

BITCH

AN EXAMPLE OF SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE

Charles A. Collins
Southern Illinois University
at Edwardsville

Perhaps the most undisputable statement which can be made about language is that it changes. This process of change has occurred since the beginning of spoken language and most definitely remains active in the present day. Change may happen on several linguistic levels but most often concerns syntax, morphemics, phonetics, or semantics. The most common language change, according to Liles, is in a textical item or, more simply stated, in the meanings we assign to words (1975:286). New words may be added, old words may disappear, functions may change, features may be added, new dimensions of meaning may appear, or any other unforeseeable change may occur, for change is not limited to one type and is totally unpredictable in nature. In fact, Wardhaugh states that the process of change is predictable only in that certain kinds of things happen and these things happen slowly (1972:185). With this in mind, all that a student of language change can do is attempt to note past changes, what they were and what possibly prompted them into being. It is according to this thinking that, in this paper, I investigate the several meanings of one word, "bitch," which is extremely common in American vocabularies. I will show not only what it has meant through the years, but also what might be the ideas behind the changes in this particular lexical item. To best do this, it is beneficial to look first at some of the theory regarding the ways in which language accomplished meaning changes as well as at a few ideas regarding the interaction of word meanings with cultural environments.

Processes of Lexical Change

Since we are dealing with changes in word meanings, it helps to first consider what words are. Words have been pondered for hundreds of years by thinkers certainly greater than myself. The most obvious thing about words that most of these great thinkers have noticed is, of course, that they carry meanings and these units of meaning are strung together to

creat larger units of meaning we call sentences. But the age old question remains: Why does a word have a certain meaning? Not claiming to be a philosopher, I can only agree with the statement that words mean what we make them mean (Bloomfield and Newmark 1963:353). Edward Sapir followed a similar line of reasoning when he defined a word basically as a form containing as much information as a language will allow it to have (1921:32). Since language is in control of its speakers to a certain extent, it is those speakers of a language who, by general consensus, decide what the meaning of a word will be. One must remember, however, that this is not a conscious decision. People rarely get together and discuss what they would like a word to mean. Like language change itself, assignment and meaning is a slow, unpredictable process which will continue to change as long as the users of the particular language allow such change to happen.

Generally, words have two different types of meaning: denotative and connotative (Hayakawa 1978:52). A denotative meaning simply denotes what something is in a form much like a dictionary definition. Denotatively, a four-legged, furry canine is a dog. But different people associate different thoughts and feelings toward this same four-legged creature, depending upon their individual experiences and learning; thus some people love the animals while others are frightened by them. This, the connotative meaning of a word then is, by its very nature, highly personalized and unique to specific individuals. The distinction between denotation and connotation is important to us if we are to be aware that our choices of words will have different effects on different people and in different situations. In any case, this distinction between denotative and connotative clearly emphasizes the fact that there is much more to a word than its definition. This becomes very apparent to people trying to master a foreign language since they eventually will find that words in other languages have uses in addition to their English glosses and that mastery of this new language requires learning these new uses in order to communicate effectively in cultural situations where that language is spoken. It also becomes apparent when looking at language change since usually it is the connotative value of a word that prompts a denotative lexical change.

The connotative associations of words are highly integrated into the processes by which a language acquires new words. Bloomfield lists three possible ways for speakers to increase the lexicons of their language (1963:331f). First,

they may create new words out of existing morphemes and words in their language through compounding and other methods. Liles adds that this may be accomplished merely by shifting the function of a word, i.e., changing its grammatical role or part of speech (1975:291). Second, they may borrow words from other languages and apply the morphemic and phonologic rules of their language to make them their own. Third, they may extend the uses of existing words so that they have new applications and shades of meaning appropriate to certain situations. It is this third process for creating new vocabulary which is usually the most common in the English language and which is most at work in the history of our word "bitch."

