniteur Belge*, 2004-12-30/0181587).</en>

<en><label>5</label> *Annexe au Moniteur Belge*, 1958-05-12/ 1542.</en>

<en><label>6</label> Mannekenpismascotte, "Op weg naar Broxeele" 12-6-2011 (2), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BtPOD76gAWI> [accessed August 21, 2014].</en>

<en><label>7</label> Mannekenpismascotte, "Manneken Pis—Broxeele" 12-6-2011 (3), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vyQNaGIJhyo&feature=relmfu> [accessed August 21, 2014].</en>

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

Commented [Q4]: AU: Please check if the insertion of the closing quote is ok..

Field Code Changed

Commented [Q5]: AU: Please check if the insertion of the closing quote is ok.

<en><label>8</label> Mannekenpismascotte. ⁶Manneken Pis—Broxeele” 12-6-2011 (4),

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PeVQhJX3EfA> [accessed August 21, 2014].</en>

<en><label>9</label> For the importance of the gaze, see John Urry, “The Consumption of Tourism.” in *Consuming Places* (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 129–40. Transcript of the

opening sequence of the video: “[Man’s voice] “Tu as vu la madonne” [Woman’s voice] “Elle a vu des vaches!” “Il y avait une madonne quand même” [Man’s voice] “Ah oui, jolie!” [Woman’s voice] “Maintenant je sais que je suis à l’⁷étranger.”</en>

<en><label>10</label> “Mon église”. This phrase has already been used in the previous clip, Manneken Pis—Broxeele 12-6-2011 (2), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RdQWIDJeZ9s>, where the other occupants have ridiculed their companion for its use.</en>

<en><label>11</label> In fact, the outward form of the Manneken Pis fountain owes a lot to the traditions of religious portraiture and in particular the Low Countries portrayals of the infant Jesus. As a result, there are a number of reactions to the urinating statue ~~which~~that draw on Christian devotional tropes. For an examination of this, see Catherine Emerson, “The Infant of Brussels: The Manneken Pis as Christ Child.”, *Irish Journal of French Studies*, 3, 2003: 94–108.</en>

<en><label>12</label> Justine Digance, “Religious and Secular Pilgrimage: Journeys Redolent with Meaning.” in Timothy Dallen and Daniel Olsen (eds) *Tourism, Religion and Spiritual Journeys* (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 36.</en>

<en><label>13</label> Digance, “Religious and Secular Pilgrimage.”, p. 39.</en>

<en><label>14</label> Jean Rychner, *Les XV joies de mariage* (Geneva: Droz, 1967).</en>

Commented [Q6]: AU: Please check if the insertion of the closing quote is ok.

Commented [Q7]: AU: Please provide the editor group for the endnote reference “Urry 1995”.

Formatted: French (France)

Commented [Q8]: AU: Please provide the English-translated version of the transcript, if needed.

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

[René Laurent, “L’Acte de 1453 concernant les limites des quartiers à Bruxelles,”](#) in Georges Despy et al. (eds) *Hommage au Professeur Paul Bonenfant* (Brussels: Universa, 1965), pp. 467–78, p. 477.

Commented [Q9]: AU: Please provide the full editor group details for the reference "Laurent 1965".

Formatted: French (France)

[Den zesten wijck, van Sinte Jacobs poirte tot der Lakenhallen ende vandair, tot der Spiegelbruggen, ende van Sinte Jacobs poirte tot dair dMenneken pist ende al de Stooftstrate tot der Hallen metter Volderstraten ende achter de Halle. Den sevensten wijck, vandair dMenneken pist tot der Steenpoirten ende vandair, de Guldestrate tot den wykete ende Pepercorenborre, de Gasthuystrete omtrent den Corenhuyse tot der Coe ende tot der beckerien aen Sinte Jans poel.](#)

[A documented history of the statue can be found in Vincent Heymans, *Monument à Manneken-Pis—angle rue de l’Etuve, rue du Chêne: Étude historique du monument et de ses abords* \(Brussels: Ville de Bruxelles, Département Urbanisme Architecture Cellule Patrimoine Historique, 2003\); details of cases when the statue has been moved are given in pp. 11–14.](#)

[This claim, though often reported, is open to doubt, since a contemporary satirical poem depicts the statue as having been damaged by the bombardment, indicating that it had not been removed to a place of safety. The poem is preserved in manuscript, Archives de la Ville de Bruxelles, liasse 620A. Two versions of it are discussed in Paul M. G. Lévy, “La Plus Ancienne Complainte de Manneken-Pis,” *Les Cahiers Bruxellois*, 5, 3, 1960: 202–13.](#)

[Bernhard Müller, *Manneken Pis. Der gefährlicher Gang der Schweiz nach Europa* \(Bern: Erpf, 1992\).](#)

[June 10, 1946 Discours du président du Royal Racing Club de Bruxelles à l'occasion de la remise d'un costume de footballeur, Brussels. Archives de la ville de Bruxelles, Fonds Lebouille, p. 78.](#)

[Louis Quiévreux defines the district as that found south of Notre Dame de la Chapelle between the Palais de Justice and the Rue Haute, Louis Quiévreux, *Marolles, cœur de Bruxelles* \(Paris: Dutilleu, 1958\), pp. 11–15.](#)

[For an examination of how French and Dutch interact in Brussels, see Jeanine Treffers-Daller, *Mixing Two Languages: French-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective* \(Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994\).](#)

[“Trente ans du Manneken-Pis: ‘La journée se prépare.’” *La Voix du Nord*, 27 May 2011.](#)

[An example of this can be seen in Mannekenpismascotte. “Feest Manneken Pis 3-9-2011.” <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GFNGSdzFy14>> \[accessed August 21, 2014\].](#)

