

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

Research
Article

Olga V. Zaytseva

Abstract

This article presents an attempt to classify the possible ways of nomination and designation of genitalia in the Russian language. The theoretical basis of our study is Allan & Burridge (1988), related to the study of orthophemisms, dysphemisms and euphemisms, as well as Cornog (1986), Goldman (1990), Cameron (1992), Braun & Kitzinger (2001) classifications of genital terms. The material for the study was 120 fragments of sexual interaction from pornographic texts describing consensual and non-consensual sexual interaction. Based on the lexico-semantic analysis, four ways of nominating genitalia were identified: orthophemistic, euphemistic, dysphemistic and metaphorical. During the study it was established that euphemistic, dysphemistic and metaphorical ways are involved in the construction of images of the sexual interaction characters mainly from the position of their conformity/nonconformity with the dominant body canon in the culture.

Keywords

gender linguistics; sex and gender; pornographic discourse; sexual identity; genital terms

Kutafin Moscow State Law University, 9 Sadovaya-Kudrinskaya Ul., 125993, Moscow, Russia

Corresponding author:

Olga Zaytseva (Ms.), deyaldelwer@mail.ru

For citation:

Zaytseva, Olga V. 2020. "Ways of Denoting Genitalia in the Pornographic Narrative and Their Role in Constructing Images of Sexual Interaction Participants." *Language. Text. Society* 7 (2). <https://ltsj.online/2020-07-2-zaytseva>.

Received:

4 September 2020

Reviewed:

20 December 2020

Accepted:

21 December 2020

Published:

30 December 2020

UDC:

811.161.1'06'271'42



Language. Text.
Society

Vol. 7 No. 2, 2020
ISSN 2687-0487

INTRODUCTION

The ambiguity in the perception of the human body brings us back to the medieval era, in which notions of courtly love, chastity and the sinfulness of sex were juxtaposed with crude eroticism, promiscuity and sexual violence. For the medieval man, genitalia were important: the presence of a vagina or penis determined the nature of an individual's sexual self-presentation and set the boundaries within which their entire future life was to take place (Hartnell 2019, 237-242). The pornification of European culture, positioning itself as liberal in its attitude toward sex and forms of its representation, was to suppress the frustration of Christian consciousness over the sinfulness of the flesh. Legal sanctions for once universally recognized prohibitions have been abolished; public discourse on a number of other prohibitions is in the process of transformation. Yet contemporary sexual liberalism is limited in its scope of action. It does not extend to the sphere of representation/description of sexual relations, which has a tangible impact on the possibility of the individual's sexual identity manifestation. Its quasi-free nature has determined the place of sexuality in consumer culture—sex remains a taboo subject, and its forms of representation are viewed from a position of anti-normativity (Bey 2011, 197-198). The social aspect of nudity, whose dual status, defined by the “sacredness-taboo” parameters, has given the naked body the potential for a manifestation capable of causing both discomfort and arousal at the same time. This dualism has not prohibited the use of genital vocabulary in sexual communication, but it has created a need for speakers to draw on linguistic resources to denote what is not normally spoken about in public space (Braun and Kitzinger 2001). The ability of the genitals to function rhetorically extends beyond questions of reproduction, generating numerous conflicting discourses that do not allow genitalia to be viewed *a priori* (DeLuca 1999, 11-12). In sexual interaction and in everyday communication, if the context permits, reference to genitalia passes through the re-symbolization of anatomical terms, making them more comfortable for word usage (Strozier 1966, 63). Conceptualization of their external and functional characteristics takes place in the wording of other concepts. Although linguistic creativity in generating analogues of taboo terms is limitless, many of the created terms can be assigned to the same thematic groups.

In the study of sexual communication (including sexual slang), little attention has been paid to the compilation of sexual vocabulary and the classification of genital nominations and other ways of their verbal designation. Most of the existing research is focused on gender-oriented pejorative vocabulary and sexual slang used by communicants in various contexts of interaction. The existing works devoted to the verbal representation of genitals are Anglocentric, monospecific, and focused on the study of: ways of nominating genitals used in children's presence and by children, and the development of anatomically correct and psychologically comfortable nominations (Goldman 1990, 138, 144; Gilgun and Gordon 1985, 46); ways of nominating genitals through proper names (Cornog 1986); features of nominating genitals by men and women (Cameron 1992; Braun and Kitzinger 2001). At present we have no information on what groups of genital nominations (as well as other verbal and non-verbal ways of their designation) are represented in other languages (including Russian), whether there are thematic groups common to all languages and cultures, how the stylistic and expressive parameters of word usage correlate with communicative genres and what image of owners they translate. The study of the lexicon of genitalia seems to us a promising direction especially now, when the emergence of virtual space has contributed to the redistribution of communication boundaries and generated new opportunities for the expression of sexual identity in digital format. The aim of this work is related to the study and presentation of the classification of genital nominations existing in the Russian language.

