

XVII међународни научни скуп
Српски језик, књижевност, уметност

Књига IV

ЗЛОБНИЦИ, ЗЛИКОВЦИ, ЧУДОВИШТА, ПСИХОПАТЕ

**КЊИЖЕВНО-ЛИНГВИСТИЧКО-КУЛТУРОЛОШКА
ХУМАНО(ПО)ЕТИКА:**

ДОБАР – ЛОШ, ЗАО

пројекат Центра за научноистраживачки рад

Филолошко-уметничког факултета

2022-2023

Филолошко-уметнички факултет, Крагујевац
Андрићев институт, Андрићград
2023.

Филолошко-уметнички факултет, Крагујевац
Андрићев институт, Андрићград
2023.

XVII међународни научни скуп *Српски језик, књижевности, уметности*

Књига IV

ЗЛОБНИЦИ, ЗЛИКОВЦИ, ЧУДОВИШТА, ПСИХОПАТЕ

Зборник радова са научног округлог стола ЗЛОБНИЦИ, ЗЛИКОВЦИ, ЧУДОВИШТА, ПСИХОПАТЕ одржаног у оквиру XVII међународног научног скупа *Српски језик, књижевности, уметности* (Крагујевац/Андрићград, 11–13. новембар 2022) и то као резултат рада на пројекту КЊИЖЕВНО ЛИНГВИСТИЧКО-КУЛТУРОЛОШКА ХУМАНО(ПО)ЕТИКА: ДОБАР – ЛОШ, ЗАО Центра за научноистраживачки рад Филолошко-уметничког факултета 2022-2023.

ПРОГРАМСКИ ОДБОР

Председник

Мр Зоран Комадина, редовни професор

Потпредседници

Др Милош Ковачевић, редовни професор

Др Драган Бошковић, редовни професор

Чланови

Др Владимир Поломац, ванредни професор

Др Часлав Николић, ванредни професор

Др Бранка Радовић, редовни професор

Др Биљана Мандић, ванредни професор

Др Јелена Атанасијевић, редовни професор

Др Мирјана Мишковић Луковић, редовни професор

Др Катарина Мелић, редовни професор

Др Персида Лазаревић ди Ђакомо, редовни професор,

Универзитет „Г. д Анунцио”, Пескара, Италија

Др Анђелка Пејовић, редовни професор, Филолошки факултет, Београд

Др Ала Татаренко, ванредни професор, Филолошки факултет Универзитета „Иван Франко”, Лавов, Украјина

Др Зринка Блажевић, ванредни професор, Филозофски факултет, Загреб, Хрватска

Др Миланка Бабић, редовни професор, Филозофски факултет,

Универзитет Источно Сарајево, Босна и Херцеговина

Др Михај Радан, редовни професор, Факултет за историју,

филологију и теологију, Темишвар, Румунија

Др Димка Савова, редовни професор Факултет за словенску филологију, Софија, Бугарска

Др Јелица Стојановић, редовни професор Филозофски факултет, Никшић, Црна Гора

Рецензенти

Др Душан Иванић, редовни професор (Београд)

Др Александар Јерков, редовни професор (Београд)

Др Драган Бошковић, редовни професор (Крагујевац)

Др Катарина Мелић, редовни професор (Крагујевац)

Др Богуслав Зјелински, редовни професор (Познањ, Пољска)

Др Душан Маринковић, редовни професор (Загреб, Хрватска)

Др Роберт Ходел, редовни професор (Хамбург, Немачка)

Др Ала Татаренко, ванредни професор (Лавов, Украјина)

Издавање овог зборника подржало је

Министарство науке, технолошког развоја и иновација Републике Србије

ЗЛОБНИЦИ, ЗЛИКОВЦИ, ЧУДОВИШТА, ПСИХОПАТЕ

Уредници

Др Марија Лојаница, ванредни професор

(гости-руководилац пројекта)

Др Никола Бубања, редовни професор

(руководилац пројекта)

Др Милош Ковачевић, редовни професор

(руководилац пројекта)

Jelena M. JOSIJEVIĆ¹
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
Department of Anglistics

Nina Ž. MANOJLOVIĆ²
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
Department of Anglistics

THE WHORE OF BABYLON VERSUS DON JUAN: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF GENDER PROMISCUITY IN ENGLISH SLANG³

This paper aims at analyzing English slang labels used for promiscuous people. Sixty-five expressions are extracted from *The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (2008) and *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang* (1998). Since slang is both a linguistic and sociological phenomenon (Mattiello 2008: 30), these expressions are analyzed from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Drawing on the methodology proposed by N. Fairclough (1995a: 98), CDA is conducted on three levels: descriptive, interpretative, and explanatory. Relying on Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), the analysis aims at identifying the predominant source domains that the domain of FEMALE/MALE PROMISCUITY is mapped to in English slang. It demonstrates that this particular sexual lifestyle is romanticized, approved, and even celebrated when practiced by men, while women are degraded, condemned, or even demonized for doing the same. The results further show that the discursive practice is systematic and consistent. Due to the dialectical nature of discursive and social practices, the paper argues that this gender-biased discourse, which abounds in slang slurs for women while there is a scarcity of euphemized slang expressions for men, is not only shaped by the societal norms, but also operates as a mechanism of imposing the double standards for genders. In addition, slang terms may have the power to shape the social attitudes within the communities, but not only those which create and use such slang slurs on a daily basis. Wider communities exposed to such conceptualizations, by simply being aware of their existence, may be manipulated into believing that the gender inequity in using offensive language is standard and hence normal and acceptable practice.

1 jelena.josijevic@filum.kg.ac.rs

2 nina.manojlovic@filum.kg.ac.rs

3 Истраживање спроведено у раду финансирало је Министарство науке, технолошког развоја и иновација Републике Србије (Уговор о реализацији и финансирању научноистраживачког рада НИО у 2022. години број 451-03-68/2022-14/ 200198). Рад је настао у оквиру националног научног пројекта *Књижевно-лингвистичко-културолошка Хумано(и)етика: Добар-лош, зао*, у оквиру циклуса пројеката *Језик, књижевност, култура данас* Центра за научноистраживачки рад Филолошко-уметничког факултета Универзитета у Крагујевцу, 2022–2023. године.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, mapping, conceptual metaphor, English slang, promiscuity, negative perception

1. INTRODUCTION

Ideologies are created through language, so language becomes their main instrument (Leonardi 2008: 164). Due to the instrumental role of language in creating ideologies, ideological manipulation is conspicuous on all linguistic levels (Hatim and Mason 1990: 16). Lexicons are extremely susceptible to becoming ideological tools because they, inter alia, have the power to label different social groups, assert their position within a society, impact the attitudes of other community members toward them, and hence predetermine how they will be treated by others.

Slang, as an integral component of a lexicon, is essentially a sociological phenomenon, i.e., a form of social practice. Hence, most definitions found in the linguistic literature focus primarily on its sociological nature (Mattiello 2008). In sociological accounts, slang is basically regarded as a powerful instrument of identification within a social group (Eble 1996, Allen 1998, Mattiello 2005, 2008, Smith 2011). Even though some social groups use it for the sole purpose of preventing non-members from understanding the content of what group members communicate among themselves (Burridge 2004: 34), it is now predominantly used for building a unique sense of *togetherness* – “keeping insiders together and outsiders out” (Mattiello 2008: 32). Slang can also be employed for opposing people in authority (Eble 1996), marking social differences (Allen 1998), or describing, evaluating, and categorizing people (McConnell-Ginet 2003: 70). The latter use of slang can become a dangerous weapon in the hands of those who aim at spreading misconceptions and prejudice about other social groups in order to encourage and invigorate discrimination and maltreatment of those groups, or at least make such conduct understandable, justifiable, and/or pardonable.

