

HERE I SIT--A STUDY OF AMERICAN LATRINALIA¹

Alan Dundes
University of California, Berkeley

Any American male who has ever had an occasion to enter a public bathroom such as one found in a railroad or bus terminal has surely observed at one time or another one of the many traditional inscriptions found on the walls of the facilities. In some quarters, e.g. in the rest rooms of some bars and café's, one finds the custom has been institutionalized in that a small slate and an accompanying piece of chalk are hanging on the wall. This allows individuals to write freely and at the same time it saves the establishment the expense of continually repainting walls.

Despite the widespread distribution of these inscriptions and despite the fact that many of them are demonstrably traditional, one looks in vain for extended collections of published texts and for any rational discussion of them or the practice of writing them. Most histories of the water closet (e.g. Pudney, Reynolds, Wright) do little more than recognize that such traditions exist. Typical is the remark made by poet John Pudney, author of The Smallest Room, who bothers to say (1954:130), "I must here resist the temptation urged on me by several men of letters to quote more freely from this poetry of the smallest room." Certainly there can be no doubt as to the antiquity of the genre. In the chapter devoted to latrines of John G. Bourke's classic Scatologic Rites of All Nations, one finds references to the obscene poetry written in Roman latrines (1891:136). What little evidence is available in print does attest to the age and international spread of this popular form of written folklore. Gershon Legman, an authority on erotic folklore bibliography, mentions (1964:254, 451) The Merry-Thought or The Glass-Window and Bog-House Miscellany of 1731 with the only known complete copy at Oxford. In the important journal of obscene folklore, Anthropophyteia, one finds a handful of brief collectanea, e.g. one entitled "Skatologische Inschriften" or ones by Fischer and von Waldheim, which indicates the presence of the form in modern Europe. A fair sampling of Mexican examples appeared in a chapter "Grafitos en Los Comunes" in Jiménez' best-selling Picardía Mexicana. The classic study of the form in America was made by Allen Walker Read who privately published it in 1935 under the euphemistic title, Lexical Evidence from Folk Epigraphy in Western North America: a Glossarial Study of the Low Element in the English Vocabulary. The title page of this eighty-three page monograph announced that the circulation was restricted to students of linguistics, folklore, a normal psychology, and allied branches of the social sciences. Professor Read's term "folk epigraphy" raises the question of what to call bathroom wall writings.

The term graffiti is too broad in that it includes all kinds of inscriptions and marks placed on walls. Moreover, the walls may be any walls, not just bathroom walls. Professor Read included in his compilation everything he saw on walls during an extensive sight-seeing trip made in the western United States and Canada in the summer of 1928. Much of his material is traditional in form only, but not content. The various homosexual rendezvous requests with listings of dimensions and telephone numbers are clearly traditional in form and are surely worth studying as indicators of one of the obvious functions of men's rooms in a culture which forbids homosexual

activities. However, the specific content of these assignation attempts is often idiosyncratic. The folklorist is primarily interested in those mural inscriptions which are traditional in both form and content. Thus while he may record the hapax logomena or one-time occurrences, he is more concerned with those which have multiple existence, that is, those which are found with almost exactly the same form and wording in many different places. Obviously, a one-time occurrence may become traditional in time, but the vast majority of the nontraditional graffiti are much too localized to diffuse easily. For the traditional inscriptions, I propose the term latrinalia. This is preferable, I think, to the closest thing to a folk term, "shithouse poetry" inasmuch as not all latrinalia is in verse or poetic form.

Before examining the nature of latrinalia in America and discussing its significance, I should like to comment briefly on the failure of American social scientists to study this kind of material. It is curious that it is perfectly permissible to investigate the graffiti of the past, say the graffiti of classical cultures, but it is not equally acceptable, academically speaking, to study the graffiti of our own culture. The rationale is apparently that it is safe to study the "once removed" whether once removed in space or time, but not so safe to study what is all too readily available in one's immediate environment. Perhaps one of the reasons why individuals are attracted to the discipline of anthropology is that the "once removed" framework is provided. Archaeologists, practicing "dirt archaeology," are free to dig into the bowels of the earth searching for buried treasures among the remains of what men of the past produced. In this connection, archaeologists have even begun to indulge in the analysis of coprolites. Physical anthropologists are free to examine every part of the human body in great detail. Ethnographers can perfectly properly go into the "field" and voyeuristically observe exotic customs, the analogues of which they might be embarrassed to watch at home in their own culture. (One is reminded of the folk definition of anthropology: the study of man . . . embracing woman!) Even the unusually great concern with the finer points of kinship may reflect an abiding and fundamental curiosity about basic family relationships. That ethnographies reflect the culture of the ethnographers as much as the people described cannot be doubted. Germane to the present study is the lack of data in standard ethnographies on defecation and urination. When, where, and how are these acts performed? When and how precisely is toilet training for infants introduced? One can read an entire ethnography without ever coming upon any reference to these daily necessities. The study of man must include all aspects of human activity.