Genital and Equivalent Terms in Online Sexual Discourse

In normative discourse, the speaker, touching on the topic of sex and sexuality, has to resort to finding an adequate alternative to the tabooed term (Brown and Levinson 1987; Duda 2011; Almoayidi 2018). This alternative (further conventionally referred to as “term-analogue”) is supposed to protect the speaker’s “face”, which can be damaged by discussing taboo topics, considered in public discourse as a manifestation of bad taste (Allan and Burrige 1988; Almoayidi 2018). The instability of the correlation between the form of expression and the signified makes it impossible to establish principles for distinguishing the unmentioned tabooed term and the mentioned term-analogue, whose content plane combines both tabooed and non-tabooed meanings—the latter, due to the tendency to interpret the lexical unit in its pejorative and non-preferred connotations, risk being supplanted by the tabooed meaning (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum 1957). In normative discourse, euphemisms are thought to act most often as alternatives. They are figurative, underlie semantic changes of the tabooed term, and are numerous in form and ways of expressing shades of meaning (Allan and Burrige 1988, 2). In a number of contexts, terms-analogues are not always intended to euphemize meaning. In pornographic texts, euphemisms coexist with orthophemisms (straightforward utterances) and with dysphemisms—expressions that, in contrast to euphemisms, are overtly offensive to the signified, addressee, and/or third party (Allan and Burrige 1988, 10-12; Duda 2011) — that is, the choice between alternatives depends on the register and the level of formality of the interaction. In this study, we take into account that the activity of the producer and the consumer of pornography is conscious, although it is not advertised in public space—the producer forms a response to the request of its audience, represented by an anonymous user of a pornographic stories portal and members of thematic communities; the consumer is aware of his/her interest in such texts and views pornographic literature as a possible way to satisfy his/her sexual needs. In other words, for the producer and consumer of pornographic content, its anti-normative nature is not a revelation.

The nature of representation of the naked body is related to its gender attribution. Gender as a set of socially acquired behavior patterns allocated to each member of the biological category of men and women, and the ways of its representation in language formed the basis of the heteronormativity of the European culture, in which men are the main consumers of sexual pleasure (Fernández-Fontecha and Catalán 2003). This aspect is actively discussed by representatives of feminist schools, who follow the Whorfian thesis that any phenomenon is organized through its representation in language: the characteristics assigned to each of the sexes in the sex metaphor are aimed at reinforcing androcentricity, since it is men who have a monopoly on the freedom of activity in sexual interactions (Cameron 1992, 373; Fernández-Fontecha and Catalán 2003). The sacred and taboo status of female and male genitalia are not equivalent: in everyday discursive practices, female genitalia are more taboo and less sacred; the opposite is true of the male genital system. There is clearly an insurmountable cultural and social tension underlying conceptualizations of female sexuality (Braun and Kitzinger 2001, 146). Historically, the female genitalia were outside the institutional rhetoric of Christianity. Interest in them was mediated and represented a set of abstract and mythologized judgments about female nature, manifested through the ability to procreate and menstruate. In mythological consciousness, an intimidating, chthonic image of the female essence embodied in the womb took root, appearing empty and cold and undoubtedly a danger to men; menstrual discharge, considered uncontrollable, was seen as a punishment for the woman’s original sin (Hartnell 2019, 243). For centuries, these judgments have supported ideas about the vagina as an “unholy” organ. Their reproducibility in culture has survived, however, this myth has become less recognized. A number of researchers have found a large number of derogatory sexualized metaphors aimed at conceptualizing ideas about the female body, the female place in the world and the female role in sex, and considered as part of patriarchal discourse (Penelope 1990; Fernández-Fontecha and Catalán 2003). The situation is

different with the male sexual organ. The penis, endowed with a public role, has become an object of religious veneration. At the same time, the sociocultural complex of universally recognized historical forms established a certain canon of corporeality, in which the parameters of the male genitalia such as their size and duration of erection played an important role—non-compliance with this canon in both external and functional characteristics is still a threat to the whole set of basic male identities (Hartnell 2019, 243-245; Kon 2002).

The conceptualization of genitalia is at the junction of physical sensations and social experience of partners, facing the need to reinterpret terminology to preserve “face” in public discourse or to expand connotation and include additional meanings in sexual interaction, which is reflected in the construction of sexual identities of communicants and the nature of sexual activity. The variety of ways of nomination does not simply work for the narrative of the pornographic text, but also reflects the peculiarity of transformation of sexual terminology into abstract categories, that is, it expresses bodily experience within the linguistic structure—through terms that are not related to sex, while being capable of conceptualizing knowledge about human physiology. The lexicon of genitalia can be organized through metaphors that embody existing cultural patterns related to the gendered aspect of the human body (Lakoff and Kövecses 1987). In this paper, we are interested in the formal side of the conceptualization of knowledge about genitalia, that is, the existing set of lexical tools consisting of distinguishable elements in a text or in certain linguistic structures (Burgers, Konijn, and Steen 2016).

The degree of elaboration of the existing classifications depends on the scope and goals of the research conducted. The collection of material for compiling the classifications was carried out by polling, did not contain authentic examples of word usage and ignored the context in which the named lexemes could be used. However, the lists of nominations presented are extensive, with 1,200 English-language terms for vagina and over 1,000 for penis (Braun and Kitzinger 2001). Cornog’s classification (1986) is fixed on the use of proper names as genital terms. She distinguished five types of nominations, which included variations of the “owner’s” name, other human names, descriptive word/construction, and imaginary names. Goldman (1990) identified six thematic groups, which included the process of urination, analogies based on external similarity, human names, anatomical terms, animal names, and other nominations. The most elaborate are the classifications of Cameron (1992) and Braun and Kitzinger (2001). Cameron developed two classifications of male genital terms based on a survey of male respondents (personification, animal, tool, weapon, food associations, reference to a woman and other sexual taboos, sound symbolism and phono-aesthetics, other) and female respondents (proper names, animals, tools, weapons and war metaphors, food, romanticization of the penis, “long/thin/hard/useless” parameters, absurdity). Braun and Kitzinger classification includes 17 thematic groups: standard slang, euphemism, absurdity, space, receptacle, humiliation, hair, animal, money, personification, gender, food associations, danger, sex and pleasure, plants, fantasy, urination. It is possible to speak about four aspects highlighted in the classifications. These aspects form the basis of the metaphorical conceptualization of genitalia and are realized through (1) associations with external resemblance to genitalia, (2) similarity of functional characteristics, (3) characterization of their owner or the object of sexual interaction, (4) emphasis on the sacred/taboo aspect. The selected thematic groups contain both euphemistic and metaphorical examples of terms with significant (i.e., involving the perception of the phenomenon) and descriptive character (aimed at expressing the attitude towards it). In the presented classifications, with the exception of Cornog’s study, which focused on the aspect of the use of varieties of proper names as nominations of genitalia, the groups largely overlap, which probably indicates universal patterns in the generation of genitalia terms.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

