Spanish *carafe*: Problems and Proposals.

1. Few will deny that there exists a difference between expository language and 'emotive' or 'expressive' language. While this difference may be difficult, indeed, insensible, to precisely characterize, it is apparent to most people that qualitatively or quantitatively, some factors intervene in the speech act to separate utterances with a purely communicative intent from those whose primary motivation is the release of emotional tension. While a moment's reflection will suffice to convince us that a large (perhaps unduly so) proportion of our verbal output may be roughly classed as 'emotive', this form of discourse has received relatively little attention within the discipline of linguistics, compared to the quantity of effort devoted to the description of so-called 'non-emotive' or 'literal' discourse. This is particularly surprising, given the fact that the partially overlapping discipline of literary criticism, in view of its subject matter (which incidentally comprises a large sample of all linguistic production), places great emphasis on the expressive properties of human language. The tenets upon which are founded the study of poetics and style implicitly assume the primacy of expressive language and consequently imply, in the formal study of language, the consideration of an 'expressive' component (or at least dimension) in the grammars of natural languages.

Until relatively recently, the study of expressive language within the field of linguistics was confined to etymological inquiries and purely descriptive summaries. While the gap which separates the study of emotive language from that of purely 'neutral' discourse is being closed, much work remains to be done before these two facets of the same phenomenon can be united under the rubric of a single science. In addition to the problem of incorporating emotive discourse into grammars of languages, it will be necessary to characterize the (nearly?)
universal process by which inherently non-emotive words become intrinsically emotive in function, since, as noted by Edward Stankiewicz (1),

Contextually expressive variants may, of course, be inherently expressive words, if we view them diachronically. Many derived interjections owe their origin to non-expressive cognitive elements (e.g. Engl. damn, Jesus, Holy Moses), or to various taboo-distortions (such as heck, gosh, cripes, French sacré bleu, dian tre) (p. 243).

The present note is intended as a contribution to the growing body of literature on emotive language, comprising the study of a single, widely diffused, form found in the Spanish language. The form in question is the word carajo, which, in the words of the poet Robert Graves (2), is 'the great mainstay of ... swearing, which is used indiscriminately as noun, adjective, verb or adverb'. This word has exerted a fascination on Spanish philologists, since its origin is as clouded in mystery as its eventual history. While great progress has been made toward the eventual elucidation of the problems surrounding this singularly interesting form, several recalcitrant areas remain. This study in no way purports to offer any definitive solutions, but merely seeks to gather in one spot those available data which may facilitate the inclusion of this form in a more comprehensive grammar of Spanish. Following a brief survey of etymological hypotheses and an equally brief description of the contemporary manifestations of carajo and its variants, some rudimentary proposals will be offered concerning the formal status of this word and the expressions which it engenders.

The original meaning of carajo was 'penis', and, while vestiges of this meaning still persist, although in diluted form, in the Iberian peninsula, it has disappeared from most dialects of Latin America. Since the purpose of the present inquiry is the study of the emotive potential of the word carajo, examples will be largely confined to the Latin American region, where the anatomical connotations have vanished. Investigation of this word is hindered by the prudish inhibitions of otherwise well-equipped investigators, which precluded their discussing, at least publicly, a word of such value, since, as remarked by A. A. Fokker (3), 'la plupart des dictionnaires usuels semblent avoir été faits pour les
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jeunes filles, puisque les mots "obscènes" y manquent très souvent". Nonetheless, the data which have survived such scholarly misgivings permit the existing lacunae to be fairly accurately delimited.

Spanish *carajo* appears to be the reflex of a uniquely Iber-Romance form, although etymological parentage has occasionally been suggested with Provençal *carahi/caraig/caraich*. The cognate form in Portuguese is *caralho*, in Galician *carral*, and in Catalan *carall*, with a number of phonetically-deformed euphemisms in each language. No attestations are found in Italian (1) or French (2).

The first extant attestation of Spanish *carajo* comes in the *Glossario del Escorial* (3):

(1572) plepocium [praeputum] por capillo del carajo  
(1750) priapis, i por carajo  
(2274) androgejñus, por cosa que tiene cono y carajo

The following verse appears in the *Pleito del Manto* (4):

Por que tuviste con él
Añición van sin medida
Pues carajo en esta vida
Nunca entro justo por él?

The *Cancionero de Baena* offers the following lines:

Señora, pues que non puedo
Abrevar el mi carajo
En este vuestro lavajo
Por damar mi denuedo, etc.

(1) Except for a humorous attempt at creating an Italian cognate found in the novel *Figuraciones en el Mes de Marzo* by the Puerto Rican writer Emilio Diaz-Valcárcel (Barcelona 1972, p. 88); *Beniamino Dell Caragno*. This, however, could not be the correct derivation from *caracilia* which would have yielded *caracchio* or possibly the more conservative *caraglio*: starting from *carallium*, only the latter reflex would be possible. The normal source for [[i]] in Italian is Latin gi, or dy; e.g. radius > raggio, fìlius > figlio, etc. This same configuration also gave [dli]; e.g. medius > medio, etc. In fact, the only case where Spanish [[a] and Italian [[i]] coincide etymologically is in the derivation -allum > -aggio (Sp. ajío) which is the result of borrowing from French or Provençal; e.g. Sp. corajo-L. coraggio, Sp. viaje-L. viaggio, etc. In other instances, this ending underwent the normal development in Italian to become -acco, or survived intact, as in sempiterno.

(2) In the *Larousse Manual no. 444* (August 1951), p. 691, one finds the French word *caraju* "Gypsy, Spanish bohemian", which is claimed to have come from Spanish *carajo*. If it comes from any Hispanic word, however, it is most probably the Portuguese euphemism *caraco*, used as a derogatory term for Spaniards.