This extension of meaning can happen in several ways and may or may not result in the loss of a word's original meaning (Liles 1975:292). One way it occurs is by generalization, or widening, of meaning. This involves expanding the meaning of a preexisting word to include a broader category of referents which are all similar in some respect. A second way of extending meaning actually involves the opposite process of specializing, or narrowing a word down, to a specific referent. Third, a meaning may shift or transfer so that it may be applied to other objects. A shift involves applying the ideas associated with one thing and its name to some other thing. Often shifting occurs through a process known as amelioration whereby a word shifts to naming a more favorable class of objects than that to which the original meaning referred. Transference of meaning, or metonymy, is very similar to a shift but often involves just the opposite association, that is, a word becomes attached to a less favorable class of objects through the pejoration process. The concept of pejoration will be quite clear when we look at our example of change, but it is surprising to note that amelioration also occurs to "bitch."

In the development of meaning changes, yet another process is common, and I hope to prove that it is the phenomenon most often responsible for the particular changes to the meaning of "bitch." This process is noted by many linguists (Liles 1975:292, Bloomfield and Newmark 1963:356, Hickerson 1980:114, Hayakawa 1978:111) and has long been a tool in figurative writing. This process is simply the use of metaphor, but the profound semantic changes it has prompted in language are far from simple. Metaphor basically involves taking advantage of the connotative values of words by applying selected features of these connotations to something new. This creation of metaphors selects characteristics of a word and extends them to other word referents not having

all of these same characteristics. The idea of semantic markers, or features, as developed by Jerrold Katz helps us to understand this process. The semantic marker theory posits that words have features to them which are used to distinguish them from other words (Pearson 1977:168). In turn, the connotative meaning of words will add additional features to that word to distinguish it from the denotative meaning. What happens in a metaphor is that we take a certain word and its features and apply it to something not possessing an identical set of features, but which has certain features in common with the other word. Thus, if we say "He is scum," we feel the person referred to has something in common with the green stuff on the top of a pond or with our bathtub ring. Perhaps this individual is disgusting and undesirable as we might perceive scum to be. Through the use of metaphor we have conveyed this association which we have made in our minds to other participants in our communicative activity. In this way, the meaning of "scum" itself may start to be associated with disgusting undesirables and eventually take on a new meaning. Through just this type of process many of our words have, in fact, changed in meaning.

The fascinating aspect of semantic changes, and of metaphors in particular, is that these changes usually remain specific to the language in which they originated. Of course metaphoric expressions may be borrowed, but it is unlikely that the thoughts behind the metaphor's original application will simultaneously occur elsewhere and lead to the same new application of meaning. The puzzle inherent to metaphors is that their initial associations become lost and we are left with what are called "dead metaphors." It is the linguist's job, then, to try to recreate the circumstances and associations responsible for the metaphor. Unfortunately, this recreation is based to a big degree upon speculation, and no exact truth is discoverable as to how, or whether, a new word meaning is in fact the result of such figurative usage. As an exercise in recreating metaphors, I will give one word as an illustration of many meanings resulting from one metaphor and its extensions. It is truly a marvelous thing that in one language so many meanings can derive from one word such as "bitch," while in other languages these same meanings must be conveyed by several different words or even entire phrases, clauses and sentences.

In dealing with meaning changes, it also becomes necessary to go back to a statement made previously concerning words meaning what we let them mean. It is necessary to have this in mind in order to see some of the "why" involved in changing meanings and creating metaphors. The reasons behind our letting

meanings exist are directly connected with the cultural attitudes and social norms of the time. Language is, after all, a part of culture and, as such, is best understood in contexts of cultural phenomena (Nida 1964:97). Bloomfield and Newmark state that "the study of semantic change takes us into the study of culture in the broadest sense and often tells us a great deal about the culture of past and present societies (1963:352)." Few people would disagree that words mean little outside of contextual situations. In turn situations mean little outside of cultural contexts. Therefore, in addition to looking at the semantic aspect of "bitch," I will also try to give, when I can, the situations and ideas necessary for a particular meaning change to occur. An exercise such as the following is very enlightening and entertaining for the researcher, but its true worth lies in illuminating the processes of change as discussed and the actual effects of culture on language. Let us now deal directly with "bitch" and see how all of this discussion fits together.