For the study, 180 fragments from pornographic stories were collected, in which consensual and non-consensual sexual interactions between two or more partners were described. The term consensual interaction in this article refers to a description of voluntary and noncommercial sexual activity; non-consensual interaction refers to a description of sexual activity in which one party uses physical and psychological pressure (such as blackmail or intimidation) to induce the other party to have sex or engage in sexual acts.

The categories according to which pornographic texts were selected are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Categories for selecting pornographic texts

Biological sex of partners in interaction	Categories of sex stories for describing consensual sexual interaction	Categories of sex stories for describing non-consensual sexual interaction
male partner + female partner	<i>traditional, romantic, classical, straight sex</i>	<i>rape, forced, straight sex</i>
male partners	<i>romantic, gay male</i>	<i>rape, forced, gay male</i>
female partners	<i>romantic, lesbian</i>	<i>rape, forced, lesbian</i>

Pornographic stories are a type of fiction texts and have plot-compositional features characteristic of this type: despite the fact that pornographic literature is fixed on the description of sexual activity, it also contains a conditional exposition, which gives a superficial description of one or more participants in the event, as well as a setup, which describes a chain of events that preceded the sexual interaction and/or became its cause. Thus, in order to narrow the context for the use of genital terms, we considered only scenes describing sexual interaction itself. We should also take into account that the anonymity of the authors of pornographic texts does not allow us to establish their age, gender and orientation—this paper develops classifications of genital terms in texts describing heterosexual and homosexual consensual and non-consensual contact. The genital terminology of heterosexual and homosexual forced and uncoerced pornographic discourses is outside the scope of our study.

In our analysis of the lexical units we took into account the experience of previous English-language studies (see *Genital and Equivalent Terms in Online Sexual Discourse*). We also considered non-metaphoric ways of nominating genitalia, including: anatomical terms, literary and colloquial style nominations, obscene vocabulary, diminutive and augmentative terms, and adverbs of place with diffuse semantics. The selection of terms was made manually by repeated reading of the texts.

The total corpus of consensual and non-consensual sexual interactions that we collected contains 78,290 words (romantic sexual interactions—38,707 words; forced sexual interactions—39,583 words).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

On the basis of the material under study we compiled and analyzed a list of 191 nominations of male and female reproductive organs, among which 109 terms referred to female genitalia and 82 terms to male genitalia. Four ways of nominating genitalia were identified: orthophemistic, euphemistic, dysphemistic, and metaphorical. The metaphorical method, which traditionally belongs to

the variety of euphemistic coding of information, was singled out as a separate group, which is justified by the need to focus on a fundamentally different way of verbalizing the terms of genitalia consisting in their conceptualization in terms of other concepts.

Orthophemistic Nomination

Orthophemistic nominations include anatomical terms and lexemes of literary and colloquial styles. Unlike euphemistic, dysphemistic and metaphorical ways of nomination, which participate in the construction of characters' images and can express evaluative meanings, orthophemistic terms aim to fix and convey the sequence of actions and participate in the detailing of sexual activity.

The nominations *genitalii* 'genitalia', *(polovoi) organ* '(genital) organ' or *(polovye) organy* '(genital) organs', *promezhnost* 'crotch' are found to denote both female and male genitalia, which is due to the nature of these lexemes, being hyperons in relation to other terms of genitalia. The term of colloquial style *pisya* 'pee-pee' and its derivative nomination *pis'ka* 'wee-wee', whose semantics contain no indication of the gender aspect, in contrast to the lexeme *pisyun* 'willy, johnson', which is used exclusively to denote male genitalia, can also be considered universal nominations.

Anatomical terminology represents the human genitalia in detail and much more broadly than the lexemes of the literary and colloquial styles, which focus on the external organs of the reproductive and excretory systems. The most frequent anatomical terms for the female reproductive system include: *klitor* 'clitoris', *vlagalishche* 'vagina' (2.08 ipt), *(polovye) guby* 'labia' (1.04 ipt)/*(polovye) gubki* 'vulvar lips' (1.59); for the male reproductive system, *golovka* 'glans' (1.78 ipt), *yaichki* 'testicles' (0.33 ipt) and a derived lexeme belonging to conversational style, *yaitsa* 'balls' (1.42 ipt). The most used to denote male genitalia is the lexeme *chlen* 'penis' (15.78 ipt). Nominations belonging to the literary style are practically not used for the construction of sexual interaction.

The anatomical terminology of female genital organs found in the description of sexual interaction includes the terms *matka* 'uterus' and *(devstvennaya) pleva* 'hymen', which are the internal organs of the female reproductive system. Both lexemes are low-frequency and are used in the context of describing a particular sexual activity: in the context of the defloration or deep and intense penetration, both in conjunction with consensual interaction and rape, in the construction of which the trauma and painfulness of penetration is fetishized—the fear and suffering of the victim come into the focus of the narrative.