(3) Álvaro Castro, *Glosario Latino-Españoles de la Edad Media*, Madrid (Hernando) 1936.

In a 15th century document cited by Emiliano Jos (1), we encounter the form carajo, a type of fish, much like the Catalan terms cavall de rei ‘a fish’, cavall mari ‘a marine animal’, cavall de jun ‘a type of aquatic flora’, etc. Gil y Gaya (2) has compiled a comprehensive list of 16th and 17th century citations of carajo, all glossed as ‘el miembro viril’.

In many of these texts, carajo appears alongside a variant form cajo, suggesting kinship with Italian cazzo, of similar meaning and connotation. By the 18th century, the obscene status of carajo had been firmly established, so that Nicolás Fernández de Moratín (Arte de las Putas) could state:

Ni tampoco tu boca obscura diga
Si no es muy precisa coyuntura
Jocaro, derro, uscojo, ni ocho
(transposición se llama esta figura).

where carajo, joder, cojones, and cajo are euphemized by means of the transposed syllables.

The form cavallo appears in 1258 in the Portugaliae Monumenta Historica (3): ‘Per aquas fontis predicti, usque ferit in riuulo cavallo’. Cavallo is found in various 13th century Portuguese caxioncicos (4) including those of J. de Guibade (1411, 7), Stevan da Guarda (1267, 21), Pedro Garcia Burgales (1336, 5), Fernando Esquio (1506, 9; 1507, 6, 12), Pero da Fonte (1330, 6, 11) and Martin Soares (1320, 5, 16). Catalan cavallo makes its appearance in the Llibre de Tres of the 14th or 15th century, and is indirectly attested by euphemistic forms in the Cançoner Sàuric Valenci (5).

3. Adding to the mystery and intrigue concerning Spanish carajo and its neighboring cognates is the fact that the precise etymology is unknown: the forms give the impression of having sprung fully developed into the mainstream of the medieval languages. While such a proposition is of course meaningless, the paucity of early attestations may be at least in part attributed to the fact that the term was not easily lend itself to inclusion which form the basis for most etymological vacuum has resulted in the attempts for the proto-form which never existed. While the ultimate origin of the contemporary forms remains speculative, any representative etymological study must leave open the possibility to provide an overview of the whole.

By regarding the common idea that the Ibero-Romance one early Spanish carajo, Catalan cavallo, and Portuguese cavall have come from a single proto-form would have to have been discounted. Thus, for example, Latin alia, Old Galician ala and Portuguese espojo, Cat. espell, Ptg. espelho are just perhaps for a common root ‘garlic’ in each language (7), but the semantic plausibility and comparative development of the common development in 15th century.

In one of the first refers to the Spanish carajo, Fokker (8, cit., pp. 297) borrowing (2), suggesting the

b) ‘thing that comes out of the anus’ (9), concluding the possibility of a reflex of *caracal*, which perhaps ‘Hagiu’.

A short while later, More by implication, the cognate

(1) Emiliano Jos, Notas lingüísticas y económicas de documentos inéditos de Armadas a Indias del siglo XV (1495-96), in Estudios Dedicados a Némésis Pidal. Madrid (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas) 1957, V. 7, part 1, pp. 35-46 [p. 39].

(2) Samuel Gil y Gaya, Tesoro Lexicográfico, Madrid (S. Aguirre Terre) 1960, V. 4, p. 476.


(4) I cite here from the edition of Elia Sanchez Machado and José Pedro Machado, Conexiones de Biblioteca Nacional. The first number refers to the catalogue number and the second number(s) to the line(s).


(1) This possibility was given by Alcover. The Viri; Upon noting the high price, he

(2) First suggested in 1255 by

(3) M. L. Wagner, Geschichte

(4) M. de Montoglio, Estudios Catalana 3 (1925) 40-51 [p. 48].
least in part attributed to the significance of the word itself, which did not easily lend itself to inclusion in the courtly and religious works which form the basis for much of medieval Hispanic literature. This etymological vacuum has resulted in a number of hypothetical reconstructions for the proto-form which was to be diffused throughout the Iberian peninsula. While the ultimate goal of the present study is a characterization of the contemporary manifestations of carajo, some of the more representative etymological speculations will be briefly glanced at, in order to provide an overview of the probable diachronic evolution of this form.

By regarding the common intersection of phonetic developments affecting Ibero-Romance, one easily arrives at the conclusion that for Spanish carajo, Catalan carall, Portuguese caralho and Galician carallo to have come from a single proto-form (as no one doubts they did), this form would have to have been either *c(h)aracilium or *c(h)aralium. Thus, for example, Latin alium ‘garlic’ gave Spanish ajo, Catalan all, Galician allo and Portuguese alho, while speculum ‘mirror’ gave Sp. espejo, Cat. espell, Ptg. espelho, Gal. espello, and so forth. No other Vulgar Latin configuration would have given rise to this series of reflexes, except perhaps for a common later development utilizing the word for ‘garlic’ in each language (1), a hypothesis which in view of its lack of semantic plausibility and the almost nonexistent probability of a common development in four separate languages, may be safely discounted.

In one of the first references in modern times to the etymology of carajo, Fokker (op. cit., pp. 507-8) alludes to the possibility of an Arabic borrowing (2), suggesting the verb ḫarada ‘to come out’ and the noun ḫaraq ‘thing that comes out’. This hypothesis, however, was quickly to be disputed by M. L. Wagner (3), who notes the phonetic and semantic discrepancies between the Arabic forms and the Romance reflexes. Scepticism was also evinced by Corominas (op. cit.), who discussed the possibility of a reflex of *caracilium in Egyptian Arabic qirqal ‘hook’ and concludes that the phonetic similarity is merely fortuitous, in view of other forms such as the Hispano-arabic qirqal = reir a carcajadas ‘to guffaw’.