There is plenty of evidence that slang labels can be a great asset in creating and spreading ideologies against marginalized social groups. They reflect the fact that these groups are deprecated by the community using such slurs. However, every single instance of their usage does not only serve as a re-confirmation of their current social treatment, but is also a re-affirmation of the negative communal stance towards them. In other words, the use of slurs reinforces and extends negative attitudes towards marginalized social groups. For instance, the labels used for African Americans, such as *ape*, *monkey*, and *crow*, reflect the attempt of one social group to dehumanize the other based on race and skin color. The perceptions of dehumanized beings made it easier for the wider community to practice or accept slavery as normal conduct. In other cases, slang slurs are used to portray certain social groups as sinful and evil. For example, the word *sod* (clipping from *sodomy*) is used for male homosexuals and, with the obvious Biblical reference to Sodom (and Gomorrah), the slur carries the

ideological message that homosexuality is sinful, deranged, and wicked. The full power of jargon is perhaps most evident in the Nazi propaganda. A. Bein (1964) explored the racist and derogatory descriptions of Jews in the German language, including the slang terms (from the 18th century to the period of the Third Reich). J. W. Young's *Totalitarian Language: Orwell's Newspeak and its Nazi Communist Antecedents* analyzes the language of totalitarian regimes. One section compares Orwell's *Newspeak*, the fictional language set forth in his book in 1984, and Nazi German language practices by highlighting their similarities: the dehumanization, the extensive use of jargon, and the specific forms of calls to blind obedience. In his book *The Language of Oppression*, H. A. Bosmajian (1974) includes a chapter on the anti-Semitic language of the Third Reich, illustrating the Nazi use of ambiguous terminology and novel slurs as a small step towards the Final Solution. Obviously, slang has historically been misused as an integral component of ideological discourse. Systematic and long-term exposure to manipulative discursive strategies obviously has sufficient power to reinforce the desired negative perceptions and seed negative attitudes towards certain social groups. These perceptions sometimes get so deeply rooted in our personal and collective (sub)consciousness that whole communities can be brainwashed and turned into psychopaths and sociopaths who are willing to commit, or witness in silence, monstrous crimes against humanity, such as slavery or The Holocaust.

This brief overview proves that slang, seemingly humorous and harmless play with available linguistic assets, has systematically been misused by the dominant structures to persuade community members that villainous crimes against their fellow humans are to be accepted, pardoned, supported, or even celebrated. This testifies to the fact that slang has an enormous potential to be used as an instrument of ideological manipulation. Humor, witticism, word-play, rhyme, and figurative language make slang expressions attention-grabbing, funny, and thus easily memorable. Hence, the same linguistic and stylistic features that can make slang expressions amusing facilitate their spread through a community, together with more or less obscured ideological messages they commonly carry. Even individuals who would not tolerate explicitly stated offenses against certain social groups tend to repeat entertaining slang expressions, unaware that it makes them a link in a whole chain of systematic discrimination, oppression, and abuse.

Since slang, as everyday speech, has a tremendous potential to spread easily and shape personal and public perceptions of marginalized groups, it is examined here within the theoretical and methodological framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CDA argues that discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned (Wodak and Meyer 2009), so the main task for CDA scholars is to explore the dialectical relations between discourse, ideology, and power. CDA has faced criticism for failing to recognize the cognitive aspects of communication, so numerous scholars have advocated for the integration of Cognitive Linguistics with CDA (O'Halloran 2003, Koller 2004, Chilton 2005,

Hart 2010). Metaphor study is “indispensable to this endeavor” since it is a core component of Cognitive Linguistics (Gou 2013: 475). Thus, this article shall focus on metaphorical mappings found in English slang expressions from the perspective of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT).

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a growing interdisciplinary research movement which includes multiple distinct theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of language (Johnson and McLean 2020). Despite the diversity in proposed methodological strategies, CDA scholars share the same main premise – discourse is simultaneously socially shaped and has the power to shape our social and political reality (Foucault 1970, Wodak 1999: 8, Heros 2009: 173).

The main concern of CDA scholars is to expose the linguistic devices used to produce and re-produce power, dominance, inequity, and manipulation in both oral and written texts, which should never be observed in isolation from the social and political contexts in which they are created (Van Dijk 2001: 352). The final goal of CDA is to empower people by raising their awareness of the hidden social structures that they have been systematically exposed to (Haque 2007: 113) and/or by maintaining equilibrium between those who create discourse and those who are its target recipients (Fairclough 2001: 229).

Norman Fairclough (1995a) proposed the CDA methodology which is now widely known as Fairclough’s three-dimensional model. According to N. Fairclough (1995a), discourse includes three dimensions: discursive events, discursive practices, and social structures. CDA research should shift between descriptive, interpretative, and explanatory stages. First, we should analyze texts or other forms of discourse in order to obtain extensive and comprehensive descriptions. Then, we should examine and interpret those descriptions in relation to the contextual understanding of the given discourse. Finally, we should take into account the broader social contexts, including implicit and explicit rules and norms which govern the society and the discourse itself.

CDA practitioners have already recognized the power of metaphors in reinforcing ideologies. According to Fairclough (1995b), metaphors are socially motivated and they carry different ideological loadings. On the other hand, they have the power to change our perceptions of the world. In order to fully comprehend the mechanisms involved in this dialectical process, we must first focus on the cognitive aspects of metaphorical expressions.

2.2. THE THEORY OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

Conceptual metaphors are seen as expressions via which a more concrete concept (i.e., source domain) is used to explain a more abstract one (i.e., target domain) (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 8). Conceptual domains of metaphors are intricate “knowledge structures which relate to coherent aspects of experience” (Evans 2007: 61). A source domain conveys a literal meaning and a target domain is characterized by source domains (Croft and Cruse 2004: 195). Thus, if we say that some activity will save/cost us hours, the source domain is MONEY (*save/cost*) and the target domain is TIME. The formula TARGET DOMAIN IS SOURCE DOMAIN (*X is Y*) is frequently used to represent the connection between a target domain and its source domains (e.g., TIME IS MONEY). The process of linking a source domain to a target domain is called mapping.

One of the most important features of metaphor is that cross-domain mapping is systematic. There are common ontological correspondences according to which entities in the target domain correspond systematically to those in the source domain. Consequently, conceptual metaphors frequently form subcategories. There might be “the most specific metaphorical concept” (TIME IS MONEY) which can include a whole set of more general metaphorical concepts (TIME IS A RESOURCE). Sometimes, metaphorical concepts can form an entire taxonomic hierarchy. However, mapping is also partial and selective, i.e., only some aspects of the target domain are involved in the mapping (**HOUR IS MONEY*) and/or not all the experience about the source domain is mapped (**TIME IS A COIN*).

Analyzing conventional conceptual metaphors, CMT scholars indicate that the cognitive mechanisms involved in their interpretation are for the most part unconscious, automatic, and effortless, as is our linguistic system and the conceptual system in general (Lakoff 1993). Metaphors that we rely on constantly, unconsciously, and automatically in language use become an integral part of our cognitive system; they cannot be easily resisted since they are mainly unnoticeable (Lakoff and Turner 1989). Since we cannot challenge what we do not notice, this mechanism can be abused by any dominant group.

2.3. ENGLISH SLANG TERMS

Interest in the morphological, lexical, and sociolinguistic aspects of slang has been gaining momentum during the last two decades (Soring 1981, Eble 1996, Cooper 2001, Forsskål 2001, Willson 2003, Mattiello 2005, 2008, Bolozky 2007, Turunen 2016). The semantics of slang words has attracted the attention of almost all pertinent studies. E. Mattiello (2008) demonstrates that meanings and concepts are organized within the slang lexicon identically to those found in general lexicons. First and foremost, slang expressions can be described via their meaning relations to other items found within the same slang lexicon – synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, etc. For instance, DSUE

lists several expressions for *attractive girl*, including *angel cake*, *cough drop*, and *cuddle bunny*. These terms are synonymous and they have a whole set of antonyms, such as *bat*, *bogwoppit*, or *double-bagger* (meaning *ugly girl*). We will illustrate hyperonym–hyponym relations with examples from the same dictionary (DSUE). The expressions signifying *drugs in general* (e.g., *dynamite* or *gear*) are hyperonyms to a whole set of terms used for specific types of drugs. Their hyponyms, which are mutually co-hyponymous, include, inter alia, *dead road*, *dead trip*, and *death wish* (*escasy*, *LCD*, and *PCP* respectively). Very commonly, slang terms use standard words with novel, non-standard meanings. Eble (1996: 54–60) emphasizes that slang words diverge from their standard meanings in opposite semantic processes, including narrowing and broadening, generalization and specialization, and amelioration and pejoration. Semantically speaking, it is even more important to note that slang relies heavily on figurative language.