Bitch

The word "bitch" has had a colorful and busy past in the English language. The main meaning of bitch is that of the female of the species, particularly dogs. I call this the main meaning because it is the meaning which the word first had in our language and the meaning from which metaphors were made. The word's origin is not certain. Partridge thinks that perhaps it is related to the Sanskrit word for genitals, *bhagas* (1961). If we consider this origin for a moment, we might come up with an association of some creature with exposed genitals with those creatures we call beasts. This is our first metaphor and is supported by the fact that the next step Partridge gives in his etymology is the Latin *bestia* (beast), which in turn becomes *bistia* in Late Latin and enters Old French as *bisse* with the dilectical form of *bische*. This later becomes *biche* in French. Somewhere in this progression the meaning of geast became specialized to refer only to female beasts. Exactly when this occurred can not be determined since it happened before written records, but that it did occur seems fairly certain since the feature of being female is still prominent in many of the meanings of "bitch." But no one is sure if this is our source for "bitch" because in Old Norse there existed the *bikkja* with the same meaning. This source seems the most likely for the Old English word *bicce*, and perhaps it, too, is ultimately a cognate of the Sanskrit word. The earliest cited occurrence of the Old English *bicze* (*bicce*) is at 1000 A.D. This date follows the

migration of the Germanic tribes, the Angles and Saxons, into England in the fourth through the sixth centuries and the Viking expansion into Britain in the ninth and tenth centuries. It is very possible that *bikkja* was brought with the Vikings and borrowed by the Anglo-Saxons. Once the word was in the English language, it underwent phonological modification involving a change from /k/ to /c/. This is a relatively easy sound change and would leave us with a word almost identical with our modern pronunciation. However, the French were probably not without influence in this word. At the time of the Norman Conquest in 1066, the Old English and French forms of the word were very close, close enough in fact that they were probably mutually understandable between the Normans and Anglo-Saxons so that the two words became one.

The spelling changes no doubt came about due to the influence of the Norman scribes hearing sounds and writing them differently from how the Anglo-Saxons had. The spelling of the word is a prime example of the language fluctuations in the Middle English period. Between 1000 and approximately 1600 it is found written as *bicze*, *bicche*, *bytche*, *bytch*, and finally *bitch*. From these different written forms we witness the palatalization of /k/ to /c/ before the letter "e," representing a fronting of the consonant sound in the environment of other front sounds. We also see the addition of "h" in the spelling of this /c/ sound; no doubt this was a French addition similar to the insertion of a "t" before the "ch." As the French scribes attempted to apply their spelling rules to foreign words, they found it necessary to add and delete some letters. The "y" for our "i" is another common example of the French influence as well as of a dialectical spelling found in "bytch" in 1398. Finally, we note the loss of the final "e," the last remnant of the Old English declensional system to disappear in the singular form of the word, although the "e" still is used whenever the morphemic rules of English require it (before an "s" in the genitive and plural forms, etc.).

So, after all of this, what the English language is left with is a word pronounced /b c/, spelled "bitch," meaning a female animal, particularly a canine. And the rest is history. The first change to be considered here is the shift from a female dog to the meaning, first recorded around 1400, for a lewd, promiscuous woman in general and a prostitute specifically. For clarification, Appendix 1 lists those semantic features of the female dog "bitch" which seems to be applicable to a female human "bitch." The most obvious feature shared is femininity, but with dogs it really is not completely obvious

or important to know that one is female until the onset of estrus. It is at that time when the female dog is sexually receptive and engages in promiscuous copulation. These features may, then, be shared by a human female of a similar nature, albeit not only when she is in estrus. Through this metaphor, then, the new meaning occurs when speakers ignore the features which distinguish human and nonhuman beings in order to express this similarity in sexual behavior.