A short while later, Montoliu (4) suggested that Catalan carall (and by implication, the cognate forms in the other Ibero-Romance dialects)

(1) This possibility has given rise to the following folk etymology in Catalan, reported by Alcover. The Virgin Mary went to the market, to buy some garlic. Upon noting the high price, she walked off, exclaiming car all ‘expensive garlic’.
(2) First suggested in 1305 by Fr. Pedro de Alcalá in his Vocabulario Arábigo en Letra Castellana (Granada). Cf. Gili y Gaya, loc. cit.
(3) M. L. Wagner, Nachmals sie, geöffnete, ZePh 54 (1910) 759-76.
(4) M. de Montoliu, Estudios etimológicos y lexicográficos, Bullettii de Dialectologia Catalana 3 (1915) 49-51 [p. 48].
came from Old Catalan \textit{coral}, coming from Latin \textit{corallium}. The vocalic change of \textit{o} to \textit{a} is explained as due to assimilation to the stressed vowel, aided by the influence of \textit{caramella}. MONTOLIU’s hypothesis was first accepted by J. JUD (1) and also partially accepted by Leo SPITZER (2), who notes the similarity in meaning between \textit{corallium} ‘coral, red worm’, and its eventual result among the Romance languages. Further noted is the use against the evil eye [\textit{mal de ojo}, \textit{felatrix}] of this talisman, a practice also noted by Robert Graves \textit{(loc. cit.)} for the ass’s penis, the original meaning of Spanish \textit{carajo}:

... its purpose is to avert the evil eye, or ill-luck, and the more often it can be introduced into an oath, the better. Touching the phallicus or an amulet phallus form, is an established means of averting the evil eye, and \textit{carajo} means ‘ass’s phallicus’, the appeal is to the baleful God Set, whose starry phallicus appears in the Constellation Orion, to restrain his anger.

Later, however (3), SPITZER expressed doubts on the correctness of MONTOLIU’s proposal, noting that the unassimilated \textit{coral} was thereby left unexplained (4). He also spoke out against the etymology proposed several centuries ago by Covarrubias (cf. Pagés, \textit{op. cit.}) which attributes \textit{carajo} to Latin \textit{charazēre} ‘to write’ ‘por la semejanza que tiene con la cola o rabo, de ahí el llamarse también, en castellano, \textit{pene}, derivado del lat. \textit{penis}’. This etymology offers very little in the way of plausibility, and has not remained as a contender in the search for the true derivation (5).

As an afterthought to these ruminations, SPITZER became the first to propose the etymology \textit{characium} from a word meaning ‘stake’ or ‘pole’. He suggested a diminutive formation utilizing the suffix \textit{-idum} added to the word \textit{charas} (Greek \textit{χαράς} ‘small stick’), a proposal which both semantically and phonologically is more plausible (cf. Spanish \textit{palo}, English \textit{rod}, etc.) that it has been accepted by most later investigators.

---

2. Leo SPITZER, review of the BDC V. 3, in the \textit{Literaturzeitung} für germanische und romanische Philologie 40 (1919) 176-7.
4. However, some parallel developments of unstressed \textit{o} to \textit{a} are offered by Oliva J. TALLGREN, \textit{Glossar catalaun et hispano-romane} II, \textit{Neuphilologische Mitteilungen} 14 (1912) 12-34 (p. 38).

---

One of the first to reject respect to SPITZER’s no utilizing the older Canarian Latin period, since the termination \textit{-idus} demonstrates that in the Hispano-Latin period, however, the suffix \textit{-idum} is still present. \textit{Characium} is greatly in doubt.

The validity of the Spagnolo \textit{carajo} was later vindicated by Meyers-Lübke in his later voice of scepticism, acknowledging that the term was used by Colomina, and others, Corominae propounds derivation from the Classical Greek, \textit{charis}, \textit{retinere-retinaculum}, etc. MINAS notes the vulgar Greek \textit{καρδών} to mean ‘sexual intercourse’, and \textit{cardialis} for Portuguese \textit{carda}, none of whom these particular etymologies are possible.
One of the first to rise to the defense of SPITZER’s proposed etymon *characulum was BRÜCH (1), who noted that the major weakness with respect to SPITZER’s notion is the fact that the derivation of diminutives utilizing the older ending in -ātus was no longer possible in the late Vulgar Latin period, since the posttongic penult was syncopated yielding the termination -ātus, devoid of all diminutival force. BRÜCH counters this problem, however, with a hitherto unmentioned attestation of the (otherwise hypothetical) Greek/Latin word charax in the Vulgar Latin of the Iberian Peninsula, in the De Ré Rustica of Columella, who lived around 100 A.D. (Book V, iv, 1) characatus; (Book V, v, 16) vineis characatis, where characatus refers to the grape vines which were supported by poles. Also noted by BRÜCH is the fact that the Latinized inflection in -ātus demonstrates that the root word charax was firmly implanted in the Hispanic-Latin lexicon by the first century A.D. During this time period, however, the formation of new diminutives through the suffix -cilium was still possible; thus, the possibility of a proto-form *characulum is greatly increased.

The validity of the SPITZER/BRÜCH hypothesis regarding the etymology of carajo was later accepted by M. L. WAGNER (ZrpH 54,752) and by MEYER-LÜBKE in his Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. A later voice of scepticism was raised, however, by COROMINAS (loc. cit.) who, while acknowledging the plausibility of the proposed etymon *characulum, inclined in other directions. COROMINAS notes the complete lack of documentation of the form *charax in the Vulgar Latin of the Iberian Peninsula, although the author’s own awareness of characatus as used by Columella, renders this objection somewhat untenable. Nonetheless, COROMINAS proposes the etymology *caraculum, an instrumental derivation from the Classical Latin verb carrare ‘to card wool’, formed in analogy with such paradigms as balthare-baltnaculum, lentere-lenaculum, retiere-relinaculum, etc. As indirect support for this hypothesis, COROMINAS notes the vulgar Catalan usage of the verb carrar from carrar to mean ‘sexual intercourse’, in addition to its etymological meaning of ‘card wool’. This hypothesis, however, was not supported by J. M. PIEL for Portuguese (2), nor in the Portuguese dictionaries of MORAIS SILVA.


