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Feminist commentators on language have noted in many contexts that the world has been “named” from a male and male-dominant perspective and that lexicogrammatical features in languages often reveal important underlying cultural (male) assumptions. Some feminists, following the theories of Benjamin Lee Whorf, believe these features are not simply reflections of a prior social reality but mechanisms whereby that reality is continually naturalized and reproduced (Spender 1980; Elgin 1985).

In a well-known application of this general thesis, Schulz (1975) and Stanley (1977) have examined from a historical perspective the elaboration of the English lexicon in the area of terms denoting women as prostitutes. They argue that the existence of a very large number of items in this lexicon indicates the cultural salience of the equation “woman = prostitute,” while the insulting or dysphemistic character of many items bears witness to (and reinforces) the culture’s negative attitudes to women and to sex.

At the College of William and Mary in the spring of 1990, I conducted a seminar on the topic of language and gender in which this feminist approach to the lexicon was discussed at some length. As we pursued the argument, a male student commented that he and his roommates had once sat down and generated 110 synonyms for the “male member.” This was not a class assignment, but an informal leisure activity. A woman student responded that she had engaged in a similar activity with her friends, though their score was “only” about 75 terms.

My interest was piqued by this exchange. I wondered why college students apparently consider the activity of listing penis terms interesting and enjoyable. I also wondered what an analysis of the terms themselves might tell us about American English and—in the light of feminist claims such as those of Stanley and Schulz—American culture. I suggested to the students concerned that they repeat the exercise, this time recording the results for further analysis. The full listing of penis terms is given in the appendix.

Methodology. The data to be analyzed were collected through participant observation. Two students, one male and one female, participated in
a replication of the original spontaneous exercise with their immediate peer groups (in the men's case, the same people who had earlier participated for fun; in the women's case, because more time had elapsed since the initial activity, a minimally overlapping set). The two groups involved differed in terms of gender but were otherwise relatively homogeneous; they were unmarried college students aged 18–21, who are middle class, almost all white (in the case of the males, all white), and predominantly heterosexual. These already-existing friendship groups, it is important to point out, were single-sex: the investigators believed that the activity they wished to observe, listing synonyms for *penis*, would not naturally take place except in single-sex groups of intimate friends. Thus, to work with randomly selected or grouped informants, or to carry out interviews one-on-one, would have been unnatural and probably self-defeating. (It should, however, be noted that in this instance the activity was not totally natural and spontaneous: the informants were told that the investigator was recording for research purposes.)

Strict controls were not placed upon the data-collecting process. The investigators introduced and structured the exercise in whatever way they found most appropriate, both for putting the informants at ease and for maximizing the number of items produced. In practice, for reasons both good and interesting, this meant that the female and male investigator structured things differently.

The female investigator encouraged general discussion of sexual practices and attitudes as well as the production of lexical items; this seems to reflect general norms of all-female talk (Coates 1986), such as establishing trust and intimacy, approaching topics from a personal/relational perspective, and so on. The male investigator by contrast (and similarly, reflecting putative norms of all-male talk, such as a more distanced and impersonal approach to topics) encouraged competition within the group to produce more and better terms. It also seems that the men were more interested in the naming game *qua* game.

This gender difference in subcultural style must also have affected the data, explaining at least in part, for example, why the males produced almost three times as many items overall as the females did. Another obvious consequence was to favor the competitive production by males of many unusual, idiosyncratic, and perhaps even newly coined words. (Whether the terms are attested in the standard dictionaries of slang does not show conclusively what their provenance is, given the domain and the campus subculture in question; nor is attestation a concern of the present analysis.)

In summary, then, this was not a representative sampling of American English speakers, nor in all probability a representative sampling of vo-
cabulary items in common usage among the narrow social group from which the sample was drawn. Let me observe, then, that the study was not designed as an exhaustive survey of terms for the penis in current American English, but rather aimed to address the following questions:

1. Are the penis terms produced by these college students indicative, as one might expect from a feminist perspective, of underlying conceptual and cultural assumptions concerning gender and sexuality?
2. Do the terms and their underlying assumptions differ according to the gender of the producers?