[Jean Francis, *JULIEN dit MANNEKEN-PIS ou la petite histoire du ZIZI FRONDEUR bruxellois* \(Brussels: Rossel, 1978\), p. 125. I am very grateful to Seán Ó hAodha of the Irish embassy in Brussels for clarification on the precise diplomatic protocol of Manneken Pis's mission.](#)

[L\[ouis\]P\[iérard\], “Manneken Pis à Colmar. Fraternisation Belgo-alsacienne.” *Le Soir*, October 2, 1922.](#)

Formatted: French (France), Not Highlight

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

<en><label>26</label> Victor Turner, “Liminality and Communitas,” *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 94–130.</en>

Commented [Q10]: AU: Please provide the editor group for the endnote reference “Turner 1966”.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: French (France)

<en><label>27</label> P[érard], “Manneken Pis à Colmar.”</en>

<en><label>28</label> The idea is implicit in Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006) and was developed in a public lecture given at NUI Galway on September 19, 2012. The same idea is discussed from a different perspective in Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Sage, 1995).</en>

<en><label>29</label> Dan Hunter, “Cyberspace as Place,” *California Law Review*, 91, 2003: 439–519.</en>

<en><label>30</label> Benedict Anderson, “Globalization and ~~h~~Its Discontents,” *Field Day Review*, 1, 2005: 177–88; see also Karen Le Rossignol, “Dreaming Well ~~B~~being into Being: Dualities of Virtual-Actual Communities,” this volume, Chapter 7.</en>

Commented [Q11]: AU: Please provide the full details for the first occurrence of this endnote reference.

<en><label>31</label> For an account of how this operates, see Niclas Lundberg and Anders Söderman, *Establishment on YouTube*, Masters dissertation (Sweden: Umeå Universitet 2011).</en>

</en-group>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Benedict. “Globalization and ~~h~~Its Discontents,” *Field Day Review*, 1, 2005: 177–88.

Anderson, Benedict _____. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006).

_____. “Globalization and its Discontents,” *Field Day Review*, 1, 2005: 177–88.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Dallen, Timothy and Daniel Olsen (eds.) *Tourism, Religion and Spiritual Journeys* (London: Routledge, 2006).

[De Certeau, Michel. *L'Invention du quotidien 1. Arts de faire* \(Paris: Gallimard, 1990\).](#)

Formatted: French (France)

Digance, Justine. “Religious and Secular Pilgrimage: Journeys Redolent with Meaning” in Timothy Dallen and Daniel Olsen (eds) *Tourism, Religion and Spiritual Journeys* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 36–48.

[De Certeau, Michel. *L'Invention du quotidien 1. Arts de faire* \(Paris: Gallimard, 1990\).](#)

Francis, Jean. *JULIEN dit MANNEKEN-PIS ou la petite histoire du ZIZI FRONDEUR bruxellois* (Brussels: Rossel, 1978).

Formatted: French (France)

Heymans, Vincent. *Monument à Manneken-Pis—Angle rue de l'Étuve, rue du Chêne. Etude historique du monument et de ses abords* (Brussels: Ville de Bruxelles, Département Urbanisme Architecture Cellule Patrimoine Historique, 2003).

Hunter, Daniel. “Cyberspace as Place” *California Law Review*, 91, 2003: 439–519.

Laurent, René. “L'Acte de 1453 concernant les limites des quartiers à Bruxelles” in Georges Despy et al. (eds) *Hommage au Professeur Paul Bonenfant* (Brussels: Universa, 1965), pp. 467–78.

Commented [Q12]: AU: Please provide the full editor group details for the reference "Laurent 1965".

Formatted: French (France)

Lévy, Paul M.G. “La Plus Ancienne Complainte de Manneken-Pis” *Les Cahiers bruxellois*, 5:3, 1960: 202–13.

Lundberg, Niclas and Anders Söderman. “Establishment on YouTube” (Masters dissertation, Umeå Universitet, 2011).

[Mannekenpismascotte, “Feest Manneken Pis 3-9-2011.”](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GFNGSdzFy14> [accessed February 4, 2013].

[Mannekenpismascotte, “Manneken Pis—Broxeele” 12-6-2011 \(3\).](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vyQNaGIJhyo&feature=relmfu> [accessed January 28, 2013].

[Mannekenpismascotte, “Manneken Pis—Broxeele” 12-6-2011 \(4\).](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PeVQhJX3EfA> [accessed January 28, 2013].

[Mannekenpismascotte, “Op weg naar Broxeele” 12-6-2011 \(2\).](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BtPOD76gAWI> [accessed 28 January 28, 2013].

[Mannekenpismascotte, “Manneken Pis—Broxeele 12-6-2011 \(3\).](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vyQNaGIJhyo&feature=relmfu> [accessed 28 January 2013].

P[ierard], L[ouis]. “Manneken Pis à Colmar: Fraternisation Belgo-alsacienne.” *Le Soir*, 2 October 2, 1922.

[Quiévreux, Louis. *Marolles, cœur de Bruxelles* \(Paris: Dutilleu, 1958\), pp. 11–15.](#)

Rychner, Jean. *Les XV joies de mariage* (Geneva: Droz, 1967).

Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. *Mixing Two Languages: French-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994).

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).

Urry, John. *Consuming Places* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Commented [Q13]: AU: Please check if the insertion of the closing quote is ok.

Commented [Q14]: AU: Please check if the insertion of the closing quote is ok.

Commented [Q15]: AU: Please check if the insertion of the closing quote is ok.

Quiévreux, Louis. *Marolles, cœur de Bruxelles* (Paris: Dutilleul, 1958), pp. 11-15.