

## A review

of the article: Ways of Denoting Genitalia in the Pornographic Narrative and Their Role in Constructing Images of Sexual Interaction Participants

by author(s): Olga V. Zaytseva

Reviewed by: Eleonora Lassan, Doctor habilitatus

Affiliation: Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

### Assessment of selected essential parameters of the article:

1.	Does the title of the article correspond to its content?	<u>corresponds</u> / does not correspond
2.	Compliance of article format with formal requirements (abstract, keywords, length, references).	complies / does not comply
3.	Keyword selection	<u>corresponds</u> / does not correspond
4.	Does the abstract correspond to the article content?	<u>corresponds</u> / does not correspond
5.	Relevance	high / <u>sufficient</u> / insufficient
6.	Originality	<u>high</u> / sufficient / insufficient
7.	Logic and correlation of sections	high / <u>sufficient</u> / insufficient
8.	Findings and conclusions	<u>sufficient</u> / insufficient
9.	Quality of expression (language, style)	high / <u>sufficient</u> / insufficient
10.	Quantity of language examples or evidentiary support	high / <u>sufficient</u> / insufficient
11.	Theoretical relevance (if applicable)	high / <u>sufficient</u> / insufficient
12.	Correspondence of the References to the content	<u>corresponds</u> / does not correspond

### Comments and recommendations of the reviewer:

The article is a highly original study in the field of the designation of male and female genitalia in the process of sexual interaction. The author draws the corporeal canon prevailing in sexual culture. This area (the lexicon of sexual communication) is practically unexplored in relation to the Russian language obviously due to a certain taboo nature of the named topic in the Russian culture. The author fills this gap to a certain extent.


In my opinion, some linguistic formulations should be clarified.

On the whole, the article is an interesting linguistic and cultural study.

Recommendation:

for unconditional publication / for publication with discussion notes /  
for publication after revision / for unconditional refusal of publication.

Signature of the reviewer

A small, square, light gray box containing a handwritten signature in black ink. The signature is cursive and appears to read "May".

Date: December 20, 2020