As far as the primary aim is concerned, it does not matter whether some of the terms are coinages rather than attested usages. What is of interest, rather, is whether novel coinages manifest the same underlying logic as attested items, always assuming such a logic can be discovered; whether, in other words, there are constraints on the creation of new terms. If so, this constitutes strong supporting evidence for the existence (among speakers, rather than simply as a post hoc analytic construct) of an underlying cultural and conceptual system governing the structure of this lexicon.

When data collection was completed, the listings obtained were analyzed by grouping them in semantic categories. Preliminary categorization was done by the student investigators and reflected their intuitions as participants as well as discussions they had had with other participants during data collection. This preliminary analysis established basic category sets which were later refined. Where a problem arose at a later stage of how to assign or interpret a specific term, the student investigators were consulted once again. (For example, is meat spear a weaponry term or a food term? I relied on participant intuitions to clarify that it is a weaponry term—though with links to the “food” category.)

The Male Group

This group consisted of four roommates (including the student investigator), aged 20 and 21, whose relationship went back a number of years. All were white, middle class, and professedly heterosexual. They completed the exercise in the living room of their house, and in 30 minutes generated 144 terms. The investigator felt that this was an arbitrary cut-off point: many more terms could have been produced, but they would have been variations on already-established themes.

The themes themselves were not difficult to pick out. A small number of categories account for the overwhelming majority of the 144 items. For these men, the penis is recurrently metaphorized as a person, an animal, a tool, a weapon, or a foodstuff. Let us examine these metaphors in more detail now.
Personifying the penis. In England, there is a popular cartoon character named “Wicked Willie” (willie ‘penis’ is common in British English), who is, in fact, a penis. He first appeared in a book titled Man's Best Friend. The underlying conceit is that men secretly regard their penis as an individual in its own right (and one to whom they are deeply attached). Though the cartoon is a joke, it presumably speaks to a widely recognized, culturally constructed experience of the penis as uncontrollable Other, with a life of its own.

This perception has its serious, not to say problematic, aspects in myths about male sexuality and rape (to which men sometimes claim they are driven by irresistible physical urges). It is also expressed metaphorically in the 38 items on the male group's list which give the penis some kind of personal name.

There are three main subcategories of personal names. The first and most numerous are respect titles and address forms for authority figures. They include Kimosabe (Tonto's address term for the Lone Ranger), his Excellency, your Majesty, the chief, the commissioner, the mayor, and the judge. Also in this category are a number of items which denote symbols of personal authority, such as scepter, rod of lordship, Excalibur, and hammer of the gods. They are included here because they stand metonymically for (divine or royal) persons. Though Excalibur and hammer of the gods might have been classified as a weapon and a tool respectively, and these are not coincidental associations, the primary significance of these terms lies in their association with authority figures.

That association itself has two possible interpretations, both of which may be valid at the same time. One is that, as with the cartoon mentioned above, men are ruled by their genitals. The other, more Freudian, is that the penis in some metonymic sense is the man—it is his “rod of lordship” through whose symbolic power he himself rules.

A second and related subcategory is that of names which refer to the protagonists of myth, legend, TV, and comic books: Genghis Khan, Cyclops (the penis is recurrently named as “one-eyed”), The Hulk, Cylon, The Lone Ranger, The Purple Avenger (again, purple may be added to many items; the comic book character is simply called “The Avenger”), Mac the Knife, and Kojak (suggested presumably by that character’s bald head). To be appropriate in this category, the name must refer to someone heroic or masterful or warlike—Tonto and Gandhi would not be good names for the penis. Many of these terms are typical in being appropriate in a number of different ways. For example, Cyclops connotes gigantic size as well as one-eyedness and mythic status; Mac the Knife contains a weaponry term.
The third subcategory is different, since the names in it connote intimacy rather than authority: Dick, Peter, Percy, John Thomas, Johnson, and the jocular appellation Mr. Happy.