Euphemistic Nomination

In the pornographic narrative, euphemisms lose their veiling function and act as one of the tools for organizing artistic images, qualitatively complicating the narrative. In the analyzed texts we encountered both lexical units with a higher style register (*plot* 'flesh', *lono* 'bosom', *(zhenskie) prelesti* '(female) charms', *(zhenskoe) estestvo* '(female) nature', *fallos* 'phallus'), and lexemes with diffuse semantics. The latter were used mainly to denote the female genital organs. In the studied texts, they are represented by deictic words (*tam* 'there', *tuda* 'to there', *ottuda* 'from there', *vniz/vnizu* 'down/below', *nizhe* 'lower', *gluboko/glubzhe* 'deep/deeper', *vglub* 'deep into', *vnutr'/vnutri* 'into/inside') — see Table 2. Their referentiality is determined through anaphoric and/or cataphoric connections in the text. For the addressee, the key to decoding is the distinct situational-thematic relationship set by the context of the word usage—in the pornographic narrative, this occurs intuitively through the description of a sexually explicit interaction.

TABLE 2. The use of lexemes with diffuse semantics in the pornographic narrative

<i>tam</i> 'there'	<i>Tam ona tozhe byla ochen' krasiva.</i> 'She was very beautiful there, too.' <i>Ya tseloval ee tam, prinimaya v sebya ee bozhestvennyi nektar.</i> 'I kissed her there, taking in her divine nectar.'
<i>tuda/ottuda</i> '(to) there/from (there)'	<i>Nakonets, ya zasunula tuda yazyk. Nasten'ka nachala stonat' ochen' gromko, chto zavodilo menya ochen' sil'no.</i> 'Finally, I stuck my tongue in there. Nastenka started moaning very loudly, which turned me on a lot.' <i>Ya khochu vysosat' ottuda ves' tvoi sok.</i> 'I want to suck all your juice out of it.'
<i>vniz/vnizu</i> 'down/below'	<i>Tvoi bedra zhivut svoei zhizn'yu, oni podragivayut, dvigayutsya v storony i ty lovish' moyu ruku i sil'nee prizhimaesh' k sebe vniz.</i> 'Your hips have a life of their own, they wiggle, move sideways, you catch my hand and press it down harder.' <i>Ya ne smog uderzhat'sya ot soblazna i potseloval vnizu.</i> 'I couldn't resist the temptation and kissed below.' <i>Ya vse bolee nastoichivo lizala ee sosok, potom stala ego sosat' i nachala spuskat'sya vniz k ee trusikam. Ona vsya gorela zhelaniem.</i> 'I licked her nipple more and more insistently, then started sucking it and began going down to her panties. She was burning with desire.'
<i>nizhe</i> 'lower'	<i>Net, ya budu lizat' tebya nizhe, tak, khorosho, davai, dai mne svoi grekh...</i> 'No, I'll lick you lower, so, good, come on, give me your sin...'
<i>gluboko/glubzhe</i> 'deep/deeper'	<i>Ya vsadil gluboko i stremitel'no.</i> 'I shoved deep and rapidly.' <i>Ya vygnulsya, starayas' ne to chto by prinyat' glubzhe, a sdelat' kak mozhno bolee priyatno.</i> 'I arched up, trying not just to take it deeper, but to give as much pleasure as possible.'
<i>vglub'</i> 'deep into'	<i>Ya chuvstvuyu, chto on vystrelil vglub' menya.</i> 'I feel him shoot deep into me.'
<i>vnutr'/vnutri</i> 'into/inside'	<i>Ona, iz poslednikh sil, sderzhivala natisk. Ya snova shlepnul ee po grudi, i moi chlen proskol'znul vnutr'...</i> 'She held back my onslaught with the last of her strength. I slapped her breasts again, and my cock slid inside...' <i>I kogda ty vo mne, ya chuvstvuyu takuyu napolnennost' i zavershennost' sebya, kak zhenshchiny. Ya szhimayu tvoi ladoni svoimi — v zamok, ya derzhu ikh tak krepko, i ya chuvstvuyu zhar vnutri. On nesterpim, on fizicheskii, ponimaesh'? On kak lava rastekaetsya vnutri.</i> 'And when you're inside me, I feel so full and complete as a woman. I squeeze your palms with mine—in a lock, I hold them so tightly, and I feel the heat inside. It's unbearable, it's physical, you know? It's like lava flowing inside.'