Since ethnography, like charity, should begin at home (how can we possibly perceive the bias of our accounts without fully understanding our own culture?), the study of latrinalia is clearly a legitimate area of inquiry. One must not forget that it is humans who write on bathroom walls and humans who read these writings. As one writer has put it (Reynolds 1943:171-172), "Stereotyped and crude, our lavatory inscriptions are the measure of our social fixations; and that enterprising anthropologist who is said to be collecting photographs of them in all parts of the world should reveal more of the truth than all of the bombastic historians who will so soon be clothing our grotesque society with dignified phrases and political stercorations, representing its present antics as studied movements, to be explained in terms

of high principles and rational conduct." So then let us proceed with our essay in hard core ethnography!

In American culture, anything which leaves the body from one of its various apertures is by definition dirty. The transition is immediate. Saliva is not defiling until it leaves the mouth. Similarly, nasal, ear, or eye secretions (with the possible exception of tears) are not offensive until they are removed from the body. The emitted materials are frequently as disgusting to the emitter as to others. Few Americans would be able to drink a glass of water into which they or someone else had just expectorated or even drooled. It is true that French or soul kissing allows for swapping spits, but in this case, the saliva is encountered while still inside the mouth and it is presumably not deemed dirty. A more mundane example would be the removal of partly masticated food from the mouth. Since by definition anything which emerges from the body is dirty and disgusting, an unchewed morsel may present a social problem. Does one grasp it with the fingers or with an eating utensil? Is there any sense of embarrassment at removing the morsel in front of others and realizing the removal is being observed? How does one dispose of the chewed bit of gristle? Is it placed surreptitiously on one's plate and perhaps concealed with a convenient lettuce leaf? Of course, there is nothing inherently dirty. Man, not nature, makes dirt and one can say that dirt, like beauty, lies in the eyes of the beholder. The concept of dirt is part of culture and as such it falls into the province of the cultural anthropologist.

One of the few places where dirt may be displayed and discussed in American culture is the bathroom, private and public. Bathrooms, generally speaking, are status symbols and not infrequently houses are measured in part by the number of bathrooms they possess. It is in the home bathroom that the child is taught to deposit his feces and urine. Here is one place where he is allowed to manipulate his genitals and expose them to view, either his own view or the view of others. Not only are the genitals and buttocks exposed, but the products of micturition and defecation may also be observed. Later, in public rest rooms, the child soon learns that he must make public what has hitherto been private. He must urinate alongside strangers and in the course of so doing, he may observe the organs of others in the act just as these other individuals may observe him.

Despite the overt behavior, the culturally prescribed pretense that such activities do not exist, as manifested in the taboo against referring directly to them, continues. The large number of euphemisms attest to that. The private family idioms of the home, e.g. to go potty, to do number one (urination) or number two (defecation), to wee wee, to make a poo, etc., cannot be used in the public context. Children in school are taught to "excuse" themselves. (Note that to "excuse oneself" may carry the sense of apologizing!) The ironic part is that the child must go through the public confessional act of raising his hand to tell the teacher and all of his peers that he wishes to answer a "call of nature." The child soon learns the gamut of farfetched euphemisms ranging from "washing" or "freshening" up to "seeing a man about a dog," going to "shake hands with the head of the family," or trying to do something about the fact that one's "back teeth are floating." (For an extended discussion of such euphemisms, see Pudney 1954:20-37 and Sagarin 1962:69-74.) Note that the term lavatory literally refers to cleaning

and thus to sinks, not toilets. Yet the word lavatory has become almost taboo and is now substituted for by newer euphemisms (Reynolds 1943:179). Once in the school bathroom, however, the behavior cannot be anything other than to the point. It is in the public school bathroom (termed boys' and girls' "basement" at my secondary school in Pawling, New York, though the rooms were not located in the basement) that important social interactions take place. Boys meet there to discuss the problems of the day while girls similarly go there to gossip. It is in many ways a place of comparative freedom from the normal restraints imposed by the adult world. The necessity of some sexual exposure no doubt contributes to the bathroom's role as a place of sanctioned license. It is in public bathrooms, particularly men's rooms, that one finds latrinalia.