The beast in man: animal names. There were 15 animal names in the list. Five, echoing the second subcategory of personal names, denoted mythical or fictional animals: King Kong, Simba, King of the Jungle, The Dragon, and Cujo (a rabid dog in a Stephen King thriller). Five, predictably, named snakes: snake, one-eyed trouser snake, python, cobra, and anaconda; a related term was eel. Four named other animals: hog, weasel, hairy hound of hedonism, and—in a different vein—beast of burden.

Man, the tool user. The semantic category of tools, implements, and machinery accounted for no fewer than 19 terms. Some were apt simply because of shape (pole, pipe, garden hose); others invoked the motion of the penis in erection (hydraulics, crank, gearshift). The largest number, however, made metaphoric reference to the active role of the penis in sexual intercourse: screwdriver, drill, jackhammer, chisel, lawnmower, hedgetrimmer, and fuzzbuster. It is prototypically the female body and genitals that are screwed, drilled, hammered, trimmed, and busted in these somewhat sadistic metaphors, a fact which may indicate a thematic link with the fourth major category, weaponry and war.

Sex as a weapon. The association of the penis with weapons of destruction has been much analyzed and deplored in feminist writing. (For a good illustration in the domain of "nukespeak," the language of nuclear defense technology, see Cohn 1989.) It is certainly apparent in 15 items on the male group's list.

Most weaponry terms for the penis ring the changes on three types of weapon: guns (spoo gun, squirt gun, love pistol, passion rifle), spears or knives (meat spear, lightsabre), and missiles (pink torpedo, heat-seeking moisture missile). There are other terms which do not directly name weapons but which clearly evoke warfare and destruction, such as stealth bomber, destroyer, and a series of terms involving the word helmet (polished helmet, shiny helmet, purple helmeted love warrior). The helmet presumably is a fanciful allusion to the shape and position of the glans, but its military connotations are clear (especially in the last item).

One notable feature of this whole category is the persistent collocation of "love" and "war" terms (passion rifle, love warrior), which presumably indicates the metaphorical linking of sex and violence much discussed by feminists in relation to cultural norms of masculinity.
Consuming Passions: The Penis as Food. There are 15 food terms in the male group's list, and according to the student investigator, the male informants find this category the most "demeaning and disgusting." The list can be subcategorized into three classes of foods.

The first, represented by love popsicle and lucky charm blow pop, has licking and sucking (thus, fellatio) as its theme. Most of the fifteen fall into a second class of terms denoting meat (especially sausage or pork): wiener, wienie, wienerschnitzel (which I take this as an elaboration on wiener rather than a reference to breaded veal cutlets), vienna sausage, Oscar Meyer, piece of pork, tube steak, and Whopper. Many of the sausage terms are insulting because they connote small size. The anomalous item, in a class by itself and also unequivocally an insult, is noodle (thin, pale, and flaccid).

Women and Other Taboo Sexualities. Surprisingly few terms in the list make direct reference to women and their (real or mythical) experience of the penis. They are invoked implicitly in the "tool" terms, as we have seen; and there is also a small group of "sport and leisure" terms implicitly naming women's vaginas as "holes" and "caves" (cavedweller, slimy spelunker, 5-iron, ace in the hole). Somewhat less offensive are three terms referring to female pleasure: pussy pleaser, leaning tower of please-her, and wife's best friend.

Except for the food category, there are also few terms making reference to explicit sexual preferences and practices other than heterosexual vaginal intercourse. Apart from the two fellatio-related terms above, there are two references to anal sex, rectum wrecker and anal intruder; and one to masturbation, wanker.