Another type of euphemistic substitution involves the speaker's knowledge of the properties and characteristics of genitalia, i. e., it is achieved through their intensional meanings. The perception and correct decoding of the meaning requires establishing the identity between the features mentioned and the phenomenon to which they refer. Thus, the verbal designation of genitals can be realized through pronomination—by emphasizing their sacred/taboo status (*intimnaya tochka* 'intimate point', *intimnoe mestechko* 'intimate place', *svyashchennaya plot'* 'sacred flesh', *samoe chuvstvitel'noe* 'the most sensitive'); metonymic transfer—mentioning the component part of genitals (*klitor* 'clitoris', *skladka* 'fold', *moshonka* 'scrotum', *golovka* 'glans'), mentioning internal organs of the reproductive system and the innards of women (*matka* 'uterus', (*vlazhnoe*) *nutro* '(wet) gut'); spatial metonymy—by indicating the area of genital location (*mezhdug nog* 'between legs', *vnizhu zhivota* 'lower abdomen', *pakh* 'groin'), mentioning the object of clothing covering genitalia (*pod/v trusiki* 'under/in panties', *pod yubochku* 'under skirt', *v shtany/v shtanakh* 'under pants/in pants'), as well as their physiological features. Female genitalia are characterized by such parameters as wetness (*v X mokro* 'X is wet', *chto-to (trusy) promoklo* 'something (panties) got wet', *X potekla* 'X is leaking'), warmth (*v X teplo* 'X is warm'), taste (*Y ponravilsya vkus X* 'Y liked the taste of X'), presence of pubic hair (*pushok lobka* 'pubic fuzz', *X byla gladko vybrita* 'X was clean-shaven'), muscle contraction (*vnutri vse sokrashchaetsya* 'everything is contracting inside'). Signs involved in the designation of male genitalia are such parameters as changes in the size and degree of hardness of the penis due to the rush of blood to it, which indicates the state of erection (*u nego vstavav/vstal* 'it was getting hard/he had a hard-on'; *on byl tverdym* 'it was hard'). Related signs can also include the temperature parameter (*on byl goryachim* 'it was hot'; *chto-to goryachee* 'something hot'), taste properties (*on byl sladkim* 'it was sweet'), and increased sensitivity of the male penis (*samoe chuvstvitel'noe* 'the most sensitive').

Finally, euphemization is possible through the identification of the genitals with their owner. In hetero-normative interaction, roles are assigned to the participants in the sexual act: there is the one whose genitals penetrate and the one whose genitals are penetrated. This knowledge finds expression through a simplified logical structure in which no distinction is made between the participants of sexual interaction and their genitals and which is framed linguistically: the agent is the penetrating subject, the objective (also: locative and ablative) is the object of penetration. Within this group the nomination of genitalia is implicit (i.e. not verbalized) and logically incorporated into constructions of (1) penetration/infiltration (*(grubo, nezhno) voiti* 'enter (roughly, gently)'; *proniknut'/pogruzit'sya v X* 'penetrate/merge into X'; *protknut'/porvat' X* 'pierce/rupture X'), (2) sexual practices (*sosat' komu-to* 'suck someone'; *vzyat' v rot* 'take into mouth, give head'; *lizat' komu-to* 'lick someone', *konchat'/konchit' v kogo-to* 'cumming/cum into someone'), (3) ending penetration (*vynut'/vyiti iz X* 'take out/exit from X').

Dysphemistic Nomination

The genital terms, which we classified as dysphemistic nominations, have a low frequency in the texts we studied (2.29 ipt). Their low occurrence in both consensual (1.29 ipt) and non-consensual (3.28 ipt) interaction texts does not allow us to assert a correlation between the nature of the texts and the use of dysphemistic terms in them. At this point, it is possible to talk about the role of dysphemistic nominations in the construction of characters, whose specific semantic component is involved in creating both visually repulsive images and images whose descriptions of derogatory and cruel treatment are presented as justified.

Dysphemisms can include diminutives (with diminutive and derogatory semantics) and augmentatives. Diminutive and augmentative suffixes are differently involved in the formation of the evaluative component. Apparently, they bring a functional and stylistic coloring to words, characterizing the word in the context of describing the interaction of a certain kind; secondly, in its

rhetorical aspect—in the context of correlating the nomination with its signified and characterizing the signified by its correspondence to the dominant corporal canon in culture. Semantic potential of diminutives and augmentatives is realized within the framework of two variables (“large size—small size”), which, in the context of genital terms, do not so much contain information about the anatomical features of the pornographic narrative characters, as they are one of the basic elements in the elaboration of their images.

The corporal canon, which is the key to the interpretation of images, sets different standards of sexual attractiveness and acceptable sexual behavior for men and women. For women, these standards are related to the subtlety of their bodily forms, physical frailty and the presence of little sexual experience: in the context of constructing the female image, the diminutive meaning of diminutives does not contradict the corporal canon, that is, they point to the small size of the female genitalia (*dyrochka* ‘little hole’, *knopochka* ‘little button’, *shchelochnka* ‘slit’). The description of female genitalia as small and narrow forms a socially acceptable and conventionally pious image of a woman in the mind of the consumer of a pornographic text. At the same time, the content of the diminutive term works to deconstruct the male image, focusing attention on the lack of masculinity and pointing to the inability of a man to show active aggression. The small parameters of the male penis are associated with sexual dysfunction and indicate that the male character is unable to handle the onslaught of love (*zverek* ‘little beast’).

Augmentative suffixes give the derivative base the meaning of large size, and the dimensional-valuation component is able to convey mainly negative emotions: fear, contempt and indignation; less often positive ones—surprise and admiration. Augmentative terms are aimed at the deconstruction of the female image, which is achieved through the representation of the female vagina as a dimensionless organ, which is associated with a frequent change of sexual partners and in the context of female sexual behavior is evaluated negatively within the hetero-normative culture (*dyrishcha* ‘huge hole’, *pizdishcha* ‘huge cunt’). With regard to men, through the use of augmentatives, emphasis is placed on the size of their genitals. At the same time, the emphasis on the large size does not always have an active positive coloring—the male genitals are presented as dangerous, causing physical discomfort and causing fear of the object of penetration (*khuishche* ‘huge dick’). In other words, the semantic potential of augmentative terms in the context of male genitalia is fully capable of being implemented in pornographic texts about non-consensual interaction.