The tendency of slang terms to name concepts figuratively has been widely acknowledged (Eble 1996: 61–73, Munro 1997: 11–12). *Beast*, *ride*, and *wheels* are used instead of *car* (DSUE), and they employ metaphor, metonymy, and synecdoche respectively, which are common mechanisms of giving existent words novel slang meanings. It is now a well-established fact that slang is to a significant extent metaphorical (Sornig 1981: 3). Even though many authors recognize that slang relies heavily on metaphor, the in-depth analyses of cognitive metaphorical mechanisms employed in slang creation are a true rarity (Turunen 2016). Max Turunen (2016: 2) argues that the lack of such studies may be attributed to scholars shying away from delving into taboo speech. Turunen (2016) examined the conceptual metaphors in slang terms *shit*, *piss*, and *blood*. To our knowledge, slang terms referring to promiscuity have not been analyzed within this theoretical framework.

3. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PRELIMINARIES

The relative prominence of figurative language in slang and the fact that this matter is under-researched served as the main motivation for this paper. The analysis co-integrates Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Cognitive Linguistics, i.e., Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). By doing so, we strive to open an interdisciplinary dialogue between these two theoretical frameworks. The main bridge between the two theories arises from their main postulates. Namely, CDA presupposes that discursive practices both reflect and manifest social realities. Secondly, discourse abounds in figurative language. Finally, CMT presupposes that metaphors and our conceptualizations of the world that surrounds us (including our social reality) are also in dialectical relations in that they both reflect and shape one another.

This approach will allow us to focus on both cognitive and social functions of metaphors used in English slang. On the other hand, the mapping mechanisms may reveal the nature of the conceptualizations found in slang

terms, which can also further expose the attitudes toward gendered promiscuity that communities, and general society, impose on their members.

The analysis relies on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CAD. In other words, it will include three stages: a descriptive, an interpretative, and an explanatory analysis. The sample consists of 65 slang expressions used to label promiscuous people of both sexes. The corpus for this analysis is extracted from *The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (DSUE) and *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang* (ODS).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Sixty-five dictionary entries in *The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (DSUE) and *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang* (ODS) are tagged with the epithet *promiscuous*. The quantitative analysis of the dictionary definitions reveals a stunning disproportion in gender distribution. Only four slang terms are not labeled as gender-specific, e.g., *tramp* (*a promiscuous man or woman*) and *a fuck-around* (*a promiscuous person*). However, *alley cat* and *raver* are, reportedly, applicable *especially to women* (DSUE, ODS). Eight nouns from our sample are used exclusively for promiscuous men, while fifty-three expressions are used for women only (DSUE, ODS). The statistical data show that more than 80% of slang labels are applicable exclusively to women. The share of female-referring expressions surpasses 86% if only gender-specific expressions are taken into account.

The sample is divided into three groups. The sub-samples include:

Gender-neutral slang terms:

<i>alley cat</i>	<i>fuck-around</i>	<i>trump</i>	<i>raver</i>
------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------

Male-referring slang terms:

<i>chaser</i>	<i>goat</i>	<i>loverboy (loverman)</i>	<i>skirt chaser</i>
<i>Don Juan</i>	<i>lech (letch)</i>	<i>ram</i>	<i>wolf</i>

Female-referring slang terms:

<i>bag</i>	<i>flooz(s)ie (floozy)</i>	<i>muff</i>	<i>slag</i>
<i>bike</i>	<i>grinder</i>	<i>nympho</i>	<i>slag-bag</i>
<i>bimbo (bim, bimlette)</i>	<i>gutter slut</i>	<i>pig</i>	<i>slapper</i>
<i>bint</i>	<i>hoe</i>	<i>pincushion</i>	<i>stepper</i>
<i>biscuit</i>	<i>hosebag</i>	<i>punchboard</i>	<i>stinky</i>
<i>butter legs</i>	<i>hot pants</i>	<i>punching bag</i>	<i>tart</i>
<i>bag</i>	<i>jagabat</i>	<i>puta</i>	<i>trim</i>
<i>bike</i>	<i>kappa slapper</i>	<i>quim</i>	<i>vamp</i>

<i>canal conch</i>	<i>lowheel (low-heel)</i>	<i>roach</i>	<i>village bike</i>
<i>case</i>	<i>lowie (lowey)</i>	<i>round heels</i>	<i>whore of Babylon</i>
<i>charity girl</i>	<i>man-eater</i>	<i>scrub</i>	<i>whore-dog</i>
<i>cooze (coozie)</i>	<i>Melvyn Bragg</i>	<i>scrubber</i>	
<i>dartboard</i>	<i>mole</i>	<i>scupper</i>	
<i>douche bag</i>	<i>moll</i>	<i>skunk</i>	

The quantitative dominance of the terms applicable exclusively to women proves that the English language is far more productive when it comes to inventing novel linguistic expressions for labeling females as promiscuous.

The qualitative analyses conducted further on will additionally support these claims. The semantics of the slang labels reveals deeper and more significant discrepancies in this discursive practice. For comparison purposes, we shall start with the definition of the adjective *promiscuous*. CD defines it as (*disapproving*) *having many sexual partners*. MWD adds further explanation: *not restricted to one sexual partner or few sexual partners*. As evident at first glance, the discursive practice of labeling men as promiscuous is less derogatory. The expressions used for promiscuous women are not only quantitatively dominant, but also more diverse, picturesque, and creative. Since most slang labels in this sample are specific instances of figurative language use, they carry additional layers of meaning by evoking different concepts. The source domains, which the target domains of male and female promiscuity are mapped on, allow us to identify and systemize those concepts. The links between the concepts provide the means to expose specific discursive strategies targeted at promiscuous people.

4.2. INTERPRETATIVE ANALYSIS

At this stage of CDA, the male-referring and female-referring slang labels are analyzed separately. First, it must be noted that some expressions are not figurative, so CMT cannot be applied. However, since they are still valuable assets of the gendered discourse under inspection, they will not be excluded. It is also important to note that metaphor is not the only mechanism for mapping the target domain PROMISCUITY to the desired source domains. Metonymy and synecdoche are also prominent. Interestingly enough, some expressions rely on two strategies simultaneously.

4.2.1. Promiscuous men

The selected dictionaries list eight slang terms for a promiscuous male. Despite the scarcity of such expressions, three source domains can be defined: PROMISCUOUS MAN IS A HUNTER, PROMISCUOUS MAN IS AN ANIMAL, and PROMISCUOUS MAN IS A LOVER.

Promiscuity in men is mapped on the source domain HUNTER in two slang labels: *chaser* and *skirt chaser*. The emphasis is on the act of pursuing, chasing, hunting prospective sexual partners. The latter label involves metonymy – a garment typically worn by women is used to present a female individual.⁴ It is important to note that these expressions give no indication of whether a labeled male person is successful in these endeavors. There is a high probability that his conquests are unsuccessful, so he might not actually be promiscuous (having many sexual partners), even though he aspires to be. In other words, the person labeled as *chaser* is not subjected to judgment for promiscuity; he is perhaps subjected to mockery for having to try so hard to woo women into sexual intercourse.

PROMISCUOUS MAN IS AN ANIMAL is present in *lech/leech* (backformation from *lecher/lecherous*), *goat*, and *ram*. ODS defines *goat* as *applied to a lecherous (older) man; from the male goat's reputation for sexual insatiability*. References to sexually insatiable male specimen of domestic animals are also present in *ram*. CD defines *ram* as *an adult male sheep that can breed*, but when used as a verb, *ram* means *to hit or push something with force*. The latter meaning is reported here because sexual intercourse is commonly depicted as an aggressive and abusive action against women (e.g., hitting, pushing, punching, etc.). ODS highlights that *ram* is used for a *virile or sexually aggressive man*. And while the labels referring to domestic animals are almost always slurs, *wolf* does not appear to be so. It is used for *sexually aggressive men* (ODS), but wolves are known to be alpha (apex) predators. There are strong associations to so-called *alpha males*. Hence, in male communities, *wolf* can easily be used as a glorifying expression which celebrates the strength and power of a male who is labeled as such.