Phonaesthesia. It will already be clear that whatever the metaphorical significance of the items listed by the male group, they also manifest a certain aesthetic pleasure in creative play with language (cf. hairy hound of hedonism and heat-seeking moisture missile). There is one category where this pleasure is foregrounded, since the terms in it are not metaphors but rather phonaesthetic items meaning little other than just "penis" to their users. They include such perennials as dick, prick, cock, dork, dong, wang, and Yiddish loans schmuck and schlond.

Miscellaneous Items. Only about 20 of the 144 male terms are left unclassified by the preceding seven categories. At least two discernable themes emerge in this miscellaneous remnant: body parts (third leg, main vein, bone) and references to size or shape (tube o'thrills, sweaty cigar, love horn, thunder log, thunder stick, shaft, stump, ten-incher, monolith). Only one term, special purpose, seems incapable of being grouped in any way at all.
DISCUSSION. The metaphors the male group apparently use to organize their lexicon of terms referring to the penis recapitulate well-worn themes and conventions having to do with cultural prescriptions for masculinity (both sexuality and, even more saliently, gender-identity). The penis inspires awe (your Majesty) but also fondness (John Thomas). It is for fun (hairy hound of hedonism) but also a ravening beast (Cujo). It dominates and destroys (rod of lordship, Genghis Khan, stealth bomber, jackhammer) but is sometimes ridiculous (squirt-gun) and provokes anxiety about size and performance (noodle, wienie, beast of burden).

When young men sit down together and compete to produce these lexical items, what exactly are they doing? Feminist scholars like Schulz and Stanley would doubtless say that they are reproducing and revalidating pernicious assumptions that exist in heterosexist, male-dominated culture. The phallus must act, dominate, avenge itself on the female body. It is a symbol of authority to which we all must bow down. Its animal desires are uncontrollable; it has a life of its own. Above all, it matters enough to be named in 144 different ways (almost all of them positively evaluated by the namers)—enough that naming it is a game college students choose to play.

I have no quarrel with this feminist argument so far as it goes. Indeed, I would endorse it, for the reproduction of certain social meanings, which are indeed pernicious, is the primary accomplishment of the male students' activity. But I would also wish to draw attention to the other things that are accomplished in this naming of parts.

First, it is clear that the young men are playing creatively with language. Their game, which manifests an aesthetic as well as a social/sexual impulse, gives a social function to linguistic creativity. A different group of men (or the same men under other circumstances) might bring these impulses together in a similar way using a different expressive form—writing poetry or rock lyrics, for instance. This game gives a social sanction to linguistic creativity among young men who define the alternatives as threatening to their masculinity.

Second, though I do not want to argue for the subversiveness of the game the men are playing, I do think they are not simply reproducing myths and stereotypes. They are also recognizing them as myths and stereotypes; and to a significant extent, they are laughing at them. The humor in their terminology is self-evident, and as the game goes on, the metaphors grow more absurdly exaggerated, threatening to deflate the self-importance of the male member by turning it into a complete joke.

Finally, however, this is no more than a threat. Like all jokes, this one masks serious anxieties—in this case about masculinity and sexuality.
Even if the men are problematizing the symbolic value of the penis and poking fun at it, they must in the end reaffirm the values they have dared to joke about. When a man suggests so baroque a term as, say, purple helmeted love warrior for his penis, he partly distances himself from the metaphors of penis-as-hero and sex-as-war; but partly, too, he recirculates those metaphors.

THE FEMALE GROUP

This group consisted of eight students who lived in the same dorm and were friends of the investigator. All but one were white, all were middle class, and the investigator reported that all were heterosexual, though it is not clear that every woman in the group volunteered information on her sexual orientation. All of the men, by contrast, had insisted explicitly and repeatedly on their heterosexuality. The women were asked first, “What do you think of the male genitals?” Once discussion had got underway and a tone of intimacy and female solidarity had been established, the investigator followed up with “Can you think of names and phrases you use or have heard used to describe it [the penis]?”