(2) J. M. Piel, Notas à margem do “Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch”, Biblios (Coimbra) 10 (1934) 124-48 [p. 132]; A formação dos nomes de lugares e de instrumentos em português, Boletim de Filologia 7 (1944) 31-47 [p. 43].
and Machado (1), nor in the Catalan dictionary of Alcover/Moll (2), all of which support the derivation from *charaulum.*

Such, then, is the contemporary status of etymological research on carajo and its congenitors. While the available data elude the formulation of definite conclusions, the general hypotheses may be reconsidered in the light of considerations of overall plausibility. The lack of early attestations of carajo and its etymological predecessors seems, as noted earlier, to be the result of a prudish avoidance of mentioning certain anatomical regions, particularly within the context of religious, moral-didactic, and heroic works. Even today, the majority of written literature is not an accurate reflection of the everyday spoken language, and this seems to have been even more so during the middle ages.

Due to the etymological difficulties encountered with positing a Latin base form *caraulum,* it seems certain that carajo comes from an earlier *c(h)araulum.* As to Corominas’ proposal of an instrumental form of carre, this appears rather doubtful in view of the fact that the unusual metaphorical extension of the Romance reflex of this verb to refer to the sexual act occurs only with the Catalan carlar (3), while the meaning of ‘penis’ is, and always has been, common to Spanish carajo, Portuguese caralho, Galician carali and Catalan caral.

These considerations implicate *charaulum* as an early diminutive form, whence the conclusion that Greek charax ‘small stick’ provided the original Latin base form. In any case, it seems certain that some process of metaphorical metamorphosis operated at an early period of Iberian Vulgar Latin in order to produce the uniform meaning which carajo and its cognates assumed across the Iberian Peninsula. In view of the contemporary non-literal status of carajo, we may therefore tentatively characterize the evolution of this word as a metaphorically-motivated semantic replacement followed by a later dissolution of etymological meaning resulting in a purely expressive form. More will be added on this latter point following a categorization of the contemporary manifestations of carajo.

4. In contemporary Spanish, carajo, in view of its objectionable nature in all dialects, is represented by a number of euphemisms, ranging from the simple replacement of a single phoneme to the creation or exchange of the entire word. Most common among the simple phonetically-deformed variants are a badajo, caroles, etc. (1) Evidences exhibited by carajo which only occur as such; as in echar (tollar) ajos! (2) Submitted through phonetic association.

The possibilities for varied as the people who use them may vary. In the following use of one of the original anatomical signs, the qualitative or expressive usage is partly paid to such transparencies or offensive persons. This use of them in any language, whether in a direct manner or in a more oblique fashion, is part of the conveyance of emotion. (3)

Closely related to the possibilities is the use of forms. The usage shared by colo, etc.,

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{carajo} & \text{coño} & \text{bonetes} \\
\text{mierda} & \text{etc.} & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

(1) The obvious use is the one of the word as a metonymic equivalent for the body as a whole. It is used in a direct manner or in a more oblique fashion, part of the conveyance of emotion.

In English, the slot occurs with emo, emo, emo, etc. This usage of

(1) Cf. Charles Kany, *American English* (1960, p. 142; 144; 146). Right is the Spanish verb *toblar* (p. 59) while in the novel *Us,* we also find, *radajo.* See also *Raphael's* (1963, p. 33).

(2) Kany, op. cit., p. 142. *Us,* English *prish,* *puchr,* etc.

(3) cf. Breitmaier, *op. cit.*
deformed variants are caraé, cary, caramba, carambo, cariño, carife, carajo,  
hadajo, caracoles, etc. (1). However, the fall range of syntactic possibilities  
exhibited by carajo is not shared by any of the euphemistic forms,  
which only occur as simple interjections or in allusions to vulgarity such  
as in echar (sohar) ajos lit. 'to throw (let loose) garlic', fig. 'to say carajo',  
through phonetic association.

The possibilities for employing carajo are almost as numerous and  
varied as the people who use this word, but certain common and quasi-  
universal examples may be extracted from the totality of available  
instances. In the following discussion, all cases will involve only a  
figurative or expressive usage of carajo, and will be completely devoid of  
the original anatomical significance. Thus, for example, no attention will  
be paid to such transparent usage as the epithet carajo applied to a  
snark or offensive person (2).

The most obvious use of carajo is as a simple interjection of anger,  
fear, surprise, or disbelief. Used in this fashion it shares the scene with  
other vulgar forms such as coño, mierda, cojones, joder, as well as less  
offensive terms. This usage is purely ejaculative and, as with similar  
forms in any language, carries no semantic value other than the  
conveyance of emotion.

Closely related to the ejaculative use, but offering a wider set of  
opportunities, is the use of carajo to reinforce the interrogative qué, a  
usage shared by coño, mierda, diablos, demonios, etc. (3). For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \text{ ¿Qué } & \text{ carajo } \\
& \text{ coño } \\
& \text{ demonios } \\
& \text{ mierda } \\
& \text{ etc. } \\
\text{ te pasa?}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) \text{ ¿Qué } & \text{ carajo } \\
& \text{ etc. } \\
\text{ me importa a mí?}
\end{align*}
\]

In English, the slot occupied by carajo in Spanish is filled by devil, hell,  
fuck, etc. This usage of carajo carries an inherent value, the extent of

(1) Cf. Charles Kany, American Spanish Euphemisms, Berkeley (Univ. of Cali-  
ifornia Press) 1969, p. 142; Ingo Nagel, Die Bezeichnung für "dumm" und "ver-  
richt" im Spanischen, Tubingen (Max Niemeyer) 1971, p. 180. In the contemporary  
Mexican work Jornando que Sucho (Mexico 1968), we find the euphemism caras-  
(p. 59) while in the novel Usmari by the Puerto Rican Pedro Juan Soto (San Juan)  
we also find carajo. See also, Werner Brinshauer, El Español Colosal, Madrid  
(Gredos) 1993, passim.