The variety of latrinalia forms includes: (1) advertisements or solicitations, normally of a sexual nature; (2) requests or commands, often concerning the mechanics of defecating or urinating; (3) directions, which consist of false or facetious instructions; (4) commentaries, either by the establishment or by clients; and (5) personal laments or introspective musings. These categories are not hard and fast and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. A sampling of each of the categories should serve to illustrate the nature of American latrinalia.

The majority of advertisements are probably not traditional in that individuals simply write their own names and telephone numbers. Furthermore, in view of the paucity of published materials, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not a number of items have appeared elsewhere. Typical "want ads," which may or may not be traditional, include:

1. For a good blow job, call 777 2024
Bill, don't call, it's me, Bob.
2. I'm big. 9" long, 3" round, and ready to go.
(In another hand) How big is your prick?

In view of the nontraditional content of most latrinalia advertisements, I will proceed to the more common traditional category of requests or commands. The following are usually placed near men's urinals:

3. Don't throw cigarette butts in the urinal--
it makes them soggy and hard to light.
4. Please do not throw butts in the urinal.
Do we piss in your ash trays?

This is strikingly similar in style to the private swimming pool sign which reads:

We don't swim in your toilet
Please don't piss in our pool.

The pool sign reflects, of course, the fact that Americans do in fact urinate in swimming pools (just as American infants urinate in their baths)!

A large number of urinal latrinalia specifically ask for care in aiming the stream of urine. Typical examples of this "toilet training" tradition include:

5. We aim to please.
You aim too please.
6. It is our aim to keep this place clean.
Your aim will help.

These are often written by the management. A common request urges men to stand close to the urinal to reduce the chances of spillage.

7. Stand up close. The next man might have holes in his shoes.
8. Stand close, the next person may be barefooted.
9. Stand up close
The next fellow may be a Southerner
And be barefooted. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas, 1945)
10. If your hose is short
And your pump is weak
You better stand close
Or you'll pee on your feet.
11. Old rams with short horns
please stand up close. (Fort Lewis, Tacoma, Washington, circa 1945; cf. Read 1935:20)

An appropriately localized version from New England is as follows:

12. Puritans with short muskets step up to the firing line.
(Damiscotta, Maine, circa 1950)

Another example of latrinalia which is posted by the management rather than the customers is one found in diners' restrooms:

13. If you shit here, eat here
We don't want just the tail end of your business.

Occasionally, there are blason populaire latrinalia:

14. Shake well. Texas needs the water.

For the special case when a man urinates into a toilet rather than into a urinal, special instructions may be found:

15. Be like brother
Not like Sis
Lift the seat
When you take a piss. (New York City, 1924)
16. Be like Dad and not like Sis
Pull your lid before you piss. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas, 1945)

Some commands are concerned with toilet flushing.

17. Flush your toilets for Wichita's sake. (Hutchinson, Kansas, circa 1958; cf. Read 1935:20)
18. Flush twice: L.A. needs water.
19. Flush hard. It's a long way to the kitchen.

This insult to the chef is a reversal of the conception that man is a dirt-making machine which transforms food into feces. This conception is

illustrated by a latrinalia verse in French which was found in Oxford, England, in 1947: "Ici tombent en ruines les merveilles de la cuisine." In the above text and the following, the "natural" procedure is reversed as feces becomes food.

20. Don't flush the toilet. The next man might be hungry.
(Chicago, 1960)

21. Please flush the toilet.
We want the niggers to starve to death. (A Missouri café, 1965)

There is also some instruction designed to keep the toilet seat clean.

22. Here is the place we all must come
To do the work that must be done
Do it quick and do it neat
But please don't do it on the seat.