Although this form of questioning left open the possibility that women would produce terms they knew passively but did not use themselves (a possibility also in the male group, since the investigator imposed no restriction on production of lexical items), it seems from the list that the women—perhaps influenced by the prior discussion—did focus primarily on terms they associated with women’s perceptions of the penis. Fifty terms in all were elicited. (This is a reduction of the original number, “around 75,” whereas the men “improved” their score from 110 to 144. As I observed above, the women were less interested in the game and found its format less congenial, nor did they compete as keenly. One might expect, too, that the penis itself would be of greater interest and concern to men.)

There is some overlap between the women’s list and the men’s, but there is also a striking difference. The women’s utilizes fewer and less clearly defined categories. This is not simply a function of their having produced far fewer items overall. The categories that do not appear or are poorly represented in their list are not random omissions. Rather, they are exactly those categories a feminist critical of male sexual aggression would indict most severely: authority symbols, ravening beasts, tools, and weapons. One might generalize by saying that women find the penis endearing, ridiculous, and occasionally disgusting, but not awe-inspiring or dangerous.
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Names. The nine personal names in the female group’s list are all in the “intimacy” subcategory except for one: Eisenhower. The others include John Thomas, Ralph, Fred, Peter-dinkie, and Buddy. There are no chiefs, excellencies, hulks, or rods of lordship.

Animals. There are no animal names comparable to those in the male group’s list, and only two references to animals: animal length and visions of horses.

Tools. The only term in this category is the prosaic tool.

Weaponry and war. The women produced three terms in this category: Atlas rocket, mission-seeker, and—a very slight variation on the male group’s term—purple-helmeted warrior of love. All three of these were regarded by women informants as humorous.

Food. Wiener and (rigid) tube steak appear in the list, as do in the male group’s list. The only other food-term is biscuit, referring to hard dog-biscuits rather than soft Southern biscuits.

Romancing the bone. The women generated four terms that had no equivalent in the male group’s list, all taken from the stock euphemisms of romance fiction, a genre with which men are less familiar (or less willing to admit familiarity). They all fit into the frame “She felt his ——— against her.” They are throbbing manhood, swelling passion, swelling hardness, and growing desire. A related euphemistic term was family jewels.

Long, thin, hard, and/or useless things. While this is not a well-defined category, women listed eight items denoting the penis in terms of its size, shape, and hardness (there were several similar terms in the male list’s “miscellaneous” category). For example, pencil, icicle, boner, poker, pulsating pole, blood-engorged pole, and—nonmetaphorically—long muscular expansion and full-length. The reference to blood in blood-engorged pole is not a totally isolated example, but is repeated in the list’s most overtly contemptuous item, vaginal blood fart. This seems to betray a certain disgust with the clinical details of the genitals of both sexes. The fart element of it also links thematically to two other terms whose main informing metaphor is superfluity or uselessness: third leg (which also appears in the male group’s list) and fifth appendage.

Nonsense terms. The largest single category of terms for the women is nonsense terms, like the phonaesthetic terms in the male group’s list (except that it is less clear in the women’s case that the point lies in the sound rather than the sense). Some of the terms are the same as the men’s:
dork, schmuck, and wanger. Dick and prick are, however, more elaborated (dickhead, dickwad, prickola). In addition there are two terms which have other uses apart from denoting the penis: doodads (which recalls the “uselessness” motif of third leg) and dingaling. More usually used to mean “an eccentric or crazy person,” this item was deployed as a suggestive euphemism for “penis” in the Chuck Berry hit song “My Ding-a-Ling.”

Finally, there is the rather appealing word tallywacker. While informants treated this as a humorous nonsense word, it may in fact have a semantic/metaphorical aptness in addition: the OED defines tally as “a stick . . . marked with notches to represent the amount of a debt or payment.” The notched stick or gun or bedpost representing a man’s sexual conquests (the stick and gun also clearly represent his penis) is a well-known image in the culture.