To attempt to offer some explanation for this association, I turned to the mythology of the Viking times. Before Christianity was introduced in England in 597 A.D., the Anglo-Saxons worshipped gods similar to those of the early Scandinavians. One of these gods was Freyja who was associated with love affairs and fertility, and was called upon for assistance in the love affairs of mortals. Freyja herself was rather loose in character and more than once was accused of sleeping with gods, elves, giants, and dwarfs (Davidson 1981:115). Venerable Bede, an early Christian poet of England in 731, reported that the worship of the Norse deities, including Freyja continued in his time even though Christianity was already widespread. Synge reports that before conversion to Christianity, these worshippers strongly sought the gratification of passion (1954:49) and they probably continued to do so, following Freyja's example. With the spread and acceptance of Christian morality such gratification would be condemned as improper and would be forced to cease. Or, if I may use a simile, people realized that according to Christian teachings such behavior was like a dog in estrus. This idea is not of my creation, however, for an early Christian poet in Iceland, where Christianity was not completely established until later in 1000 A.D., wrote that Freyja herself was a bitch (Davidson 1981:115). From Iceland this metaphor could have been, and evidently was, passed on and became active in English. It, however, did not appear in a written text in English until 1400, but this does not mean that it did not exist before then in oral form. Once in written form, though, it was a standard English usage until 1660 when it became a colloquialism (Partridge 1966:57). It remained in acceptable colloquial usage until it became considered as vulgar in 1837 when the high social standards of the Victorian age deemed it an improper word in polite company. The word survived, through the efforts of enough vulgar people I suppose, so that the meaning of "bitch" as a lewd, promiscuous woman is still used as often as is the earlier meaning, "female canine."

With this meaning established through metaphor, a myriad of other meanings spring to life. Most also form by metaphor

with either the canine or human bitch, or both. "Bitch" appears in verb, noun, adjective, and adverb forms, as well as in numerous combinations, through functional shifts. Most of these uses reflect the process of pejoration, having transferred features deemed negative by society to new meanings. Many of the derived pejorative meanings are fairly straight-forward. For example, "son of a bitch" appears in written form in 1833 and refers to the offspring of a lewd woman (Farmer 1965:202). This term is at the same time an example of a dead metaphor since we often hear it in contemporary usage in situations which are not necessarily pejorative in context. Also straight-forward, the verb "to go bitch" meant to either visit prostitutes or to call someone a bitch; "bitchy," an adjective, can mean sexually provocative; the obsolete word "bitchery" meant lewdness or harlotry; the queen in a deck of cards has also been known as a "bitch." Less obvious are "bitch's wine" and "Bitch's Heaven." "Bitch's wine" appeared in 1850 and referred to champagne, a drink of prostitutes, perhaps. "Bitch's Heaven" was an American slang word used among railroad tramps in the 1930s to refer to Boston, Massachusetts. Boston was famous among tramps, also known as "bitches," for its abundance of prostitutes at that time. It must have been an idyllic place for a travel-wearied hobo seeking the companionship of a willing female (Partridge 1968:42).

A little known meaning of "bitch" is used as an English mining term. This "bitch" (sometimes "biche," indicating a French influence) is a tool ending in a conical cavity which is used for recovering rods from a bored hole (Oxford English Dictionary). This would be something similar to our reference to male and female socket parts or pipe sections, and I believe refers to the similarity of this tool to that orifice of the female genitalia most utilized in copulation.

An interesting combination form is "bitch daughter." A bitch daughter is a nightmare and may relate to the idea of the succubus, or female demon, which supposedly has intercourse with a male while he is asleep.

It is a frequent and justified complaint of women who are at all sensitive to our derogatory slang that so many pejoratives eventually refer back to women, even though they have been applied to a man. Terms such as "bastard" and "son of a bitch" ultimately indicate a characteristic of a man's mother, not of the man himself. But "bitch" has, during its history, been applied to men although not always in the same

way. In Tom Jones, Fielding uses "bitch" in a whimsical way to refer to a man, much as we might call someone a "sly dog" (Oxford English-Dictionary). There is, though, a male correspondent to "bitch" in the word "butcher." "Butcher," because of social attitudes, probably does not have exactly the same connotations as "bitch" but is defined as "a male harlot" (Partridge 1966:57). This meaning comes about in this century in Britain.