(2) Cf. Kany, op. cit., p. 49; Nagel, op. cit., p. 180. Similar is the French use of  
cos, English, prich, pocher, etc.

(3) Cf. Brinshauer, op. cit., p. 76, 91, 94.
which will be outlined below, since the phrase *qué carajo* in effect modifies the following verbal phrase by intensifying the interrogative force.

A further example, also involving a form of interrogative and negative reinforcement, comes forth in the frame *qué — ni qué carajo*, where *carajo* can be replaced by *coño, demonios, ocho cuartos, cojones, puñeta*, and others, as well as a simple repetition of the first word (cf. BEINHAUER, op. cit., pp. 179-85). BEINHAUER notes (p. 179), concerning this usage:

Por lo general, el hablante no se limita sólo a rechazar la palabra que le molesta, sino que, para poner además en ridículo al interlocutor, le añade otro elemento más, disparatado, de su propia invención ... sucede a veces que en su excitación no se le ocurre ninguna expresión nueva, y entonces su afectividad se desahoga en una insensata repetición mecánica de la palabra causa de su enfado ... el *ni* denota claramente que el sintagma precedente *qué* + sustantivo es sentido como negativo ... sin embargo, lo corriente es que al hablante no le faltan expresiones de que echar mano como de objeto en que cebar su rabiosa negación.

Examples include:

(3) *¡Qué importante ni qué carajo!*  
(4) *¡Qué brona ni qué carajo!*

The expression which may be inserted following the first *qué* may be virtually any part of speech or phrase which the speaker wishes to deny, negate, or refuse. This syntactic construction finds no ready analogue in English, but may perhaps be compared with *to hell with*—, or something similar.

The phrase *el carajo* occurs in numerous expressions, and in fact accounts for the greatest number of examples of *carajo*, except for the purely ejaculatory expressions. First in the list of common examples is the locution *del carajo*, meaning roughly *bad*, *disgusting*, with adjectival force. For instance:

(5) *Hace un tiempo del carajo.*  
(6) *Este libro es del carajo.*

The form *carajo* used in this fashion also occurs in interjections:

(7) *¡Qué caballo del carajo!*

Tied to the expressions involving *el carajo* is the omnipresent roughly *I don't give a different variants. This

(9) *Me importa un carajo.*

In this latter frame, the *carajo* is virtually end-glottal, and seems limited only by the general enunciation of the speaker.

In the novel *La Osa* by the Barcelona writer Iglesias, *¡Me importa!*, *¡Me importa tres!* by José María Carras, *¡pueblo os importa dos carajos and seem limited only within a clearly defined expression.

The variant *el carajo* *carajo*, as in

(10) *Me voy p' al carajo.*

roughly *I'm getting the hell out with the general enunciation of the latter is *mandar al carajo*— to tell someone to go.*

In *La Osa* by the Barcelona writer Iglesias, *¡Me importa!* *¡Me importa dos carajos!* and seem limited only within a clearly defined expression.

The variant *el carajo* *carajo*, as in

(11) *¡Vete al carajo!*

(12) *Me gastaría tirarlo.*

In (II) *el carajo* also has an additional usage corresponding to one of the collation:


(2) A. Girera, *Tesoros de Cataluña*, Barcelona (1967).
roughly 'I don't give a damn' (cf. Fr. je m'en foutis), and numerous slightly different variants. This expression also alternates with variants involving un carajo, as in

(9) Me importa un carajo.

In this latter frame, the number of variants which can appear instead of carajo is virtually endless, although all must take a nominal form. Common examples include un comino, un (tres) pepino(s), un cuerno, etc. In the novel La Oscura Historia de la Prima Montse (Barcelona 1970) by the Barcelona writer Juan Marsé we are offered the sentence ¡Que me oigan! ¡Me importa tres pares de cojones!, while the Spanish novel Groovy by José María Carrascal (Barcelona 1972) provides: la felicidad del pueblo os importa dos carajos. Similar expressions abound in the literature and seem limited only by the imagination of the user, although remaining within a clearly circumscribed subset of obscene and vulgar expressions.

The variant el carajo also appears in the expression para el (p'al) carajo, as in

(10) Me voy p'al carajo.

roughly 'I'm getting the hell out of here'. This usage appears to be tied in with the general employment of el carajo to indicate a pleonastic destination in a number of vulgar expressions. Most common among the latter is mandar al carajo 'to rudely dispatch someone or something', 'to tell someone to go to hell'. In the novel Tres Tristes Tigres (Barcelona 1967) by the Cuban Guillermo Cabrera Infante, we find the following reference to this usage: '(tremenda palabra, eh: siempre, la eternidad, el carajo)'. SÁNCHEZ-BOUDY (1) glosses this use of el carajo for those of his readers unfamiliar with this style of speech (which for some reason he regards as uniquely Cuban) as 'exclamación grandilocuente', but a more appropriate translation would also take into account the syntactic possibilities of this form. Other examples of this use include:

(II) ¡Vete al carajo!

(12) Me gustaría tirarlo (botarlo) al carajo.