When the investigator asked them to say which terms were insulting, the women picked mainly words from this category (they also picked wiener and tool). This might seem curious when they could have picked vaginal blood fart, for instance, but it seems women conceptualized “insulting” differently from men. For men, an insult was to the penis itself—insult terms connoted softness, smallness, poor performance. For the women, an insult was a term for the penis used to refer to the whole man. Thus they thought it insulting to call a man a dork but merely odd to call him a pencil.

Women do not, then, perceive the penis as a separate and insulable entity to the same degree as men do. However, they both recognize and use the value men place upon their genitals. As one informant said, “I’m not really referring to his dick but to him. . . . It’s just an easy way to make a guy feel bad . . . because that’s what defines his existence, or else at least guys feel that way.”

Discussion. The interesting thing about the female list is the women informants’ near total rejection of the male conceptual schema. The names have no mythic or heroic status; the comparisons with objects (pole, pencil) lack the implication of active aggression found in screwdriver and jackhammer; even the weaponry terms are innocent of the “search and destroy” motif in stealth bomber or heat-seeking moisture missile. There are no ravening beasts and no references to masturbation, anal intercourse, or fellatio.²

The result of this female resistance to certain metaphorical categories found in the men’s lexicon is a list which is less elaborate, less creative aesthetically, and less highly structured in terms of a few productive metaphors. The women, unlike the men, do not have clear formulae for producing more and more terms. Of course, it is likely that they are
familiar with many of the terms collected in the male group; this study did not investigate how each group responded to the other’s list, though it would have been interesting to do so. But in terms of lexical production there are suggestive gender differences; and one thing they might suggest is a mismatch in the most important concepts young men and women students use to organize their thinking as well as their talk about the penis.

**DANGEROUS METAPHORS: WHAT CATEGORIES REVEAL ABOUT THE CULTURE**

This analysis began with the claims of feminist language scholars like Muriel Schulz and Julia Penelope Stanley, who have drawn to some extent on Whorfian views about the relation of language to thought and culture. That there are so many terms available to represent the penis, and that they are organized around metaphors such as penis-as-hero, animal, tool, weapon, and so on, is interpretable from this perspective not merely as a reflection of male-dominated cultural norms and values but as one important way in which those values are defined for speakers of American English.

Whorfians argue, then, that all experience, even when it seems natural and fundamental, is organized through its representation in languages. In the case we are concerned with here, the lexicon of penis terms, a Whorfian would say that the male genitals are understood and experienced in terms of the conventionalized metaphors available to represent them.

There is, however, an alternative possibility and a competing account, in which the metaphors express linguistically (and in logical, patterned ways) a prior, bodily experience of the penis. This is the argument advanced—though not specifically in relation to penis terms—by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), which deserves consideration here.

Lakoff and Johnson point out that metaphor does not live only in the elevated domains of literary discourse but in everyday language generally, right down to the most banal cliché. In their opinion, this suggests that the human mind has a propensity to organize some experiences in terms of others, and more specifically that abstract and complex experiences are frequently expressed in terms of basic physiological processes.

A conventional statement like *my anger rose until I was boiling with rage* depends on a number of metaphorical comparisons. The body is a container; emotions are substances; anger is hot (it boils, simmers, seethes, burns, flares); hot substances expand—if they are liquids, rise—within a container. The comparisons follow a systematic logic and are not coincidental. For example, anger is usually conceptualized as a hot substance because one of the reflexes of anger is a rise in bodily temperature.
One can imagine a treatment of some penis metaphors in these terms. For example, it is a physiological fact about the penis that its erections are not always within a man’s conscious control. It seems to have a “will of its own.” Does this have some bearing on the “penis-as-a-separate-person” category of terms? Or the wild animal terms, given that humans often label as “animal” bodily impulses not subject to control by the mind? Other physiological facts that might underlie important categories of items referring to the penis include its active (moving, penetrating, thrusting) role in sexual intercourse (the “tool” metaphor) and the fact that it discharges liquid at the climactic moment of sex (the “weapons” which discharge, guns; or explode, rockets, missiles).