All the terms analyzed above revolve around a strong sexual appetite, which is in some cases aggressive and violent, but not a single label contains any allusion to true promiscuity – having a multitude of sexual partners. The first such label is *Don Juan: applied to a man who has a great sexual success with a large number of women* (ODS). The first expression that evokes promiscuity as such romanticizes the idea of having multiple sexual partners by alluding to a fictional character and highlighting his success in seducing women. This expression exemplifies the mapping PROMISCUOUS MAN IS A (GOOD) LOVER. The same mapping is found in compounds *loverboy*, *lover boy*, *lover-boy*, and *lover man* (DSUE). CD defines *lover* as: 1) *the person you are having a sexual relationship with, but are not married to* and 2) *a partner in a romantic or physical relationship*. In other words, lovers are sexually active, but there are no indications that there are multiple sexual partners involved. OED records the words *lover (one who is enamored, person in love)* and *lover-boy (boyfriend, male paramour)*. There are no strong sexual allusions in *lovers* and *lover-boys*. Here, promiscuous men are depicted as boys who are in love and/

4 The conceptual metaphor WOMAN IS A GARMENT will be more prominent in slang slurs used to label women as promiscuous.

or who somebody else is in love with. The multitude of sexual partners (that is otherwise disapproved of as an undesirable form of sexual behavior) is not present in the semantic structure of these expressions.

We can conclude that only one slang term (*Don Juan*) can be truly associated with promiscuity. Still, the emphasis is not on a socially-disapproved practice of having multiple sexual partners, but rather on the successfulness of his seduction skills. In conclusion, it appears that promiscuity cannot be unequivocally attributed to men. Men are sexually insatiable beings (e.g., *goats* and *leches*). They can also get more desperate or persistent (*chasers* or *skirt-chasers*) and/or more violent and aggressive (*rams* or *wolves*) in pursuing prospective romantic interests. However, such practices are subjected to mockery rather than condemned as deviant, sinful, and immoral. One might even argue that male promiscuity is depicted as normal, expected, and/or justifiable conduct.

4.2.2. Promiscuous women

As we mentioned previously, some expressions involve mappings and some have developed slang meanings through other mechanisms. In contrast to the male-referring slang labels which mitigate the notion of promiscuity, a significant number of slang expressions used to label women as promiscuous have developed slang meanings via pejoration, such as *bint*, *flooz(s)ie/floozy*, *charity girl*, and *moll*. According to OED, *bint* originates from Arabic *girl*, *woman*, and *daughter*. Today it is defined as an *offensive way of referring to a woman* (OLD). The variations of *flossy* (*flooz(s)ie/floozy*) are all associated with the sense *fancy/frilly* and the notion of *fluffiness*. *Charity girl* has not retained any positive senses of the lexeme *charity*. Here, the notion *charitable* is exclusively derogatory. Finally, *moll* is a shortened form of *Mollie/Molly* (versions of the female proper name *Mary*). OED defines it as a *female companion not bound by ties of marriage, but often a life-mate*. Interestingly, *moll* has also become a general slur for *woman* in underworld slang (*moll-buzzer* for a *pickpocket who specializes in women* or *moll-tooler* for a *female pick-pocket*). OED also highlights that *moll* has been used for prostitutes.

It is a common practice in English slang to use the equation *promiscuous woman is a prostitute*. ODS points out the following:

The distinction between word applied to professional female prostitutes and those applied insultingly to women considered sexually promiscuous is not always clearly drawn, and many can cross and re-cross the border-line. (pg. 67)

In addition to *moll*, the same equation is found in *puta*, *hoe*, *flooz(s)ie* (*floozy*), *jagabat* (*jamette*), and *whore-dog* (*whore* + *bitch*). This practice is a dominant pattern of pejoration. However, we cannot observe this phenomenon as a figurative language use because, even though not every promiscuous woman is a prostitute (*a person who has sex with someone for money*, CD), every prostitute is promiscuous.

The remaining slang slurs involve pejoration, without exception, and many labels are used for both promiscuous women and prostitutes. This is not surprising, taking into consideration that it seems to be a general practice employed by both men and women to offend or insult female individuals by addressing them as *whores*, *hoes*, and *sluts*, even when they exhibit no signs of promiscuity. In addition, the remaining expressions contain the mappings of the target domain PROMISCUOUS WOMAN to several fairly productive source domains. We must note that it is frequently the case with metaphors that one target domain is simultaneously mapped onto two or more different source domains (Manojlović 2021). Our sample abounds in such examples. Furthermore, some source domains are more or less thematically related so that they can be organized into different subcategories: (1) reduction to body parts, (2) objectification and passivization, (3) dehumanization, and (4) vilification. The lines between the given discursive strategies are frequently blurred, so many slang terms exemplify two or more discursive strategies simultaneously. This only testifies to the power they can have in disseminating ideological messages.

(1) *Reduction to body parts*. Synecdoche is the dominant mechanism of reducing female individuals since one body part is used to refer to the whole person. With the exception of *butter legs*, the reduction to body parts is predominantly performed by mapping the target domain PROMISCUITY onto the source domain FEMALE GENITALIA (*cooze*, *coozie*, *quim*). This strategy is not surprising because reproductive organs are crucial for sexual intercourse and promiscuity as a behavioral pattern. Identical mechanisms are also frequently found in general language. For instance, *hand* in the expression *lend me a hand* is singled out to refer to the whole person since this body part is most commonly involved in the activity.

The expression *butter legs* deserves more attention. It involves a synecdoche as the main mechanism. With the noun *butter* used as a qualifying adjective, the expression has an additional overlay of meaning. It may imply *easiness to open legs* and/or *easiness to slide in/through* (DSUE). The concept of *easiness* appears to be a leitmotif in this sample. Thus, we can argue that it generates the mapping PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS EASY. Similar associations to easiness are also found in *to cut (sth) like a (hot) knife through butter*. The proposed interpretation seems to be even more plausible if we take into consideration that male reproductive organs are identified as *knives* and *swords*. FDP defines *butter* as an adjective meaning *good*, *very fine*, so one may attribute these epithets to the legs in question. Quite the contrary, the slang slur *butterface* is defined as *a woman who has an ugly face but is otherwise appealing and attractive* (FDP). If connections are made to this expression, one might interpret *butter legs* as a woman whose face is unseemly, but who has attractive physique and is easy.

The source domain FEMALE GENITALIA is interrelated with the most productive metaphor in our sample – PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS

A CONTAINER (e.g., *bag*, *hosebag*, *case*, *douche bag*, *slag bag*⁵, *muff*). The associations to female genitalia are evoked implicitly: PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS FEMALE GENITALIA and FEMALE GENITALIA ARE CONTAINERS, thus PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A CONTAINER. This mechanism is most transparent in *hosebag* since *hose* is a slang term for male genitalia (DSUE). Hence, it appears that promiscuous women (i.e., their genitalia) are not any containers, but *bags*, *cases*, and *holsters* for male genitalia (i.e., their *hoses*, *swords*, *guns*, etc.). The expression *douche bag* is interesting because it has been widely known as *douchebag* (also *douche-bag/douche bag* or a clipping *douche*), meaning *an unpleasant person* (CD) or *a contemptible person* (OED). Similarly to *whore-dog* (*whore* + *bitch*), *douche bag* can be interpreted here as *douche* + *slut* (DSUE), i.e., a *slutty douche*. However, word etymology might suggest that the meaning related to promiscuity is actually semantically closer to the historical sense of the word. *Douche-bag* is a compound made of *douche* + *bag*. The noun *douche* is first attested in 1833 with the sense in reference to vaginal cleansing and the formally identical verb is attested in 1838 (OED). Reportedly, the word originates from French *douche* and Italian *doccia* and *docchiare*, meaning *to shower* and *to spray* respectively (OED). The verb has been used in standard language as *to put a liquid, usually water, into the vagina in order to wash it or treat it medically* (CD).

There are two more metaphors in which PROMISCUOUS WOMAN is conceptualized, via its conceptual association to FEMALE GENITALIA, on other source domains – HOLE/CANAL and PENETRATED ENTITY. The source domain of HOLE/CANAL can be attributed to two terms only: *scupper* (*a drainage opening on a ship*) and *canal conch* (*a shell with labia-like opening and a canal*). The latter appears to be a euphemism since it stands for a specific form of a shell. However, due to its visual resemblance to the vagina (including labia and vaginal canal), the expression is also mapped on the source domain FEMALE GENITALIA.

The next source domain, A PENETRATED ENTITY, stands on the borderline between this discursive strategy and the one defined as objectification and passivation. The metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A PENETRATED ENTITY is attested in labels such as *dartboard* and *pin cushion* (a blend from *pin* + *cushion*). Even though women are here reduced to objects of penetration, there are strong associations between PENETRATED ENTITY and HOLES and the omnipresent source domain FEMALE GENITALIA. Once again, there is a simple logical deduction: PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS FEMALE GENITALIA and FEMALE GENITALIA ARE HOLES, thus PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A HOLE/PENETRATED ENTITY.