The remaining meanings of "bitch" depart from this first metaphoric derivation yet still share some of its features. One such meaning is "to yield, give up, or cower." The feature it shares is that of a female dog's submissiveness and docility when compared to the male dog (Partridge 1968:42). This usage, found between 1785 and 1840, was evidently coined by someone with more favorable impressions of dogs. Since this usage was short-lived, we might conclude that the more negative associations with dogs won out in the end. This idea is supported by our very common current usage of "bitch" to mean "nag, complain, be sour, carp, be negative" or to refer to a person with any of these qualities. This usage, first appearing at the beginning of this century in written texts, may be extrapolating on features of female dogs at those times in the bearing of pups when a less domesticated bitch than ours of today would have been very protective of her newborn young and would snarl, bite growl, and bark to keep people away. So, someone who exhibits similar behavior metaphorically is said to be "bitchy" or "bitching." Also, a dog who keeps bearing pups again and again is going to become a nuisance to its owner, as well as to the neighborhood, and may be considered as undesirable. Again, metaphorically something which is undesirable, whether because it is a nuisance or because it is extremely negative in character, can be called a "bitch."

These two meanings of something undesirable (a task, object, or person) and "to nag" serve as beginnings for other usages. A "bitch is a complaint; in World War II a "bitch box" was a loud speaker used to voice complaints; a "bitch session" is a time set aside for people to vent complaints; and a "bitch kitty" is a particularly disagreeable girl or task (Wentworth and Flexner 1960:39). Perhaps the most common meaning of "bitch" today is this one which is synonymous with the verb "to complain" and the adjective denoting something hard or disagreeable, both based upon the shared characteristics of the snarling, growling, disagreeable nature of a bitch protecting her young.

A different common usage of "bitch" has the opposite meaning of something disagreeable. First appearing in the 1930s and meaning classy or striking in appearance (Wentworth and Flexner 1960:39), this usage is still alive. In the past few years this meaning reappeared in the Valley Girl fad and is also common in the gay community. In both cases it means that something is very desirable and, indeed, pleasant. This meaning may derive from that characteristic of flashiness, colorfulness, and glitter associated with bitches (prostitutes) which make them attract attention. Another source may be that an object described as "real bitch" stays on a person's mind and "nags", making it even more desirable. In any case, this currently common slang usage is one that reverses the trend of pejoration for "bitch."

The most curious use, to me, of this word comes from Britain. In this case, "bitch" refers to human females, but not necessarily those of ill repute, and extends from them to something associated with them. This usage, in fact, refers, to the more socially popular ladies who gather together to chat at a tea party, or bitch party as it was called circa 1880. This bitch party was composed of females of the species (wives) who would spend their afternoons discussing topics of importance to them. To the husbands, this was a gathering of bitches who spent their time together bitching while drinking a typical drink of bitches, tea. Perhaps through guilt by association, Cambridge University slang from 1820 to about 1914 called this drink - tea - "bitch" (Partridge 1966:57). Furthermore, to pour out tea was to "bitch the pot" (Partridge 1950:210), and one who poured the tea was said to "stand bitch." "Stand bitch" in the late 18th and 19th centuries actually meant not only to preside at tea but also to perform any other typically female duty (Partridge 1966:57) or, in short, to behave like the female of the species. Metaphors accounting for these tea-time terms are not apparent to me and I do not think metaphors are responsible for these meanings. Instead, I think that the terms came about through their associations with the social function of tea and ladies at tea parties and shifted to the other meanings.

The final meaning of "bitch to be discussed is the exception to the concept of extending meanings through metaphors, transfers, or shifts. This meaning is "to spoil, bungle, or ruin" and is, I think, the result of a confusion with a different word, "botch." "Botch" means denotatively to repair sloppily and, in so doing, spoil something, the same meaning assigned to "bitch up" (Wentworth and Flexner 1960:39). Curiously, this meaning is similar to our current slang phrase "fuck up," but I doubt that any connection is to be found. From this con-

fusion of the two words we get a few metaphorical usages, usually referring to something hastily made or makeshift such as a "bitch lamp." This term may also be derived from its association with tramps who were previously noted to also have been bitches. A bitch lamp, though, is a lantern made out of scavenged materials, such as cans and rags, and is made to serve a temporary purpose. Such a lamp is intended to substitute for the real thing, and "substitute" is another meaning which is found. Perhaps then, a bitch (prostitute) is to be viewed as a temporary replacement for a real mate. Additionally, we may get from this sense of the word the obscure meaning of "to cheat" or, metaphorically, to spoil someone else's chances for something.