But this will not do entirely. The physiological basis suggested for the personal name metaphor does not fully explain why, among men, such names are often those of mythical and/or authority figures. The proposed basis for the weapon metaphor may explain guns and missiles, but not spears and, even less, helmeted warriors.

It is interesting, too, that only some physiological facts appear to be culturally validated. For example, it is also a fact that the penis is extremely vulnerable to injury and pain, requiring special protection when men play sports or fight. Yet there are no terms in either list making reference to this particular bodily experience. We talk conventionally about the lordly, striving, uncontrollable penis, but not the vulnerable penis.

Furthermore, it is evident that ways of conceptualizing the penis are not universal, as one might expect them to be if they were grounded in the physiology of the organ. The question of size, for example—in our culture and in this study bigger means better—is dealt with differently by other societies. Thus among the !Kung of Botswana, the expression that is glossed in English as ‘big genitals’ is unequivocally an insult, which can be used by and against either sex. If there were a !Kung equivalent of wienie it would be a compliment, since small-to-moderate penis size is valued (Shostak 1983). Our metaphors are more cultural than natural; they also reflect the realities of power.

I have mentioned the work of Lakoff and Johnson not merely to find fault with it, however, but to point out its very considerable value if divested of its universalist, physiologically grounded claims and made more sensitive to issues of power, especially the power vested in some social groups to define reality for the society as a whole.

In his more recent work, Lakoff (1987) has taken a step in the right direction. He notes, for instance, a (cultural rather than natural) metaphorical link in the English language between lust and anger; both of them are understood in terms of the metaphorical categories “heat,”
“hunger,” “wild animals,” “war” (409–15). Lakoff suggests that this influences our perceptions of rape, making it acceptable or justifiable in some instances. He finds it “sad that we appear to have no metaphors for a healthy mutual lust” (415).

Although Lakoff correctly observes that both men and women may share these perceptions, he does not observe that the perceptions and their linguistic manifestations emanate from a profoundly unequal culture in which the power to define reality has historically resided mostly with men. Whatever metaphorical categories may reveal about the mind, feminists are right to insist that they reveal at least as much about the culture and the social relations within which human minds are formed.

All the metaphorical correlates of lust and anger mentioned by Lakoff are also present in the lexicon of penis terms (especially and significantly the male group’s lexicon). However elegant this lexicon may be as an expression of students’ linguistic creativity, I too find it sad that when young people attempt to define the reality of the penis as a symbol of gender and sexual identity, the metaphorical categories available to them are so limited, predictable, and stereotypical. The women may reject certain metaphors which the men endorse, but their list offers no real alternatives. The vision the men’s list offers is banal and yet terrible, an experience of masculinity as dominance, femininity as passivity, and sex as conquest.

Appendix
Terms for the Penis
(* indicates term appears on female list only, † indicates both lists)

Names

Authority Figures and Symbols
- Carnal King
- the Chief
- the Commissioner
- Excalibur
- his Excellency
- hammer of the gods
- your Honor
- the initiator
- the judge
- Kimosabe
- your Majesty
- the mayor
- the persuader
- Rod of Lordship
- the Scepter

Mythic, Legendary, TV, and Comic Book Figures
- Cyclops
- Cylon
- Genghis Khan
- the Hulk
- Italian Stallion [= Rocky Balboa]
- Kojak
- The Lone Ranger
- Mac the Knife
- Nigerian Nightmare [= Christian Okoeye, football star]
- The Purple Avenger

Personal Names
- buddy*
Dick†
Dickie
Eisenhower*
Fred*
Johnson
John Thomas†
Mr. Happy†
Mr. Peter*
Percy
Peter
Peter Dinkie*
Ralph*
Slick Rick (the Fabulous Dick)
Woody†