(2) *Objectification and passivization*. The former two metaphors implicitly reduce females to their genitalia; simultaneously, they exemplify the discursive

5 We must note here that *slag* can be used independently of *bag* when other metaphorical mechanisms are involved, so it will be analyzed later in more detail.

practice of objectivization and passivization. Promiscuous women are objectified as mere recipients of the actions, i.e., penetration, or in slang terms *drilling*, *piercing*, etc. Similarly, they are also portrayed as objects of (A) *violent actions* (such as hitting, punching, slapping, etc.), (B) *riding* and (C) *eating*. A promiscuous woman is not only depicted as an object of an action or activity, but also as (D) an *object, thing, or item*.

(A) In *kappa slapper*, *punching bag*, *punching board*, *slapper*, and *stepper*, female promiscuity is mapped onto the source domain HITEE. The role of a *hitter* is obviously attributed to men. Women are portrayed as objects of violent and aggressive activities, which are otherwise typical forms of physical abuse over women. Some previous findings have demonstrated that the verbs used to describe sexual intercourse are often associated with *hurting* (Adams 1990). For instance, *to fuck* may have originated from Norwegian dialectal *fukka* (*to copulate*) or Swedish dialectal *focka* (*to copulate, strike, push*) and *fock* (*penis*) (OED). Other aggressive phrases for sexual intercourse that we can encounter in English slang include, inter alia, *to nail*, *to bang*, *to bang the crap out*, *to beat the gun*, and *to rip her guts down* (EDS).

(B) Women are portrayed as objects of riding via the conceptualization PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A VEHICLE (e.g., *bike*, *village bike*). DSUE states that *bike* can be associated with the notion *easy to access and ride*, so there is the mapping PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS EASY, as in *butter legs*. The sense of *easiness* appears to be a recurrent theme that we shall return to once again.

(C) The mapping PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS FOOD, found in *biscuit* and *tart*, depicts women as objects of eating. ODS lists that *biscuit* can be used, inter alia, for (1) *a good-looking member of whatever sex attracts you*, (2) *a promiscuous woman*, and (3) *buttocks*. The years when these senses were first attested reveal an interesting evolution pattern: *biscuit* → *buttocks* (1950) → a sexually attractive person (1990) → a promiscuous woman (1993). OED defines *tart* as a *prostitute, immoral woman*. The given dictionary records two theories of its origin: (1) from an earlier use as a term of endearment for a girl or woman (a clipping from *sweetheart*) and (2) from *jam-tart* (*tart* as a cake) which was used in British slang in the early 19th century for an *attractive woman*. In both cases, the term used today underwent pejoration, similarly as *biscuit*. The evolutionary patterns of both expressions suggest that sexually attractive women are subjected to accusations, or at least suspicions, that they are promiscuous, based on the mere notion that many men desire to have intercourse with them.

(D) As is evident from our analysis thus far, the passivation of women in sexual intercourse is a recurrent theme in English slang for promiscuous females. The most peculiar example may be *slag* (*the waste material that remains after metal has been removed from rock*, OLD). This expression is a concretization of the conceptual metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS WASTE MATERIAL. First, it is important to note that the process of obtaining slag requires *mining*, *drilling*, etc. Since it is obvious that there are associations

between sexual intercourse and *mining* and *drilling* in English slang, women here stop being objects of sexual intercourse (e.g., *rock*, *metal*, *soil*) and are depicted as waste material of sexual acts.

Old grinder, *scrubber*, *scrub*, and *trim* are rare examples that can be seen as concretizations of the conceptual metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A TOOL. It is evident that in all these instances metaphor and metonymy go hand in hand. *Grinder* is a machine or kitchen appliance used in grinding. CD defines *grinding* as: (1) *to wear, smooth, or sharpen by abrasion or friction, whet* and (2) *to rub harshly or gratingly; grate together; grit*. CD defines *scrub* as an act of scrubbing, i.e., *rubbing hard with a brush, cloth, or as a person who scrubs*. The idea of grinding and scrubbing can be associated with the second theory about the origin of the verb *to fuck*. First, both grinding and scrubbing refer to a series of quick repetitive movements. OED connects *fuck* to Middle-English *fyke/fike* (meaning *to move restlessly, fidget*), or Middle Dutch *fokken* and German *ficken* (*to fuck*), both meaning *to make quick movements to and fro, flick*, and still earlier *to itch, to scratch*. The former can easily be associated with both grinding and scrubbing, which are repetitive actions. In addition, the latter seems to be more relatable to scrubbing. CD's definition contains one keyword – *brush*. The associations between a brush and a hairy area of female genitalia are quite obvious. The same applies to *trim*.

Finally, objectification is also present in the metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A GARMENT. The said mapping is attested in three slang slurs: *hot pants*, *round heel*, and *low heel*.⁶ As in *skirt chaser*, the garments selected to represent women are those that are typically worn by women. OLD defines *hot pants* as *very tight, brief women's shorts, worn as a fashion garment*. The adjective *hot* implies *a strong sexual desire* (DSUE) and probably a necessity for those pants to be taken off quickly. It can also be associated with the notion of *easiness* or *readiness* to take clothes off. *Heels* refer to high-heeled shoes, typically worn by women. In these slurs *heels* are qualified with *round* and *low*. OED reports that *round heels* probably stems from the image of *a woman who is such a pushover that the heels of her shoes became rounded from her being pushed over backwards so frequently*. According to this interpretation, a promiscuous woman is not a person whose heels are damaged by her wandering from one sexual partner to another; rather, she is tossed and pushed to and fro. Thus, a certain level of objectification and passivization is also present. ODS highlights that this expression stems from *the notion of being unsteady on the feet, and hence readily agreeing to lie down for sexual intercourse*. This interpretation can be associated with an unsteady and loose character, but also *easiness to fall* and lie down in bed with someone. Consequently, both *hot pants* and *round heel* can also be seen as realizations of the conceptualization PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS EASY.

⁶ The latter will be analyzed within the following discursive strategy.

(3) *Dehumanization*. Dehumanization, as a discursive strategy, is most obvious in the metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS AN ANIMAL. This metaphor cannot be analyzed in isolation from PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS DIRTY/STINKY since they are practically inseparable. Namely, all slang slurs exemplifying the metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS AN ANIMAL (*pig*, *skunk*, and *roach*) also map female promiscuity to the source domain DIRTY/STINKY. It is obvious that pigs are filthy animals and that skunks produce repellent odor. These associations are less transparent in *roach*. It can be etymologically linked to *cockroach*. As such, the slur can be seen as mere wordplay: *cock* (*penis*) + *roach* (*promiscuous female*). However, folk etymology also holds that the first element originates from *caca*, i.e., *excrement*, perhaps due to the insect's offensive smell (hence the concretization of PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS DIRTY/STINKY). The metaphor PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS DIRTY/STINKY is also attested in *slut* and *gutter slut*. According to OED, *slut* is a *dirty, slovenly, or untidy woman*. Both dirt and smell are portrayed in the physical sense. Still, we cannot neglect the possibility that both can be symbolically associated with corruption, immorality, and sinfulness. Further on, these qualities can be perceived by some as specific forms of *evil*.

(4) *Vilification*. Evil is something or someone *morally bad, cruel, or very unpleasant; very bad and harmful* (CD). A villain is *a bad person who harms other people or breaks the law; a criminal; something or someone considered harmful or dangerous* (CD). Based on these definitions, English slang portrays female promiscuity as a specific form of evil.