In (II) al carajo alternates with a la mierda, al demonio, etc., while an additional usage corresponding to (12) is found in La Oscura Historia de la Prima Montse: mandar todo lo demás al cuerno. This usage corresponds to one of the colloquial uses of Catalan carall cited by GRIERA (2),

(1) José Sánchez-Boudy, La Nueva Novela Hispanoamericana y Tres Tristes Tigres, Miami (Ediciones Universal) 1971, p. 108.

(2) A. Grier, Tesor de la Llengua, de les Tradicions i de la Cultura Popular de Catalunya, Barcelona (Edicions Catalunya S.) 1930, V. 3, p. 200.
such as mal carajo te fum (fot)! An interesting phrase, apparently related to this usage of carajo is found in the novel Cambio de Piel (Mexico 1971) by the Mexican Carlos Fuentes: Te lleva el carajo o te llamas Rimbaud.

Yet another way in which carajo may be inserted into an expression is illustrated by the following variants:

(13) Me va 
\[ \text{del} \] 
\[ \text{como el} \] 
\[ \text{carajo}. \]

where an example of del comes from Cambio de Piel while como el appears in the Argentine novel El Derrotado by Leopoldo Torro-Nilsson (Buenos Aires 1970). No literal translation may be extracted from these sentences, which figuratively mean ‘things are going badly for me’. Perhaps in view of the emotive content of the sentences, this usage is restricted to the first person singular in the overwhelming majority of cases.

A final case of expressions making essential use of carajo is the class of expressions of the general form más — que el carajo, in which the use of carajo pleonastically intensifies the description; for example:

(14) Tiene más dinero que el carajo.
(15) Está más caliente que el carajo.

Occasionally the el may be deleted; for example, in Tres Tristes Tigres one finds la miré y me di cuenta de que era pobre como carajo. Since the phrase más que el carajo only figuratively introduces a comparison into the sentence, the más may, in certain instances, be omitted, giving rise to sentences like

(16) No sabe un (el) carajo de matemáticas.
(17) No tengo el carajo.

in which cases el carajo may be approximately rendered as ‘nothing’.

The above examples have illustrated some of the more common ways in which carajo and its stylistic variants are used in everyday spoken Spanish. In no instance does carajo carry its original etymological meaning, and in each of the above categories carajo plays a different syntactic rôle. This panorama of interrelated phenomena demands inclusion in a comprehensive grammar of Spanish; hence, we must address the question of the lexical and syntactic status of carajo. Before turning to these formal questions, however, it is highly illustrative to consider the following remarks of Carlos Fuentes (from the novel La Muerte de Artemio Cruz) speaking of the Mexican usage of the verb chingar (1), whose range of possibilities is near...

... palabra de honor, de malo, imprescindible, voz de los poderosos, un signo del nacimiento de la fiesta y de la colmillos de la marea... resume de la historia.

This characterization consideration, indicates to words of this category the Spanish speaker feels in question. This uniting the optimum representatively quite diverse variety statement provides an utility which may be a

5. The most pressing status of the word carajo above, its etymological anything, does carajo found? Clearly, we may of carajo as an interject consider the remaining case of speech act, for example. Jakobson, who describes an addressor sends a message by establishing a cultic bond. The of the speech act is a focus on this component. Relevant or context of the situations, emotive or giving his attitudes about forms are the interjections at the addressee and inc

(1) Roman Jakobson, On Language, ed. T. A. Sebeok [8].

(1) For a study of some of the difficulties surrounding this equally mysterious word, see Juan Clemente Zamora, Lexicología Indianorrománica: chingar y suger, Romance Notes 14 (1972) 409-13.
SPANISH carajo

of possibilities is nearly as great as that of carajo, and which engenders
the same feelings of idiomatic camaraderie among the initiated:

... palabra de honor, palabra de hombre, palabra de rueda, palabra
de molino, imprecación, propósito saludo, proyecto de vida, filiación,
recuerdo, voz de los desesperados, liberación de los pobres, orden de
los poderosos, invitación a la riña y al trabajo, epígrafe del amor,
signo del nacimiento, amenaza y burla, verbo testigo, compañero
de la fiesta y de la borrachera, espada del valor, trono de la fuerza,
colmillo de la marrullería, blasón de la raza, salvavidas de los límites,
resumen de la historia ...

This characterization, while not directed specifically at the forms under
consideration, indicates the range of emotional response to be ascribed
to words of this category, and demonstrates the inherent unity which
the Spanish speaker feels to exist among the various uses of the words
in question. This unity must be taken into consideration when consider-
ing the optimum representation for a series of semantically and syntacti-
cally quite diverse variants. While couched in poetic terms, Fuentes' state-
ment provides an accurate portrayal of the methodological diffi-
culties which may be anticipated in this line of inquiry.

5. The most pressing issue to be considered concerns the referential
status of the word carajo. Given the fact that, in the examples cited
above, its etymological significance has entirely disappeared, what, if
anything, does carajo mean in the various expressions in which it is
found? Clearly, we may at once remove from further discussion the use
of carajo as an interjection, devoid of any referential meaning. To con-
sider the remaining cases, we must have recourse to a definition of the
speech act, for example, the well-known description offered by Roman
Jakobson, who describes it in approximately the following terms (1):
an addressee sends a message about a context (referent) to an addres-
see by establishing a contact in a communication channel and utilizing
the linguistic code. Corresponding to each of these six components
of the speech act is a form of discourse which places primary emphasis
on this component. Referential language places emphasis on the refer-
ent or context of the discourse, and accounts for most normal speech
situations. Exotive or expressive language focuses on the addressee,
giving his attitudes about what he is saying. The most purely emotive
forms are the interjections. Conative language is most strongly directed
at the addressee and includes imperative and vocative locutions. Pratic

(1) Roman Jakobson, Closing statement: linguistics and poetry, in Style in
8].
messages serve to test the operation or existence of the speech channel, and include such otherwise meaningless expressions as ‘are you listening?’ , ‘good morning’, etc. METALINGUAL discourse is that directed at the code, or language, and arises, for example, when asked to paraphrase or explain the meaning of something one has said. Finally, the almost catchall category of POETIC language places the greatest emphasis on the form of the message.