Other Personifications
anal intruder
man’s best friend
wife’s best friend

Animals
Mythic, Legendary, and Fictional
Cujo
the Dragon
King Kong
King of the Jungle
Simba
Snakes
anaconda
cobra
one-eyed trouser snake
python
snake

Other
animal length*
beast of burden
eel
hairy hound of hedonism
hog
visions of horses*
weasel

 Implements, Tools, and Machinery
capitalist tool
chisel
cock knob
crank
drill
fuzzbuster
garden hose
gearshift
hedgetrimmer
hydraulics
jackhammer
joystick
lawnmower
muffbuster
pipe
pitchfork
pole
rectum wrecker
screwdriver
tailpipe
tool*

Weapons and Warfare
Atlas rocket*
destroyer
heat-seeking moisture missile
lightsabre
meat spear
mission-seeker*
morning missile
passion rifle
pink torpedo
pistol of love
polished helmet
purple-helmeted love warrior

[warrior of love*]
shiny helmet
spoo gun
squirt gun
sputnik
stealth bomber

Food
biscuit*
bratwurst
love popsicle
lucky charm blow pop
man meat
noodle
Oscar Meyer
piece of pork
summer sausage
sweet thing
tube steak†
Vienna sausage
whopper
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wiener†
wienerschnitzel
wienie

Phonaesthetic terms
cock†
dickhead*
dickwad*
dingaling*
dong
doodads*
dork†
prick†
prickola*
pud
schlong
schmuck†
tallywacker*
wang
wanger*

Toys, Games, and Leisure Pursuits
ace in the hole
cavedweller
five iron
hobby horse
pogo stick
slimy spelunker

Romantic Euphemisms
family jewels*
growing desire*
swelling hardness*
swelling passion*
throbbing manhood*

Size, Shape, and Consistency
blood-engorged pole*
chubbie
icicle*
leaning tower of please-her
love horn
love wand
monolith
package
pencil*
poker*
pulsating pole*
shaft
skin flute
stiffie
stump
sweaty cigar
ten-incher
thumper
thunder-log
thunder-stick
tube o’thrills

Body Parts
appendage
bobbing head*
bone
bonehead*
boner*
erect phallus*
fifth appendage*
long muscular expansion*
main vein
organ
penist†
third leg†
vaginal blood fart*

Masturbation
wanker

Miscellaneous
god’s gift to women*
male member
pussy pleaser
special purpose

Notes
I would like to acknowledge the work of the two student investigators, Chris Donahoe and Sareena Khosla. All the data collection and some of the preliminary analysis were carried out by them. Thanks also to the other students who participated in the seminar, and to Meryl Altman for her comments on earlier drafts.

1. Both my classifications and many of the comments I make on specific terms
The Elgin, believed least, from fellatio Lakoff, Cohn, Coates, referring male all terms,斯坦利, Shostak, their to both serious, steak, 382 "real", referring them), Shostak, their steak (e.g., are vintage. About Newbury. Difference and Dominance. The men made a distinction between items like weiner, tube steak (not primary fellatio references) and items like love popsicle (definitely fellatio references). Why this should be is unclear.

3. Schulz also makes use of the rather biologicist argument that men suffer from "womb envy," envy of women's unique creative power, their strength, and their longevity. Men's need to put women down (also perhaps their linguistic creativity in doing it) stems from perceived inferiority and substitutes for women's "real" (biological) power. I have always found this argument puzzling—men after all are social superordinates—and while the terms examined here do suggest some male anxiety, they do not really support the idea that men seriously regard themselves as inferior beings.

4. In fact, it has been a standard argument since the eighteenth century, at least, that lust and anger are linked in a natural, physiological way; the mechanisms of bodily arousal are similar if not identical in both cases. Sade, for instance, believed this, and so did the early sexologists, notably Krafft-Ebing. However, Lakoff for some reason fails to take up this argument.
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