The discussion on this discursive strategy should be opened with the metonymic mapping PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A GARMENT attested, *inter alia*, in *low heel*, even though not all representatives of this class can be associated with evil. The given expression is metonymically used to conceptualize PROMISCUOUS WOMAN. It can be explained via orientational metaphors (vertical orientation), i.e., GOOD IS UP – BAD IS DOWN, which is one of the most productive mappings in CMT (Lakoff and Johnson 1980/2003: 14–23). The adjective *low* thus points to the negative, bad, even evil aspects of the target domain PROMISCUOUS WOMAN. This becomes even more transparent in *lowie* (Australian, derogatory) originating from *low(-hell)*. Both slurs are used for prostitutes. It is important to note that even *low heel* has also been interpreted as a variant of *low-hell* (DSUE). Namely, it is a common practice in English slang (especially Cockney) to create slang expressions based on a rhyme or sound resemblance, rather than on conceptual relations. For instance, *Melvyn Bragg* (an English broadcaster, author, and parliamentarian) is used as a slang term for another slang expression – *to shag* (*to have sex with someone*, CD). *Low hell*, which may be the foundation for the other two expressions, refers to the lowest levels of Hell. It can certainly be associated with the lowest levels of Dante's Inferno – those reserved for the souls committing fraud in the form of seduction and souls guilty of flattery (who are beaten by demons or left to trudge along as animals in a ditch of excrement) and for the souls committing

treachery and betrayal toward loved ones, close friends, etc. (who dwell with Lucifer frozen forever or are confined to this circle while their bodies live on, being indwelt by demons for evil purposes). On this account, promiscuous women may be seen as sinners who rot in a gutter as animals drowning in excrement. Images of gutters and animals which produce excrement have already been detected in several other slang expressions. Their main purpose is to evoke disgust. Furthermore, the possible allusion to Circle 9 may imply that promiscuous women are indwelt by demons, and are thus demons themselves. The same applies to whore of Babylon. In addition to equating promiscuity with prostitution, the expression carries a reference to Babylon the Great, commonly known as the *Whore of Babylon*, who is a symbolic female Biblical figure and a place of evil in the Book of Revelation (OED).

There are various lower-order conceptual metaphors in which PROMISCUOUS WOMAN is mapped onto the source domains stemming from the abovementioned domain BAD/EVIL. For instance, PROMISCUOUS WOMAN IS A MONSTER is attested in *man-eater* and *vamp*. CD defines *man-eater* as (1) an animal that can kill and eat a person and (2) a woman who uses men to have a series of sexual relationships, but does not love the men. Once again, the target domain is indirectly mapped on the source domain ANIMAL. Beastly and predatory nature is even more emphasized in *vamp*. It is a clipping from *vampire*, meaning a *seductive woman who exploits men*. Vampires are imaginary monstrous beings known to suck blood from people at night (CD). As bloodsucking murderers, promiscuous women seem to be the main villains in this discursive practice.

Finally, the target domain PROMISCUOUS WOMAN is mapped onto the source domain DERANGED/A PSYCHOPATH in one slang slur. *Nympho* is a clipping from *nymphomaniac*, which is actually a person suffering from *nymphomania* – *the behavior of a woman who likes to have sex very often, especially with a lot of different people, which was considered to be an illness*. Nymphomania (also known as hyper-sexuality disorder, compulsive sexual behavior, or sex addiction) is a mental disorder. It implies here that promiscuous women are mentally ill, deranged psychopaths.

4.3. EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS

The interpretative analysis offered many possible interpretations because for some speakers these expressions might activate one association only, while for others the expressions might activate a multitude of associations at the same time. Perceptions can differ from one person to another. The same applies to the consequences of the exposure to discursive manipulation. Thus, it is essential to highlight that we can only speculate about the potential impacts of such discourse strategies, since not all members of a community will be equally affected by them. In other words, manipulative discourse will be successful in reinforcing negative perceptions about one gender either fully or partially and

they will start acting according to these newly adopted attitudes. On the other side, there are individuals capable of recognizing the underlying manipulation and ideology. Some will remain indifferent, while some might condemn it or even actively advocate against it.

The fact is that more than 80% of slang expressions in our sample refer to women. This is in line with previous findings. For instance, M. Schultz has recorded 1,000 words and phrases describing women in sexually derogatory terms, with most of them being related to sexual activity as insults intended to degrade them. The same does not apply to men-referring slang expressions. This strategy both reflects and further reinforces the general societal attitude that promiscuity, including adultery, can be rationalized and pardoned if practiced by men. On the other hand, it is to be portrayed as disgusting, bad, immoral, sinful, and evil when practiced by a woman. Male sex drive is presented as biologically uncontrollable or driven by romantic love. Consequently, it is easy to perceive male promiscuity as a natural and expected behavior. This conclusion is in line with R. Lakoff's (1975) observation that male generally equals positive and normal, while female equals negative and abnormal. After all, it is a mistress that is more commonly labeled a *homewrecker* than an adulterous man who chose to have an extramarital affair.

Vocabulary specifically related to sex is where the general stereotypical image of women as objects comes into its own (Fernández Martín 2011). Our conclusions that promiscuous women are identified as containers are in line with the previous studies which have shown that female genitalia are viewed as *receptacles* (Braun and Kitinger 2001: 154–156). Ironically enough, we have found that promiscuous women, i.e., overly sexually active women, are also given a passive role in sexual intercourse; this indisputably further implies that a man is the one who performs a sexual act. English slang generally portrays women as passive participants in sexual intercourse (Sutton 1995: 564). This discursive practice might suggest that society not only reflects, but also concurrently spreads the idea that women are to be obedient and submissive since their role is to provide a playground for men to play on. This may even result in the general misconception that their satisfaction is the ultimate goal of sexual intercourse, while female partners are there to provide pleasure without any promise that sex will also be satisfying for them. At least, men are not bound to provide it. Hurting, however, is to be expected.

It appears that this discursive practice prepares women and encourages men to see sexual intercourse as an act of aggression and violence against women. Many slang expressions in our sample depict women as victims of violent and aggressive acts. Generally speaking, the slang verbs used for making love are associated with *hurting* (Adams 1990). In addition, male penises are depicted as tools, arms, and pieces of equipment, like *drill*, *chopper*, *hose*, *pipe*, *sword*, *gun*, *meatspear*, *beef bayonet*, and *prick* (Romaine 1999: 245). As such, they are bound to be perceived as pain-inflicting. If a penis inflicts pain and sexual intercourse is hurtful, then women are given the role of victims of physical abuse

and violence. If accepted as normal and expected behavior, such perceptions can have serious consequences on the behavior of both sexes. Some men may perceive that it is the standard norm to be violent and aggressive in general. On the other hand, such notions may have the power to persuade women that male violence is to be tolerated. Sexual intercourse is a natural biological process and if women are thus bound to endure aggressive behavior and pain, it may become easier for them to tolerate any form of physical violence and abuse in general. In addition, perceptions of sexual intercourse as something painful are imposed on young women also. The promise of pain can be seen as a mechanism of intimidating young girls not to engage in sexual intercourse out of wedlock. Once married, it becomes one of their wifely duties that they must endure even unwillingly.

The process of dehumanization of promiscuous women is performed by evoking imagery of filthy, smelly, abominable, and repellant animalistic beings. These conclusions confirm the previous findings that female genitalia are associated with hairs and disgust (Braun and Kitzinger 2001: 154–156). This strategy can be a very powerful ideological mechanism. First, it may prevent women from being promiscuous because nobody desires to be perceived as hideous by the wider community. It may also induce disgust in the wider community, and disgust is just one small step away from disdain, scorn, and hatred. Every social or public display of these strong communal sentiments acts as a warning. Such warnings are used as intimidation mechanisms aimed at keeping women chaste, faithful, and obedient.

Vilification is the most extreme discursive strategy. Promiscuous women are the personifications of Biblical evil, man-eating and blood-sucking monsters, and mentally-ill, deranged individuals. Vilification may have multiple outcomes. First, allusions to Biblical evil, sin, and the promise of eternal Hell may be the ultimate intimidation strategy for some women. On the other hand, the portrayal of promiscuous women as deranged and wicked murderous monsters may be used as a mechanism of intimidating society – promiscuous women represent a threat to our communities as true sources of corruption, evil, and sin.

This analysis clearly demonstrates that slang terms for promiscuity cannot be observed in isolation. They are tightly interrelated with slang terms for female and male genitalia and slang terms referring to sexual intercourse. United, they create a complex system, which as such possesses more power in evoking similar or even identical conceptualizations. In other words, they externalize the same perceptions of gender roles in terms of sexuality and sexual practices. Simultaneously, they can reinforce these attitudes and seed them into our personal and collective (sub)consciousness. Sex-related English slang (referring to genitals, sexual intercourse, sexual inclinations, etc.) is systematic and consistent, as are the discursive practices which incorporate it and, hence, social, practices which promote it. The potential perceptions of promiscuous women expose a highly manipulative, gender-biased, and potentially harmful

discursive practice of condemning and degrading women mercilessly for the same sexual behavior that is justified and even celebrated in men.