23. Boys we all must use this throne
Please keep it clean and neat
Shit down the hole God damn your soul
And not upon the seat. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas, 1945)

The reference to "throne" recalls the euphemisms in other cultures which speak of going to the place where the king goes on foot or alone (Pudney 1954:97). A common American fantasy technique designed to minimize one's awe of a great personage is to imagine that individual at stool.

24. For those in a hurry
With no time to sit
Please lift the lid
For a more direct hit. (Women's restroom, Berkeley, 1963)

This may refer also to the practice of many women of not actually sitting on a toilet seat but of squatting over it.

One commentary complains about the nature of men's clothing as opposed to women's clothing with special reference to defecation.

25. Women women what a blessing
You can shit without undressing
But we poor men we sons of bitches
We must strip or shit in our britches. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas, 1945)

The influence of television programs and such contemporary events as demonstrations by civil rights groups (e.g. the Congress of Racial Equality) is evident in some commands.

26. Smile, You're on Candid Camera.

This is usually written on the inside of the door of the toilet stall.

27. Stay seated. This is a Core shit-in. (University library, Berkeley campus, April, 1964)

Some commands or requests are bitter parodies:

28. Support mental health or I'll kill you.

In the "directions" category, one finds mostly parodies. In the following text, the accuracy of the first line and of the order of the remaining lines was questioned by the informant. It is, however, an excellent example of a latrinalia verse of the "how-to-do-it-yourself" variety.

29. If you want to shit at ease
Place your elbows on your knees
Place your hands upon your chin
Work your asshole out and in. (cf. Read 1935:51, 73)
30. Directions to get to Texas: Go west until you smell shit, that's Oklahoma. Then, go south until you step in it--that's Texas. (Manchester, New Hampshire, circa 1953)
31. In case of atomic attack . . .
1. Put your hands over your ears
2. Put your head between your legs
3. Kiss your ass goodbye. You've had it.
32. In case of attack, hide under this urinal.
Nobody ever hits it. (Great Lakes, Illinois, 1951)

There are also false directions which are really a form of what folklorists sometimes call a catch. Repeated many times, each time in smaller writing is the line: "If you can read this come closer." Then at the bottom right below a miniscule version appears the line: "You are now shitting at a 45° angle." In similar vein is the sign on the ceiling over the urinal which says, "While you're reading this, you're peeing on your shoes."

The content of the latrinalia commentaries varies. Some are unexpectedly intellectual.

33. "God is dead." Nietzsche
"Nietzsche is dead." God

However, not many commentaries have this kind of sophistication. Few American latrinalia verses are as philosophical, for example, as the following latrinalia verse popular in Spain:

En este lugar cerrado
donde viene tanta gente
hace fuerza el más cobarde
y se caga el más valiente. (cf. Jiménez 1960:124)

The majority of American commentaries stay close to home. An "x" marked high over the wall of a men's urinal is accompanied by the explanatory line:

34. Anyone who can piss this high ought to be a fireman.

One wonders if there is any insight here into the psychological rationale underlying the motivation to become a fireman. (Note the slang term "hose" for penis and see text 10 in this paper.) One recalls the desire of many small boys to grow up to be firemen and the custom of adolescent boys of urinating on campfires to extinguish them (cf. Bettelheim 1962:166-167).

35. You are holding the future of America in your hands.

Here is a reminder during the act of urination that the same organ is one used for reproduction. Note the pseudo-patriotic responsibility to procreate.

One common commentary deals with the very real problem of those last drops of urine which all too often drip down into one's pants or down one's leg.

- 36. You can wiggle, jiggle, jump or dance
But the last three drops go down your pants.
- 37. No matter how you dance and prance
The last two drops go down your pants.
- 38. You can shake and shake as much as you please
But there'll still be a drop for your B.V.D.'s.

An English version has a different rhyme for the same message:

- 39. However hard you shake your peg
At least one drop runs down your leg.

The "shaking" is also found in other latrinalia.

- 40. You are now shaking your best friend
And he stood up for you on your wedding night. (Camp Maxey,
Paris, Texas, 1945)

However, the shaking act can be suspicious if carried on too long. Excessive manipulation of the genitals could be construed as masturbatory activity:

- 41. If you shake it more than three times, you're cheating. (cf.
Read 1935:68)

There are other anti-masturbation verses.