Also, the lexemes with pejorative semantics, accentuating the inconsistency of the characters’ genitalia with the corporal canon, were classified as dysphemisms. Thus, in the context of talking about female genitals, the dysphemistic terms are lexemes indicating the dimensionlessness and elongation of genitals (*dyra* ‘hole’, *nora* ‘burrow’, *zherlo* ‘vent’). The dysphemistic terms of male genitals include nominations, emphasizing the curvature (*koryaga* ‘snag’, *perets* ‘pepper’), the small size of the penis (*chlenik* ‘little willy’) and comparing the male sex organ to a female one (*klitor* ‘clitoris’, *klitor-pis’ka* ‘clitoris-willy’).

Metaphorical Nomination

We identified thirteen metaphorical groups of nominations of male genitalia with different source spheres (“vegetation”, “instruments”, “musical instruments”, “weapons”, “mechanism part”, “oblong hard object”, “oblong flexible object”, “nautical terms”, “elevation”, “fauna”, “food”, “sacred status”, “apex/endpoint”) and fourteen metaphorical groups of female genital nominations (“fauna”, “recesses/unfilled hollows”, “depth”, “narrow cavity”, “bulge, unevenness”, “wound”, “vegetation”, “aquatic terminology”, “sacredness & sinfulness”, “hedonism”, “entrance”, “geometric figures/shapes”, “obstacle”, “treasure”). Metaphorical terminology apparently takes an active part in modifying existing archetypal images of pornographic interaction—lover, mistress, rapist and victim—and is based on the

corporal canon, but its comprehension occurs differently than in the euphemistic method and requires creative comprehension of the human genitalia in addition to the author/speaker's knowledge of them.

Universal groups. Universal source spheres for metaphor formation include such source spheres as “vegetation”, and “fauna”. It should be noted that even within these groups, the terms of male genitalia show greater variability, although they are low-frequency in the texts we examined.

In the “vegetation” group the idea of male genitalia is realized through metaphors of the trunk, branches, dense woody parts of plants, through which the idea of masculinity is constituted. However, some lexemes (*koryaga* ‘snag’) have negative connotations and connote aesthetically unattractive genitals of an older man. Plant terms of female genitalia are expressed in metaphors of flowers and their components (*buton* ‘bud’, *tsvetok* ‘flower’, *lepestki* ‘petals’), which probably refers to the structure of the female external genitalia—small and large labia covering the vagina.

The “fauna” group is practically not represented among the terms of female genitalia. Among the most frequent terms of female genitalia is the term *kiska* ‘pussy’ (1.86 ipt), which is probably a derivation (loan-translation) of the English term *pussy*. The terms of male genitalia from the “fauna” group are aimed at creating a high-status and uncontrollable image of a man. Some of these lexemes characterize the male genitals in terms of their size and aesthetic appeal, emphasize a man’s attachment to his penis or highlight the intimacy of sexual interaction. Compared to the male terms in this group, the female terms are not as varied and conceptualize genitalia in terms of gender attribution and aesthetic appeal.

Metaphors of elevation and depth. The theme of immersion is realized in the nominations of female genitalia and is reflected in the metaphorical conceptualization of genitalia through associations with unfilled hollows, narrow cavities, depth and water terms (groups “depth”, “recesses, unfilled hollows”, “narrow cavity”, “aquatic terminology”). These groups are based on the idea that the female genitalia is a space to be penetrated, delved into and can be filled with an object (e.g., the male genital organ) or fluid (sperm).

In contrast to the above-mentioned groups, the groups “apex, endpoint” and “elevation”, used to denote the male penis, contrast the bottomlessness of the female nature, hidden inside the body, with the demonstrativeness of the male organ, reaching upward. The elongated shape underlies the metaphorical conceptualization of the penis, regardless of which group of metaphors we are talking about—it can be considered a qualitative feature in the characterization of the male penis. At the same time, elongated shape is not the only property of the penis that plays a role in its conceptualization: male genitalia can be hard (group “oblong hard object”) or elastic and flexible (group “oblong flexible object”).

It is noteworthy that the “nautical terminology” and “aquatic space” groups are also involved in the conceptualization of genitals: female genitalia in the terms of these concepts acquire the appearance of water space, large-scale, deep and uncontrollable, in which the movement occurs. Some lexemes from the above groups can also be combined into the group of geographical terms, which will include such lexemes as *bukhta* ‘bay’, *del'ta* ‘delta’, *zherlo* ‘vent’, *ust'e* ‘estuary’.

Food metaphors. Food metaphors for female genitalia were not found, which may be due to their low frequency in pornographic discourse. The component of taste (which may refer to the edibility) is conditionally contained in the lexeme *sladkaya poloska* ‘sweet stripe’, belonging to the group “geometrical figures/shapes”. Among the food nominations of male genitalia, we found (1) meat metaphors, (2) metaphors through which the scrotum (*oreshki* ‘nuts’) is nominated, and (3) metaphors referring to oral sex practices by comparing the male genital organ to a candy or a lollipop (*chupa-chups* ‘Chupa Chups’), indicating the thematic correlation of some terms and a variety of pornographic narrative. Food metaphors also retain the emphasis on the elongated shape of the penis, but the connotation of the lexemes contained in this group allows to represent the male genitals in sexual

interaction in different ways: for example, the lexeme *sardel'ka* 'sausage' is used to nominate a thick and short penis, whose aesthetic appeal is questioned by the author of the text.

Metaphors of worship, sin and sexual pleasure. The aspect of sacredness and sinfulness is conceptualized differently in male and female genitalia. In the context of the male genitalia the semantic component of status is realized, through the representation of the sexual organ as a bearer of prestige or having a monopoly on magic. The terms of male genitalia, belonging to the group of "tools" and "part of the mechanism" conceptualize the male genitalia in terms of their main function in the sexual act, associated with the realization of sexual activity and the achievement of sexual pleasure.