The discursive practices demonstrated by English slang terms for promiscuity confirm the statement that “the language and discourse of sex and sexual activity is said to be a clear testimony to the fact that it is men who have the power to name and define language” (Pauwels 1998: 55). Language has traditionally been responsible “for codifying most of the stereotypes which reinforce sexism and reaffirm male supremacy” (Fernández Martín 2011: 70). These discursive practices can be seen as one of the manipulative strategies within the wider social practice of persuading women not to be promiscuous, i.e., to be chaste – loyal and faithful to their men. These slurs are created by men in order to diminish women and exert power and dominance over them (Spender 1980). As R. Lakoff (2003) points out, language has served to keep women in their place.

We must highlight that men are not the only insulters. Abusive referential terms are used in communities of practice by women also. Women tend to use them to talk about other women who are not there to defend themselves (McConnell-Ginet 2003). The brutality towards other women in gossip sessions may even surpass that exhibited by men. The author also suggests that women do sometimes bond by speaking negatively of men (McConnell-Ginet 2003). Even though they are probably as equally creative in forming novel derogatory expressions for males, it appears, at least based on our data, that the slang terms they invent fail to be accepted by the wider community as common slang slurs. One of the multiple possible reasons for this failure may be the general unwillingness of a society to condemn male promiscuity and thus the slurs invented by women typically do not enter everyday speech.

The most interesting fact demonstrated by Sally McConell-Ginet (2003) is that some terms (e.g., *bitch*, *slut*) are becoming less strongly gendered in two ways: (1) women tend to use them for both sexes and (2) they use them jokingly among themselves with positive connotations. According to Sutton (1995), a significant number of young women report using *hoe* affirmatively to one another, a smaller number have also reclaimed *bitch*, and in jocular contexts *slut* as well. The underlying humorous elements of slang terms may be responsible for the affirmation of gendered stereotypes in positive terms. This novel practice can also be seen as an act of rebellion – the act of re-claiming offensive language and giving it a positive spin.

However, this practice does not only fail to make women less oppressed and belittled, but it may be seen as even more detrimental. Firstly, these expressions still carry heavy ideological loadings. Even though women’s usage of slang slurs within female circles of close friends is not paved with bad intentions, whenever such an expression is used, it keeps spreading and disseminating ideological messages across a community. Despite these novel affirmative connotations, most members of a community outside of the given circle of close friends will perceive these expressions from their already established perspective – with all

the negative connotations originally attached. The same negative associations are always present and slurs are becoming more prominent in language use. Secondly, if only men used derogatory name-calling, i.e., addressing and labeling women as *hoes* and *sluts*, the lack of female participation in this discursive practice would be seen as their non-acceptance of such treatment. The discursive and social practice would thus be perceived as a one-sided, non-standard, and abnormal form of behavior of one group against the other. The active participation of women in such practices, despite their intentions, which can be both good and bad, is a sign of their approval of such discursive practices as acceptable, standard, and normal conduct. In other words, it is women who *normalize* these forms of addressing and labeling women.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This analysis has opened an interdisciplinary dialogue between CDA and CMT which allowed us to unite the cognitive aspects of metaphors with their social functions. The analysis has shown that slang terms for promiscuous women are far more prominent than gender-neutral expressions and labels used for promiscuous men. The analysis has also indicated that there is a tendency to justify and/or celebrate male promiscuity. On the other hand, expressions used for women only are derogatory without a single exception. Female promiscuity is portrayed as repellent, disgusting, and most importantly – evil.

Vilification of promiscuous women is conducted via making references to religious concepts and symbols (*whores of Babylon* and *low-hell*). Women are demonized and presented as monstrous men-eating and blood-sucking beings. Seemingly humorous and harmless play with linguistic devices, which modern women may sometimes even use among themselves in celebratory fashion to address their closest friends, can be employed to exert dominance and manipulate women into obedience and submissiveness. Due to the unequal treatment of the genders and such a high level of inequity, unfairness, injustice, and iniquity toward one social group, we might even claim that it is the discursive practice itself that exhibits the meanness, maliciousness, and even ruthlessness.

Since discursive practices are both a reflection and constitutive part of social practices, it is not surprising that slang terms for promiscuity are highly gender-biased knowing that society has traditionally been nourishing the unequal treatment of men and women. The social norms for genders are obviously different, and can even be polar opposites. Men are encouraged to be promiscuous, while women are deprecated for the same behavior because they have to be restrained and kept obedient, compliant, and subservient. Although slang terms vilify women, it is the society which uses language as a means of systematic manipulation and abuse of women that might be accused of being bad, harmful, and cruel. Following the aforementioned definition of evil, both discursive and social practices can be condemned as inherently evil forces.

“There are many silly, corrupt, or even evil practices that would *cease to exist* if the participants did not generally comply with certain putative norms” (Greenberg 2007: 106). Thus, the only right way to battle ideological manipulation is to start exposing its mechanisms obscured in discursive practices and stop using the linguistic assets employed with such purposes, even when we use them with good intentions – to celebrate, mock, and consequently bond with our closest ones.

SOURCES

- CD: Cambridge Dictionary, available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- DSUE 2008: T. Dalzell and T. Victor, *The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (2008), New York: Routledge: Francis and Taylor Group.
- FDP: The Free Dictionary by Farlex, available at: <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/>
- MWD: Merriam-Webster Dictionary, available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>
- ODS 2003: J. Ayto, *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OED: Online Etymology Dictionary, available at: <https://www.etymonline.com/>
- OLD: Oxford Learners' Dictionaries, available at: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>

REFERENCES

- Adams 1990: J. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London: Duckworth.
- Allen 1998: I. L. Allen, Slang: Sociology, In: J. L. Mey and R. E. Asher (Eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 878–883.
- Braun and Kitzinger 2001: V. Braun and C. Kitzinger, “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.
- Bein 1964: A. Bein, The Jewish Parasite – Notes on the Semantics of the Jewish Problem, with Special Reference to Germany, *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, 9, 3–40.
- Bolozky 2007: S. Bolozky, Metaphors in Hebrew Slang, and their Parallels in Hebrew Literature and in the Source, *Hebrew Studies*, 48, 269–290.
- Bosmajian 1974: H. A. Bosmajian, *The Language of Oppression*, Washington: Public Affairs Press.
- Burridge 2004: K. Burridge, *Weeds in the Garden of Words: Further Observations on the Tangled History of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton 2005: P. Chilton, Missing Links in Mainstream CDA, Blends and the Critical Instinct, In: R. Wodak and P. Chilton (Eds.), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 19–51.
- Cooper 2001: T. C. Cooper, “Does it Suck?” or “Is for the Birds?” Native Speaker Judgment of Slang Expressions, *American Speech*, 76, 1, 62–78.
- Croft and Cruse 2004: W. Croft and D. Alan Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalzell 2010: T. Dalzell, *Flappers 2 Rappers: American Youth Slang*, Springfield: Merriam-Webster.

- Eble 1996: C. Eble, *Slang and sociability: In-group language among college students*, Chapel Hill – London: University of North Carolina Press.
- Evans 2003: V. Evans, *The structure of time: Language, meaning and temporal cognition*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Evans 2007: V. Evans, *Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough 1995a: N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, London: Longman.
- Fairclough 1995b: N. Fairclough, *Media Discourse*, London: Arnold.
- Fernández Martín 2011: C. Fernández Martín, Comparing Sexist Expressions in English and Spanish: (De)-Constructing Sexism through Language, *ES. Revista de Filología Inglesa*, 32, 69–93.
- Forsskål 2001: M. Forsskål, Girls' Slang and Boys' Slang: Two Towns in Finland Visited, *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 9, 2, 98–106.
- Foucault 1970: M. Foucault, *The order of things*, New York: Random House.
- Gou 2013: S. Gou, Metaphor Studies from the Perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis: A Case Study of Business Acquisition, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3, 3, 475–481.
- Greenberg 2007: M. Greenberg, On Practices and the Law, In: F. M. Quesada and E. Sosa (Eds.), *Law, Metaphysics, Meaning, and Objectivity*, *Rodopi Philosophical Studies* 8, Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, 95–124.
- Hart 2010: C. Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hatim and Mason 1990: B. Hatim and I. Mason, *Discourse and the Translator*, London – New York: Longman.
- Haque 2007: M. S. Haque, How Practical is CDA?, *East West University Journal*, 2, 1–31.
- Heros 2009: S. Heros, Linguistic pluralism or prescriptivism? A CDA of language ideologies in *Talento*, Peru's official textbook for the first-year of high school, *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 172–199.
- Johnson and McLean 2020: M. N. P. Johnson and E. McLean, Discourse Analysis, In: A. Kobayashi (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 377–383.
- Koller 2004: V. Koller, *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse: A Critical Cognitive Study*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lakoff and Johnson 1980/2003: G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff and Turner 1989: G. Lakoff and M. Turner, *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Chicago: The Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff 1993: G. Lakoff, The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, In: A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202–251.
- Lakoff 2003: R. Lakoff, Language, Gender, and Politics: Putting 'Women' and 'Power' in the same sentence, In: J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, Oxford: Blackwell, 161–178.
- Leonardi 2008: V. Leonardi, Increasing or Decreasing the Sense of "Otherness": the Role of Audiovisual Translation in the Process of Social Integration, In: C. Taylor (Ed.), *Ecolingua. The Role of E-Corpora in Translation and Language Learning*, Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste, 158–172.