So, all of this tells us what "bitch" has meant, what it means in our generation, and where and when certain meanings have become associated with it, as well as some suggestions as to its origins. But what remains to be seen is where "bitch" stands now as it moves into the future. To test this I did a limited survey to measure the qualities now perceived in the word. From this date, summarized in Appendix 2, we can conclude that "bitch" is considered to have the characteristics of being bad, hard and negative, but otherwise is fairly neutral. Perhaps this is because we have both good and bad connotations of the word in operation in our society making it difficult to decide on the general characteristics of the word. For the present, it suffices to say that "bitch" is used in more than one way, and only the context in which it occurs will pinpoint its particular meaning for us. As for the future of the word, let us remember the statement made earlier that change is only predictable in that certain things happen and they happen slowly. In other words, who knows?

Conclusion

Having examined the history of this particular word, what have we learned? In my opinion, we have merely seen further evidence that language changes through time, both phonologically, functionally, and semantically in accordance with cultural circumstances which allow such changes to happen. We have looked at the ways languages acquire new words and the way these words may extend their meanings. We have especially noted that metaphors are very influential

in the process of change and that at the heart of a metaphor is some feature shared between two things. To illustrate, we have followed the history of only one word out of the thousands available in our lexicon, "bitch." I suppose one could maintain the idea that one of the aims of semantic studies is to delay verbal responses (Weinberg 1973:141), but I doubt that anyone will actually stop to think about pouring tea or makeshift lamps the next time he calls someone or something a bitch. However, it is my hope that we all will become even more aware of the forces behind our words and their meanings as well as the processes capable of changing these meanings, for whatever these forces are, they will most certainly also bring changes to our way of thinking and talking about the world around us.

Appendix 1
Semantic Features of 'Bitch'

Female Dog:

- +Female
- +Animate
- Human
- +During estrus is:
 - +Promiscuous
 - +Sexually receptive
 - +Copulated with
- +When bears young is:
 - +Protective involving:
 - +Snarling
 - +Biting
 - +Growling
 - +Barking
- +Cowers to males
- +Submissive
- +Docile
- +Caters to needs of others
- +Possesses anatomical orifice into which male organ is inserted
- +Undesirable to possess if constantly snarling after pups
- +Undesirable to possess if constantly bearing pups and creating a nuisance

Lewd Woman:

- +Female
- +Animate
- +Human
- +Sexually receptive
- +Promiscuous
- +Engages in frequent copulation
- +Bears young
- +Undesirable in polite company and as a mate
- +Flashy in appearance

Miners' Tool:

- Animate
- +Possesses orifice into which something is inserted

Stand Bitch:

+Cater to need of others
+Female activity, but associated with females
+Human activity
-Sexual nature
+Serve tea

Bitch the Pot:

+Pour tea
+Orifice emptied (?)

Yield:

+female
+Cowering, submissiveness

Bitch Party:

+Female
+Tea
+Chatting

Unpleasant Thing or Person:

+Female
+Undesirable
+Negative responses

Complain (Complaint):

+Female
+Snarling and other negative responses

Classy:

+Striking in appearance

Appendix 2
Semantic Space of "Bitch"

To test for the current feelings of English speakers toward the word "bitch," I asked 24 people of the university community to rate the word in terms of 18 pairs of opposite adjectives, similarly to the method proposed by Osgood and described in Pelto (1970:109) for determining semantic space. Rating occurred on a seven point scale with the middle three columns indicating neutrality or vagueness, and the outer columns indicating stronger feelings and associations. The adjective pairs and percentages of response for them appear on the following page.