The terms of female genitalia within this group have a wide connotative range, representing female genitalia as something that is worshiped, which brings pleasure, or as something that leads to temptation and is the cause of sin—the designations of genitalia in some cases are metaphors, relating the signified to religious concepts. The sacred status of female genitalia can also be implemented through the metaphor of treasure, which conceptualizes female genitalia as something valuable and important to possess. This group includes the term used to refer to the female clitoris, *zhemchuzhina* 'pearl' (along with lexemes from the group "bulge" and the lexeme *goroshina* 'pea'). In general, clitoral metaphors show a tendency to represent the clitoris as a small, round organ.

Metaphors of weapons and wounds. In the texts about non-consensual interaction, the concept of male aggression is embodied in terms of weapons: the male sexual organ can be represented by firearms, shattering and thrusting weapons. In conjunction with statements describing coitus through constructions with the semantics of breaking, stretching or rhythmic blows, sexual interaction appears traumatic and dangerous to the receptive party. Among the terms of female genitalia we have also detected metaphorical nominations with the semantics of wounding (group "wound"). Lexemes from this group were found in pornographic texts about consensual interaction, which probably emphasize, on the one hand, the visual similarity of the female vagina with an open and bleeding wound, opening access to the internal organs of the woman; on the other hand, the expression of the idea of defenselessness, vulnerability and fragility of the female character. The metaphor of entrance and obstacle, used in the narrative to describe the process of defloration and constituting the idea of resistance collapsing under the male onslaught, functions on a similar principle in the pornographic narrative. These groups can be extended by constructions with the semantics of entry/exit in the group "personification" of the euphemistic way of referring to genitalia, in combination with which female genitalia literally open the door to the inner world of a woman.

Examples of metaphorical terms for male and female genitalia are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Examples of metaphorical conceptualization of genital terms

Groups	Examples
FEMALE GENITALIA	
Fauna	<i>kiska</i> 'pussy'
Vegetation	<i>buton</i> 'bud', <i>lepestki</i> 'petals', <i>tsvetok</i> 'flower'
Sacredness & Sinfulness	<i>altar'</i> 'altar'
Hedonism	<i>tsestr udovol'stviya</i> 'pleasure center', <i>prelest'</i> 'delight'
Treasure	<i>sokrovishche</i> 'treasure', <i>zhemchuzhina</i> 'pearl', <i>samoe sokrovennoe</i> 'the most intimate'
Bulge	<i>bugor</i> 'bump', <i>bugorok</i> 'knobble', <i>knopka</i> 'button'

Wound	<i>rana</i> 'wound', <i>rubets</i> 'scar', <i>razrez</i> 'incision'
Depth	<i>nedra</i> 'subsoil', <i>glubina</i> 'depth', <i>skvazhina</i> 'well', <i>zherlo</i> 'vent'
Recesses, unfilled hollows	<i>dyra</i> 'hole', <i>dyrka</i> 'little hole', <i>norka</i> 'burrow', <i>vpadina</i> 'hollow', <i>vpadinka</i> 'dent'
Narrow cavity	<i>shchel</i> 'crevice', <i>shchelka</i> 'slot', <i>shchelochka</i> 'chink', <i>peshchera</i> 'cave', <i>peshcherka</i> 'little cave'
Aquatic space	<i>ust'e grekha</i> 'mouth of sin', <i>del'ta</i> 'delta', <i>bukhta</i> 'bay', <i>farvater</i> 'fairway'
Entrance	<i>vkhod</i> 'entry'
Obstacle	<i>prepyatstvie</i> 'obstacle'
Geometric figures	<i>treugol'nik</i> 'triangle', <i>chuvstvitel'naya tochka</i> 'sensitive point'
MALE GENITALIA	
Fauna	<i>monstr</i> 'monster', <i>cherv</i> 'worm', <i>zverek</i> 'little beast'
Vegetation	<i>stvol</i> 'trunk', <i>stebel</i> 'stem', <i>shishka</i> 'cone', <i>koryaga</i> 'snag'
Food	<i>kolbasa</i> 'Polony sausage', <i>sardel'ka</i> 'sausage, bratwurst', <i>oreshki</i> 'nuts', <i>chupa-chups</i> 'Chupa Chups', <i>perets</i> 'pepper'
Sacred status	<i>dostoinstvo</i> 'virtue', <i>chudo</i> 'miracle'
Tools	<i>agregat</i> 'device', <i>prichindal</i> 'item, junk', <i>orudie</i> 'tool', <i>shlang</i> 'hose'
Mechanism part	<i>porshen</i> 'piston', <i>shtyr</i> 'pin', <i>kolotushka</i> 'rammer'
Musical instrument	<i>smychok</i> 'fiddle bow', <i>kolotushka</i> 'drum stick'
Weapon	<i>dulo</i> 'muzzle', <i>pushka</i> 'gun', <i>stvol</i> 'barrel', <i>dubina</i> 'baton', <i>dubinka</i> 'club', <i>shampur</i> 'skewer', <i>kol</i> 'stake', <i>dryn</i> 'stick'
Nautical terminology	<i>bukhta</i> 'bay', <i>machta</i> 'mast'
Oblong hard object	<i>machta</i> 'mast', <i>dubina</i> 'baton', <i>shtyr</i> 'pin', <i>stvol</i> 'trunk'
Oblong flexible object	<i>shlang</i> 'hose', <i>khobot</i> 'trunk', <i>cherv</i> 'worm', <i>sardel'ka</i> 'sausage, bratwurst'
Elevation	<i>bugor</i> 'bump', <i>shishka</i> 'cone',
Apex, endpoint	<i>samaya makovka</i> 'the very top', <i>konets</i> 'endpoint'

CONCLUSIONS

Our study did not seek to rethink the experience of our predecessors, especially since we assess their contribution to the study of genital nominations as extremely powerful and significant. Our study aims to expand and deepen already accumulated knowledge about how speakers can denote genitalia in conversation, including in the pornographic narrative and in virtual pornographic communication. The conceptualization of male and female genitalia (if we are not talking about orthophemistic terms) is based on four aspects—(1) associations on the grounds of external similarity to genitalia, (2) similarity of functional characteristics, (3) characterization of their owner or the object of sexual

interaction, (4) emphasis on the sacred/taboo aspect—somehow interpreted in euphemistic, dysphemistic and metaphorical terms.