- 42. Be a man, not a fool
Pull the chain, not your tool.
- 43. This is a teepee
For you to peepee
Not a wigwam
To beat your tomtom.

Another topic of commentaries is the cleanliness of toilets.

- 44. No need to stand on the toilet seat
For the crabs in this place jump forty feet. (cf. Read 1935:
40, 44)
- 45. It does no good to line the seat
The crabs here jump fifteen feet.

The last verse reveals the practice of putting sheets of toilet paper on the top of toilet seats as a means of avoiding contact with the seat. This folk custom has recently become formalized by the presence of paper seat cover dispensers.

There are occasional political latrinalia. Here are several demeaning presidential candidate Barry Goldwater:

- 46. When I look down, I see Goldwater.
- 47. Urine is goldwater; the only benefit is derived from the comfort of its removal.

Mathematics, the language of science, has exerted some influence:

48. The heat of the meat is inversely proportional to angle of the dangle.

The heat of the meat, that is, the state of sexual excitement, is directly proportional to the degree of erection. The greater the erection, the less the "angle of dangle." The internal rhyme in this last verse shows the poetic quality of latrinalia. (Poetic features are found in other obscenity. One thinks of the alliterative folk alternatives for saying "I've been screwed," to wit: to be "fucked by the fickle finger of fate" or to be "dangled by the diddling digit of doom.")

Another latrinalia comment on sexuality occurs in the folkloristic form of a toast:

49. Here's to the hole that never heals
The more you rub it the better it feels
All the water this side of hell
Can't wash away the codfish smell. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas, 1945)

The language of advertising can be found too. A borrowing from a Ban deodorant advertisement was found in November, 1965, on a prophylactic dispenser in a Shafter, Nevada, restroom:

50. It takes the worry out of being close.

By far the best poetry is to be found in the personal laments or introspective musings category. One of the most popular of these is:

51. Here I sit broken hearted
Tried (Came) to shit and only farted. (cf. Read 1935:50)

The sadness is actually economic inasmuch as one ordinarily pays to use most public toilets. One must make a small deposit before entering the toilet stall. The "failure to get one's money's worth," an important theme in American culture, is explicit in some versions.

52. Here I sit broken-hearted
Paid a nickel and only farted.

This last verse has a traditional response:

53. Don't cry brother
You had your chance
I didn't have a nickel
And shit (in) my pants.

There is also a combination of both verses:

54. Here I sit broken hearted
Tried to shit and only farted.
But think of the man who took the chance
Tried to fart and shit his pants.

There are other examples of American latrinalia with the introductory opening formula "Here I sit."

55. Here I sit in stinking vapor
Some sonuvabitch stole the toilet paper.

56. Here I sit in silent bliss
 Listening to the trickling piss
 Now and then a fart is heard
 Calling to the coming turd. (Los Angeles, 1918; cf. Read
 1935:51, 81)
57. Here I sit in solemn bliss
 Listening to the dribble of piss
 And now and then a fart is heard
 Then followed by a thundering turd. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas,
 1945)

These last two verses are obviously cognates and are related to the versions from Lake Tahoe and Visalia, California, reported by Read (1935:51).

Noteworthy is the sound aspect of the process of elimination. Most people are ashamed of anyone's hearing the sound of their urinating or defecating. Even the sound of a toilet flush is embarrassing to some. The whole philosophy of pretending that the activity doesn't exist is of course threatened by the possibility of someone's hearing the unavoidable telltale sound. The listener, as opposed to the voyeur, is depicted in the following verse:

58. Sam, Sam, the janitor man
 Chief superintendent of the crapping can.
 He washes out the bowls and picks up the towels
 And listens to the roar of other men's bowels. (cf. Read 1935:
 39)

The sound is also involved in some of the onomatopoeic euphemisms, e.g. "tinkle" meaning to urinate.

Some latrinalia explore the motivations for visiting bathrooms.

59. Some come here to sit and think
 But I come here to shit and stink. (Camp Maxey, Paris, Texas,
 1945; cf. Read 1935:21, 49, 74)
60. Some come here to sit and think
 And some come here to wonder
 But I come here to shit and stink
 And fart away like thunder.

A comparison of the last two reveals how a two-line verse may be expanded into a four-line verse. In the following verse, the expansion utilizes a different rhyme scheme:

61. Some people come to sit and think
 Others come to shit and stink.
 But I just come to scratch my balls
 And read the bullshit on the walls.