- Manojlović 2021: N. Manojlović, *Vreme kao ciljni domen u srpskom i engleskom jeziku* (doctoral dissertation), Kragujevac: Faculty of Philology and Arts, University of Kragujevac.
- Mattiello 2005: E. Mattiello, The pervasiveness of slang in standard and non-standard English, *Mots Palabras Words*, 6, 7–41.
- Mattiello 2008: E. Mattiello, *An Introduction to English Slang. A Description of its Morphology, Semantics and Sociology*, Milan: Polimetrica.
- McConnell-Ginet 2003: S. McConnell-Ginet, What's in a Name? Social Labeling and Gender Practices, In: J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, Oxford: Blackwell, 69–97.
- Munro 1997: P. Munro, U.C.L.A. Slang 3, *U.C.L.A. Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 18, Los Angeles: U.C.L.A. Department of Linguistics.
- O'Halloran 2003: K. O'Halloran, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognition*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pauwels 1998: A. Pauwels, *Women Changing Language*, London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Romaine 1999: S. Romaine, *Communicating Gender*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schulz 1975: M. Schulz, The Semantic Derogation of Women, In: B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 64–73.
- Smith 2011: R. Smith, Urban dictionary: Youth slanguage and the redefining of definition: What's up with meep and other words in the Urban Dictionary, *English Today*, 27, 4, 43–48.
- Soring 1981: K. Soring, *Lexical Innovation: A Study of Slang, Colloquialism and Casual Speech*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spender 1980: D. Spender, *Man Made Language*, London: Routledge.
- Sutton 1995: L. Sutton, Bitches and Shanky Hobags: The Place of Women in Contemporary Slang, In: K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, New York: Routledge, 279–296.
- Turunen 2016: M. Turunen, *Conceptual Metaphors in Slang: A Study on the Words Shit, Piss, and Blood* (M.A. thesis), Helsinki: Tampere University.
- Van Dijk 2001: T. A. van Dijk, Critical Discourse Analysis, In D. Tannen, D. Cliffrei and H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Hand Book of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Wiley – Blackwell.
- Willson 2003: D. Willson, Relevance and lexical pragmatics, *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 15, 273–292.
- Wodak 1998: R. Wodak, *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wodak and Meyer 2009: R. Wodak and M. Meyer, Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology, In: R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage, 1–33.
- Young 1991: J. W. Young, *Totalitarian Language: Orwell's Newspeak and its Nazi and Communist Antecedents*, Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

KURVA VAVILONSKA PROTIV DON ŽUANA: KRITIČKA ANALIZA DISKURSA RODNOG PROMISKUITETA U ENGLESKOM ŽARGONU

Rezime

Rad predstavlja rezultate analize engleskih žargonizama za imenovanje promiskuitetnih osoba. Analiza je obuhvatila 65 žargonskih izraza sa odrednicama *promiskuitetna osoba/žena/muškarac* iz dva izvora: *The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (2008) i *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang* (1998). Kako je žargon i lingvistički i sociološki fenomen (Mattiello 2008: 30), ovde je analiziran iz perspektive Kritičke analize diskursa (KAD). Oslanjajući se na metodologiju Normana Ferklafa (1995: 98), analiza je trodimenzionalna, tj. obuhvata deskriptivni, interpretativni i eksplanatorni nivo. Deskriptivna komponenta ukazuje da 86% korpusa čine izrazi koji se odnose isključivo na osobe ženskog pola. Teorija o pojmovnoj metafori poslužiće kao teorijsko-metodološki okvir za interpretativnu analizu. Cilj je identifikacija dominantnih izvornih domena na koje se domen muški/ženski promiskuitet preslikava u engleskom žargonu. Rezultati ukazuju da je promiskuitet kod muškaraca romantiziran, opravdan, pa i slavljen, dok su žene degradirane, osuđene, pa i demonizovane ako praktikuju isto. Eksplanatorna komponenta uspostavlja veze između žargonizama koji se upotrebljavaju u cilju imenovanja promiskuitetnih osoba i žargonizama koji se inače odnose na teme koje su u bliskoj vezi sa seksualnošću i seksualnim odnosima. Na ovom nivou zaključićemo da je opisana diskurzivna praksa sistematična i dosledna. Zbog dijalektičke prirode odnosa diskurzivne i društvene prakse, u radu ćemo pokazati da su obe ne samo rodno pristrasne, već brutalno zlonamerne i nemilosredne kada je u pitanju formiranje percepcija o ženskom promiskuitetu.

Ključne reči: kritička analiza diskursa, preslikavanje, pojmovna metafora, engleski žargon, promiskuitet, negativne percepcije

Jelena M. Josijević
Nina Ž. Manojlović

Филолошко-уметнички факултет
Крагујевац

ЗЛОБНИЦИ, ЗЛИКОВЦИ, ЧУДОВИШТА, ПСИХОПАТЕ

Зборник радова са научног округлог стола одржаног у оквиру
XVII међународног научног скупа *Српски језик, књижевности, уметности*,
и то као резултат рада на пројекту КЊИЖЕВНО ЛИНГВИСТИЧКО-
КУЛТУРОЛОШКА ХУМАНО(ПО)ЕТИКА: ДОБАР – ЛОШ, ЗАО
Центра за научноистраживачки рад Филолошко-уметничког факултета
2022-2023.

Уредници

Др Марија Лојаница, ванредни професор
(гост-руководилац пројекта)

Др Никола Бубања, редовни професор
(руководилац пројекта)

Др Милош Ковачевић, редовни професор
(руководилац пројекта)

Лектура и коректура текстова на српском
Ђорђе Ђурђевић

Лектура и коректура текстова на енглеском
Милица Баџић

За издавача

мр Зоран Комадина, редовни професор
декан Филолошко-уметничког факултета

Технички уредник
Ивана Тодоровић

Штампа
Филолошко-уметнички факултет
Крагујевац

Тираж
150

ISBN 978-86-80596-28-0
ISBN 978-86-80596-31-0 (низ)

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

82.0(082)
82.09(082)

МЕЂУНАРОДНИ научни скуп Српски језик, књижевност, уметност (17 ; 2022 ;
Крагујевац, Вишеград)

Књижевно-лингвистичко-културолошка хумано(по)етика: добар – лош, зао : пројекат
Центра за научноистраживачки рад
Филолошко-уметничког факултета 2022-2023. Књ. 4, Злобници, зликовци, чудовишта,
психопате / XVII међународни научни
скуп Српски језик, књижевност, уметност (Крагујевац/Андрићград, 11–13. новембар
2022.) ; [уредници Марија Лојаница,
Никола Бубања, Милош Ковачевић]. - Крагујевац : Филолошко-уметнички факултет, 2023
(Крагујевац : Филолошко-уметнички
факултет). - 590 стр. : илустр. ; 24 cm

Тираж 150. - Стр. 5-7: Предговор / уредници. - Напомене и библиографске референце уз
радове. - Библиографија уз сваки рад.
- Summaries.

ISBN 978-86-80596-28-0
ISBN 978-86-80596-31-0 (низ)

а) Књижевност -- Мотиви -- Зло -- Зборници б) Књижевност -- Ликови -- Зликовци --
Зборници в) Компаративна књижевност
-- Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 114652937