The data we obtained partially duplicate the results reflected in the English-language classifications. For example, the metaphorical groups "fauna", "tools" "vegetation", "depth", "hollows, unfilled cavities", "narrow cavity", "food" highlighted in our study echo the metaphorical groups presented in Braun & Kitzinger (2001). However, the diversity of terms we have revealed is not limited solely to metaphorical comprehension: four ways of nominating genitalia (orthophemistic, euphemistic, dysphemistic, metaphorical) were identified, demonstrating a great variability of terms and designations, the production of which involves both various linguistic resources and extra-lingual knowledge about the structure, physiological functions and sociocultural aspect of genitalia in existing rhetoric.

REFERENCES

- Allan, Keith, and Kate Burridge. 1998. "Euphemism, dysphemism, and cross-varietal synonymy." *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics* 1 (1): 1–17.
- Almoayidi, Khedir A. 2018. "Euphemism as a Communicative Tool: A Descriptive Study of Hijazi and Southern Region Dialects Spoken in Saudi Arabia." *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 08 (01): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2018.81001>.
- Bey, Sharif. 2011. "Naked Bodies and Nasty Pictures: Decoding Sex Scripts in Preadolescence, Re-Examining Normative Nudity through Art Education." *Studies in Art Education* 52 (3): 196–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2011.11518835>.
- Braun, Virginia, and Celia Kitzinger. 2001. "'Snatch,' 'Hole,' or 'Honey-pot'? Semantic Categories and the Problem of Nonspecificity in Female Genital Slang." *The Journal of Sex Research* 38 (2): 146–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490109552082>.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 4. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burgers, Christian, Elly A. Konijn, and Gerard J. Steen. 2016. "Figurative Framing: Shaping Public Discourse Through Metaphor, Hyperbole, and Irony: Figurative Framing." *Communication Theory* 26 (4): 410–430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12096>.
- Cameron, Deborah. 1992. "Naming of Parts: Gender, Culture, and Terms for the Penis among American College Students." *American Speech* 67 (4): 367–382. <https://doi.org/10.2307/455846>.
- Cornog, Martha. 1986. "Naming Sexual Body Parts: Preliminary Patterns and Implications." *Journal of Sex Research* 22 (3): 393–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498609551318>.
- De Klerk, Vivian. 1992. "How Taboo Are Taboo Words for Girls?." *Language in Society* 21 (2): 277–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500015293>.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. 1999. "Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, Act Up, and Queer Nation." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 36 (1): 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.1999.11951634>.
- Duda, Božena. 2011. "Euphemisms and dysphemism: in search of a boundary line." *Círculo de lingüística aplicada a la comunicación* 45 (0): 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.5209/rev.CLAC.2011.v45.1>.
- Fernández Fontecha, Almudena, and Rosa María Jiménez Catalán. 2003. "Semantic Derogation in Animal Metaphor: A Contrastive-Cognitive Analysis of Two Male/Female Examples in English and Spanish." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (5): 771–797. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00127-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00127-3).
- Fischer, Gloria J. 1989. "Sex Words Used by Partners in a Relationship." *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy* 15 (1): 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614576.1989.11074944>.
- Gilgun, Jane F., and Sol Gordon. 1985. "Sex Education and the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse." *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy* 11 (1): 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614576.1985.11074821>.
- Goldman, Juliette. 1990. "The Importance of an Adequate Sexual Vocabulary for Children." *Australian Journal of Marriage and Family* 11 (3): 136–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034652X.1990.11004418>.
- Hartnell, Jack. 2019. "Goloe Srednevekov'e. Zhizn', smert' i iskusstvo v Srednie veka" [Medieval Bodies. Life, Death, and Art in the Middle Ages]. Moscow: AST. (in Russian)

- Kon, Igor' Semenovich. 2002. "Muzhskoe telo kak eroticheskii ob"ekt" [The male body as an erotic object]. In *O muzhe(N)stvenosti*, 43-78. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (in Russian)
- Lakoff, George, and Zoltán Kövecses. 1987. "The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English." In *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, edited by D. Holland and N. Quinn, 195–221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607660.009>.
- Osgood, Charles Egerton, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. 1957. *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Penelope, Julia. 1990. *Speaking freely: unlearning the lies of the fathers' tongues*. The Athene series. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Strozier, Robert. 1966. "The Euphemism." *Language Learning* 16 (1-2): 63–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00809.x>.
-

Acknowledgments

There are no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article and this research had not any external financial support.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with publication rights granted to the journal.

This open access article is distributed under a custom license: freely available to download, save, reproduce, and transmit for noncommercial, scholarly, and educational purposes; to reuse portions or extracts in other works—all with proper attribution to the original author(s), title, and the journal. Commercial use, reproduction or distribution requires additional permissions.