All these latrinalia texts are representative and they should serve to illustrate the nature of this on-going mural tradition. However, these materials raise a number of questions. Probably the most intriguing questions about latrinalia are psychological. Why are they written at all and why in bathrooms? Why are they so much more common in men's rest rooms than in women's rest rooms?

There has been little theorizing about the psychological functions of latrinalia. Reynolds (1943:170) has stated that generations of lavatory wall writers simply write for the pleasure of breaking a taboo, presumably the taboo of referring to body elimination activities. Allen Walker Read suggests that latrinalia probably results from many different motivations. Nevertheless, he notes (1935:17) that, "A principal reason is the well-known human yearning to leave a record of one's presence or one's existence." If this is correct, the question remains, what is the psychological significance of a yearning to leave a record of one's presence?

Allen Walker Read has also observed (1935:17) that writing latrinalia was the same order of activity as the carving of initials or names on trees. Interestingly enough, psychoanalyst Ernest Jones tried to explain the latter custom in his famous paper on "Anal-Erotic Character Traits." Jones hypothesizes (1961:432) that it may possibly be a derived and sublimated form of what he terms a "primitive smearing impulse," the desire that infants allegedly have to handle and manipulate their feces, a desire whose fulfillment is invariably forbidden by toilet-training conscious parents. People who carve or write their names are leaving a memento of themselves which may injure and spoil something beautiful (1961:432). Although Jones makes no mention of latrinalia, I suggest that it may well stem from the same impulse to smear feces or dirt on walls. Dirty words are dirt by themselves, independent of the dirtiness of their referents. Certainly this theory would explain why the writing was placed on bathroom walls in particular. The fact that much of the content of latrinalia does refer to defecation and urination would tend to support the assertion that there is some relationship between the acts of writing on walls and playing with feces. Farfetched as this may sound to some, it is precisely the explanation given by the folk! In one of the best known latrinalia verses, the rationale for writing latrinalia is as follows:

62. Those who write on shithouse walls
Roll their shit in little balls
Those who read these words of wit
Eat the little balls of shit.

Here is an explicit equation of the act of writing on walls with the manipulation of one's own feces. It could not be said any more plainly than "Those who write on shithouse walls roll their shit in little balls!"

From earliest childhood, the American is taught to deny his anus and its activities. The smearing impulse is redirected to suitable substitute activities: working with modeling clay, finger paints, or throwing mud pies (cf. Ferenczi). Using words, dirty words, some individuals finally do give vent to the impulse to sully walls. Since "dirt" is supposed to be deposited in the clean white receptacles found in bathrooms, what more flagrant act of rebellion than to place symbolic dirt on the very walls surrounding the receptacles!

While Freudian explanations are not popular in anthropological and folkloristic circles, the fact that the folk confirm the Freudian explanation must be taken into account and explained by anti-Freudians. The independent congruence of analytic and folk or native theories does, it seems to me, present a reasonably convincing argument. Noteworthy also in this connection is

the fact that the second couplet of the above mentioned metafolkloristic text corroborates another psychoanalytic insight into toilet ritual. It has been suggested (Abraham 1948:385; Fenichel 1953:374) that the popular practice of reading while at stool is essentially an act of incorporation designed to balance the material which is lost through defecation. (The common rationale for such reading is the desire not to waste time. By reading in the bathroom, one can save time and make it more productive. Additionally the reading also permits and encourages the prolongation of the defecation act.) Thus "eating" the dirty words compensates for the evacuated fecal dirt. Once again, the folk apparently agree with the explanation: "Those who read these words of wit eat the little balls of shit."

A more recent localized bit of latrinalia appearing in Berkeley supports the writing-feces equation:

63. Don't write on our walls

We don't shit in your notebooks.

The Regents

What's found in our notebooks is shit anyway

The Students

(Main Library, U.C. Berkeley, 1965)

The equation of defecation and writing is not limited to American culture. Apparently in parts of Bulgaria, one who has gone to the "thinking place" is described as "thinking" or "writing" (Pudney 1954:25). The writing-defecation equation suggests that the academic motto "publish or perish," an oicotypical example of what might be termed the alternative structure proverb (cf. "do or die," "put up or shut up," "fish or cut bait," etc.), may be "shit or get off the pot" in symbolic disguise. One might remember that scholars are first supposed to amass great quantities of data from which they are expected to "get stuff out regularly" (Dundes 1962c). (Cf. the notion of weighing the output on the scales at the end of the year.)