I have chosen 60% consensus as indicative of how the public may feel toward this word. Taking only the responses in the outer two columns on either side as indicative of strong feelings, most of the pairs do not display such consensus, except for those pertaining to bad, hard, and negative. Therefore, I surmise that the general feelings associated with this word are vague, or at least neutral, due to the several definitions one may use for it. When it is thought of out of context, though, it is thought to have a notion of being bad, hard, and negative.

Appendix 2

	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	
good	0%	0%	4%	4%	29%	21%	42%	bad
hard	42%	33%	12%	8%	0%	0%	4%	soft
active	21%	38%	33%	8%	0%	0%	0%	passive
stable	4%	8%	8%	13%	25%	18%	29%	changeable
defensive	17%	21%	13%	13%	0%	3%	29%	aggressive
optimistic	4%	0%	8%	42%	8%	17%	21%	pessimistic
excitable	21%	38%	13%	13%	8%	8%	0%	calm
colorful	13%	25%	17%	8%	4%	17%	17%	colorless
positive	0%	4%	0%	8%	8%	29%	50%	negative
masculine	9%	4%	0%	25%	21%	21%	25%	feminine
cold	13%	8%	8%	42%	4%	13%	13%	hot
sane	0%	4%	8%	50%	8%	13%	13%	insane
competitive	21%	38%	13%	13%	13%	4%	0%	cooperative
sensitive	4%	4%	4%	13%	25%	21%	29%	insensitive
severe	25%	25%	33%	8%	8%	0%	0%	lenient
prudent	0%	0%	17%	25%	21%	29%	8%	rash
humble	4%	21%	17%	42%	8%	0%	8%	proud
interesting	8%	13%	21%	25%	8%	8%	17%	boring

Further testing might result in significant consensus in active, excitable, competitive, feminine and insensitive, giving "bitch" more negative characteristics in general.

REFERENCES CITED

- Bloomfield, Morton and Leonard Newmark
 1965 A LINGUISTIC INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH. Westport, Connecticut. Greenwood Press.
- Davidson, H. R. Ellis
 1981 GODS AND MYTHS OF THE VIKING AGE. New York. Bell Publishing Company.
- Farmer, John
 1965 SLANG AND ITS ANALOGUES: PAST AND PRESENT, Vol. 1. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- Hayakawa, S. I.
 1978 LANGUAGE IN THOUGHT AND ACTION, 4th ed. New York. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Hickerson, Nancy Parrot
 1980 LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Liles, Bruce
 1975 An INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Nida, Eugene A.
 1964 Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems in Hymes, Dell, LANGUAGE IN CULTURE AND SOCIETY. New York. Harper and Row.
- Oxford English Dictionary
 1933 London. Oxford University Press.
- Partridge, Eric
 1968 A DICTIONARY OF THE UNDERWORLD. British and American, 3rd ed. London. Routledge & Keagan Paul, Ltd.
- 1966 DICTIONARY OF SLANG AND UNCONVENTIONAL ENGLISH. New York. MacMillan Co.
- 1961 ORIGINS: A SHORT ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH. New York. MacMillan Co.
- 1950 SLANG TODAY AND YESTERDAY. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd

- Pearson, Bruce L.
 1977 INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTIC CONCEPTS. New York.
 Alfred A. Knopf.
- Pelto, Pertti
 1970 ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH: THE STRUCTURE OF INQUIRY.
 New York. Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Sapir, Edward
 1921 LANGUAGE. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Synge, Margaret B.
 1954 A SHORT HISTORY OF SOCIAL LIFE IN ENGLAND. London.
 Hadder & Stoughton.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald
 1972 INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS. New York. McGraw-
 Hill Book Company.
- Weinberg, Harry L.
 1959 Some Limitations of Language in DeVito, Joseph A.,
 1973, LANGUAGE: CONCEPTS AND PROCESSES. Englewood
 Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Wentworth, Harold and Stuart Flexner
 1960 Dictionary of American Slang. New York. Thomas Y.
 Crowell, Co.