Trying to fit the usage of Spanish carajo among the categories isolated by Jakobson leads to several possibilities; on the one hand, all such instances are clearly emotive, while a great number are also notably conative. Many, if not all, of the expressions using carajo seem to be poetic in function, given the existing variation among the patterns; certainly, the diachronic development of carajo must be viewed on the poetic dimension. Jakobson’s formulation, while providing a maximum expansion of the speech act, leaves somewhat unclear the relationship between referentiality and the other facets of discourse, and does not delineate which, if any, of the categories or components (since virtually no discourse consists solely of one component) are mutually exclusive or incompatible. To view these questions from a slightly different angle, we turn to the greatly simplified, but nonetheless illustrative treatment by Philip Wheelwright (1), who defines a symbol as follows:

What [all symbols] have in common is the property of being more in intention than they are in existence. In the words of an older vocabulary, it is ideally self-transcendent (p. 10). ... a “symbol” is not just anything that has meaning, it is that which carries a hidden or less obvious or more transcendent meaning in addition to the surface one (p. 24).

These considerations give rise to a four-way partitioning of all discourse, along the axes of referentiality and emotivity (pp. 48f.):

![Diagram]

(referential) (non-referential)

(expressive) (ejectative)

(emotive) (non-emotive)

(literal) (phatic)

Ejaculative utterances are non-referential; to this category Phatic discourse, being non-referential, might be assigned. Its ideally perfected form is emotive, accounting for social custom and didactic styles. Finally, difficult to categorize. The words of Wheelwright, “fire!” but in the more proper meaning, take advantage of emotivity of the language’s. POETIC DISCOURSE serves as the main part of the meaning, by social custom and formalization of symbols and is far from universally basis for comparison in other definitions, carajo is clearly of connotation. Expressions placed on the plane of emotive of this word. However, one as interjection, the quest of argument bifurcates a carajo are to be classified may be characterized second alternative seems to be most obvious fact that syntactic albeit with rather limit possibility of modifying seems to impede a certain use of these modifiers ord word.

If one accepts the referential several distinct lexical in a variety of paraphrases in question. This is idiomatically distinct uses of modernly distinct occurrences.

---

(1) Michel Goulet, Lexicalizations, in Studies out in LEX (Linguistic Enterprises) 1971
Ejaculative utterances are those which are at once emotive and non-referential; to this category belongs the use of carajo as interjection. Pluristic discourse, being non-referential and non-emotive, includes such meaningless expressions as noted by Jakobson. Literal discourse, and its ideally perfected form, logical discourse, are referential and non-emotive, accounting for most conversational language, and expository and didactic styles. Finally, we come to expressive discourse, the most difficult to categorize. The emotivity of expressive speech arises, in the words of Wheelwright, 'not by incidental conjunction as in crying “fire!” but in the more organic sense that the referential function, the proper meaning, takes at least some of its essential character from the emotivity of the language, and changes therefore as the emotivity changes'. Poetic discourse is 'a species of expressive discourse, in which the main part of the meaning is controlled by the poet's art rather than by social custom and fortuitous association'. Wheelwright's characterization of symbols and his four-way division of linguistic discourse are far from universally acceptable, but they do offer an interesting basis for comparison in our study of Spanish carajo. By Wheelwright's definition, carajo is clearly a symbol, since it transcends itself in the sphere of connotation. Expressions involving carajo may also be unequivocally placed on the plane of emotivity, for such is the essential characteristic of this word. However, except for the clearly ejaculative use of carajo as interjection, the question of its referentiality still remains. The road of argument bifurcates at this juncture: either all expressions involving carajo are to be classified as purely ejaculative, or some of these utterances may be characterized as expressive; that is, referential. The second alternative seems to offer some plausible ground for substantiation. The most obvious fact supporting the referential analysis of carajo is the fact that, syntactically speaking, it behaves as an ordinary noun, albeit with rather limited co-occurrence possibilities. Moreover, the possibility of modifying carajo by the articles el, un, and other numerals seems to impute a certain existence to this mysterious noun, since the use of these modifiers ordinarily presupposes the existence of the modified word.

If one accepts the referential status of carajo, it seems certain that several distinct lexical representations will have to be considered, since a variety of paraphrases are required to account for all the expressions in question. This is in effect the analysis accepted by Gouet (1), for the idiomatic uses of modern French foutre, for hat proposes a series of lexically distinct occurrences of foutre to account for the various non-commut-

---

(1) Michel Gouet, Lexical problems raised by some of the “foutre” constructions, in Studies out in Left Field: Essays Presented to James McCanley, Edmonton (Linguistic Enterprises) 1971, pp. 70–85.
able frames in which this word occurs. The analysis in French is aided by the fact that, except in a few unitary expressions like faire le camp, each idiomatic occurrence of the verb faire may be put into a one-to-one correspondence with another verb, such as faire, se moquer de, etc. In Spanish, however, most instances of carajo may not be replaced by another meaningful word; rather, the entire expression or phrase must be replaced. Thus, right from the outset, a difficulty presents itself with regard to the referential interpretation of carajo. In a few cases, carajo may be replaced by nada ‘nothing’ and a reasonably accurate, although non-emotive, paraphrase results. In the remaining cases, there appears to be no feasible way of uniquely replacing carajo by another word in the same syntactic frame and still retaining the basic meaning of the phrase.