The suggested anal erotic basis of writing may also explain why men rather than women write latrinalia. According to current theory, men the world over suffer from pregnancy envy (Bettelheim, Dundes 1962a:1038). In essence, men are envious of women's ability to bear children and they seek to find various substitute gratifications, e.g. couvade behavior, having an intellectual "brainchild," calling their pet project their "baby," etc. Bettelheim has assembled a good deal of convincing anthropological evidence to document the pregnancy envy hypothesis. However, although Bettelheim does cite (1962:128) the instance of the Chaga men's practice of stopping up their rectums as a form of symbolic pregnancy, he does not see that males commonly use their anuses to provide substitutes for parturition. Feces, like babies, are produced by the body. When a man defecates, he is a creator, a prime mover. Women produce feces too, but since they can produce babies from within, there is less need for women to emphasize this type of body product. That women have less need of fecal substitute activities is suggested by the fact that few women indulge in sculpture, painting, blowing wind instruments, etc. (cf. Jones 1961:435, n. 4). Certainly in American culture, it is men who are more concerned than women with creative feces metaphors. It is usually men, not women, who are "full of it," who are "BS artists," who tell "cock and bull stories."

In American culture, the emphasis is on productivity and the male must make much more than feces. He must make something of himself and he must make a living. The word "make" is itself indicative of the productive component of defecation. An infant may be told to make water, make weewee, make B.M., or just plain make (Sagarin 1962:47, 52). As an adult in a "man's world," he tries to make money or make time. Once he is successful, he may be told that he's got it made. "Time is money," the proverb says, but both time and money are symbolic fecal substitutes (Brown 1959:277; Carvalho Neto 1956:125-148; Ferenczi; Dundes 1962a, 1962b; Jones 1961:425-427) as folk speech and other folklore so abundantly attests (cf. to be filthy rich, to be rolling in it, to have money up the ass, to make one's pile, to have time on one's hands, to pass time or piddle the time away, etc.). Time and money can be saved or hoarded; time and money can be spent or wasted. In American ideal culture, saving is valued. Think of all the money and time saving devices enjoyed by Americans. Yet in American real culture, prestige accrues to those who spend or waste time and money. If a man wants to make it big or make a splash, he has to produce, to put out. He can't sit tight; he can't sit on his material. Even God, a masculine figure, is termed a maker, which is entirely appropriate in view of the anal nature of man's creation, that is, man's being molded from dust or dirt (Dundes 1962a:1046). (Note also that the "fart-thunder" linkage so patent in the latrinalia hints at an infantile origin of thunder gods as Roheim (1952:515) almost says.)

The make metaphor also applies to genital matters. A man is expected to make out, to make a woman and to make love. The couching of genital affairs in anal terms is paralleled by the whole concept of dirty words in American culture. Dirty jokes, for example, are largely genital, not anal in content. Yet jokes about sex are called "dirty jokes." The word on the sign at Berkeley was an obscene word which no false acrostic, "Freedom Under Clark Kerr," could disguise, but it was thought of as a dirty word (cf. the filthy speech movement--no pun on movement intended!). One reason why genitality is considered to be "dirty" may be guilt by association. The organs concerned are recognized and identified first as producers of urine, that is, as producers of dirt. Later it is discovered that the sexual act is performed by the same dirt-producing instrument. This situation has been summed up by Yeats in his poem "Crazy Jane Talks With the Bishop" when he wrote: "But Love has pitched his mansion in the place of excrement." Here is dirt by association.

The desire to make one's mark or to leave something behind for posterity is also very likely involved in the writing of latrinalia. Defecation as a technique to mark a place for identification is found not only in folk tales (Freud and Oppenheim 1958:38) but among other forms of primate life who apparently demarcate territorial boundaries through urination and defecation (Harrisson). The goal is also perhaps to achieve notice and immortality by producing dirt. A final example of latrinalia bears on this:

64. To the shithouse poet
In honor of his wit
May they build-far and wide
Great monuments of shit.

One wonders about the significance of leaving great stone memorials. Many great men have taken an active part in designing and building that which was to remain after they had departed. There is the obvious phallic significance

of some monuments. The Washington monument is certainly appropriate for the father of our country. But the majority are massive pieces of stone, often in the shape of little rooms or houses. (Writing on these walls involves epitaphs rather than latrinalia.) The psychology of making one's mark, of leaving some memorial behind, may be related to American males' desire to successfully compete with females who can "make" children as their form of immortality.

For those who may be skeptical of the theory that the psychological motivation for writing latrinalia is related to an infantile desire to play with feces and to artistically smear it around, I would ask only that they offer an alternative theory. For those who doubt that the greater interest on the part of males in latrinalia is related to anal creativity stemming from pregnancy envy, I would ask the same. It is all too easy to elicit destructive criticism. We know that latrinalia exists. What we want to know is why it exists and what function it serves. One day when we have more information about the writers of latrinalia (and perhaps psychological projective tests administered to such writers) and when we have better cross-cultural data, we may be better able to confirm or revise the present attempt to answer the questions.

ENDNOTE

¹This paper was presented at the 1966 meeting of the California Folklore Society at Davis, California. I am indebted to many of my students and colleagues for contributing examples of latrinalia. Unless otherwise indicated, all materials were collected from men's rooms in Berkeley and the surrounding Bay Area in 1964. I am especially grateful to psychologist Nathan Hurvitz who provided all of the items from Paris, Texas. My thanks also to Sam Hinton for his suggestion that the paper be entitled "Ars(e) Poetica." Explanations of the meaning of most of the slang terms appearing in the latrinalia may be found in the works by Read and Sagarin cited in the list of references for this paper.

REFERENCES

ABRAHAM, KARL

- 1948 Contributions to the theory of the anal character. In Selected papers of Karl Abraham. London, Hogarth, pp. 370-392.

ANONYMOUS

- 1912 Skatologische inschriften. *Anthropophyteia* 9:503-510.

BETTELHEIM, BRUNO

- 1962 *Symbolic wounds*. New York, Collier Books.

BROWN, NORMAN O.

- 1959 *Life against death*. New York, Random House.

CARVALHO NETO, PAULO DE

- 1956 *Folklore y psicoanalisis*. Buenos Aires, editorial psique.

DUNDES, ALAN

- 1962a *Earth-Diver: creation of the mythopoeic male*. *American Anthropologist* 64:1032-1051.

DUNDES, ALAN

1962b The folklore of wishing wells. *American Imago* 19:27-34.

1962c On the psychology of collecting folklore. *Tennessee Folklore Society Bulletin* 28:65-74.

FENICHEL, OTTO

1953 The scopophilic instinct and identification. In The collected papers of Otto Fenichel: first series. New York, W. W. Norton, pp. 373-397.

FERENCZI, SANDOR

1956 The ontogenesis of the interest in money. In Sex in psychoanalysis. New York, Dover, pp. 269-279.

FISCHER, HEINRICH

1909 Abortspruch aus Rumänien. *Anthropophyteia* 6:439.

FREUD, SIGMUND and D. E. OPPENHEIM

1958 Dreams in folklore. New York, International Universities Press.

HARRISSON, BARBARA

1963 Dundes continued. *American Anthropologist* 65:921-922.

JIMENEZ, A.

1960 Picardía Mexicana. Mexico City, Libro Mex.

JONES, ERNEST

1961 Anal-erotic character traits. In Papers on psycho-analysis. Boston, Beacon Press, pp. 413-437.

LEGMAN, GERSHON

1964 The horn book: studies in erotic folklore and bibliography. New Hyde Park, University Books.

PUDNEY, JOHN

1954 The smallest room. London, Michael Joseph.

READ, ALLEN WALKER

1935 Lexical evidence from folk epigraphy in western North America. Paris, privately printed.

REYNOLDS, REGINALD

1943 Cleanliness and Godliness. London, George Allen & Unwin.

RÓHEIM, GÉZA

1952 The gates of the dream. New York, International Universities Press.

SAGARIN, EDWARD

1962 The anatomy of dirty words. New York, Lyle Stuart.

VON WALDHEIM, Dr.

1909 Breslauer locus-inschriften. *Anthropophyteia* 6:433-435.

WRIGHT, LAWRENCE

1960 Clean and decent. New York, Viking Press.