A possible escape from this dilemma has been offered by Wallace Chafe (1), in the guise of postsemantic processes. In essence, what Chafe suggests is that, at the underlying semantic level, idiomatic expressions are stored as indivisible units, and that postsemantic rules give these semantic units a phonetic shape by identifying them with sequences of basic, non-idiomatic words of the language. Thus, for example, the Spanish expression estirar la pata lit. ‘to stretch out one’s paws’ fig. ‘to die’ (cf. English kick the bucket) would be semantically represented as the unitary iesuir a pata/, which, per se, would correspond to no surface phonetic representation. Later ‘litarian rules’ would identify this semantic configuration with the non-idiomatic words estirar and la pata, giving rise to the surface representation. The existence of the two levels, the idiomatic level and the literal level, is suggested by the fact that such idiomatic expressions may not normally undergo the full gamut of syntactic transformations associated with non-idiomatic strings. Thus, for example, the phrase Juan estiró la pata ‘Juan died’ may not be passivated to la pata fue estirado por Juan and retain its idiomatic force; rather, the entire verbal expression estirar la pata behaves as a unitary verb, i.e. morir ‘to die’.

In the case of Spanish carajo, it is not clear that Chafe’s proposal may be put to work, since in the dialects under consideration, there is no ‘literal’ interpretation for carajo; thus, it is hard to imagine exactly what the output of the ‘litarianization rules’ would be. One could perhaps save the day by positing a dummy surface element CARajo, and requiring that all idiomatic expressions involving this word be ‘litarianized’ to this intrinsically meaningless form. Introducing a dummy element into an analysis solely to facilitate the operation of otherwise unworkable rules, however, is an ad hoc measure which cannot be justified on independent grounds. On the other hand, if one assumed that the surface element carajo still contains some of the semantic ‘‘absolute’’ methodologically undesired (pp. 48–9), Chafe’s suggestion fails to present itself with regard to the referential interpretation of carajo. It is beyond the scope of such alternatives for the analysis of the adequacy of various carajo is in fact non-referential content. Whether this claim, one made of such an approach: this paragraphs.

6. The fact that an idiom and other words which may have a consequence; consider the English dian, which carries no article a. Further modifying some of the examples are more common holy dian, a ‘divine’ noun is found in the novel by the character Phileas Fogg, what dated, interjection by the living dainy. English speakers at structures are generally modifiers at specified points of personal initiative.

For all Spanish speakers are felt to be united in considerations as well as lexicologically distinct, although the most desirable so underlying representation of carajo be introduced of expressions under con

element *carajo* still contained its original etymological meaning, a form of semantic ‘absolute neutralization’ would result, again yielding a methodologically undesirable analysis. Elsewhere in his monograph (pp. 48-9), Chafe himself discusses examples where idiomatic expressions have no semantic, but only postsemantic, representations, but feels that such forms pose no problems for his analysis of postsemantic processes. If, however, this is in fact true, then in the case of such idioms as *carajo*, the ‘heterization rules’ are nothing but identity transformations, and one has in fact returned the whole expression to the lexicon, thus leaving unsolved the problem of lexical representation.

It is beyond the scope of this brief study to do justice to all competing alternatives for the analysis of *carajo*. Rather than belaboring the issue of the adequacy of various semantic theories, it will be suggested that *carajo* is in fact non-referential in all its occurrences, and thus purely emotive in content. While it is probably impossible to definitively establish this claim, one may at least hope to demonstrate the plausibility of such an approach; thus, then, will be the modest goal of the remaining paragraphs.

6. The fact that an idiomatic expression can be modified by articles and other words which normally presuppose existence is in itself of little consequence; consider the English expression *I don't give a damn*. Here *damn*, which carries no semantic content, is modified by the indefinite article *a*. Further modifiers may be added almost *ad libitum* although some are more common than others: *a tinker's damn, a royal damn, a holy damn, a (rip-) roaring damn*, and so forth. An interesting parallel is found in the novel *Manhattan Transfer* by John Dos Passos, where the character Phineas P. Blackhead has expanded the common, if somewhat dated, interjection *by Jingo to by the living Jingo*, and once even to *by the living almighty Jingo* (1). Similar examples are produced by most English speakers at moments of intense emotion. While idiomatic structures are generally fixed, it is frequently possible to insert additional modifiers at specified points in the expression, thus allowing a measure of personal initiative.

For all Spanish speakers, the various expressions making use of *carajo* are felt to be united not only by the common word, but by emotional considerations as well. While it might be feasible to establish a set of lexically distinct, although related, representations for the surface *carajo*, the most desirable solution would be one which started from a single underlying representation. I would like to propose, therefore, that *carajo* be introduced directly into the underlying representations of the expressions under consideration; not, however, as a lexical item, but in

---

(1) I have also heard for the Pete's sake instead of the normal for Pete's sake. Cf. Joyce's *kiss my royal Irish ass* in *Ulysses*. 
some fashion, as a lexi-co-semantic formative, which is later converted to surface carajo by means of a general interpretive rule or transformation. Rather than rigorously prove this assertion, which is probably impossible given the currently available data, certain examples will be adduced which suggest that the optimal representation for carajo lies in the lexi-co-semantic structure itself.

Consider, as an example, the following two sentences, which in terms of surface syntax, exhibit identical structures:

(18) Juan tiene más dinero que Roberto
    'John has more money than Robert'

(19) Juan tiene más dinero que el carajo.

Sentence (18) is composed of the two sentences

(20) a. Juan tiene dinero
    b. Roberto tiene dinero

and has an underlying structure something like (1):

(21) S
    VP
    V
    N
    más
    dinero
    ¬
    DEGREE
    Nó
    S
    the examples in (22) the deletion of an under
    carajo cannot be taken as
    entity. Therefore, these
    (19) be very roughly ana
    (23)

NP

Juan

Similarly, consider a set

(24) Me importa un carajo

In view of the ungrammarness

(25) *Un carajo me importa

it is clear that carajo is not

by replacing un carajo by

nos, etc., in which cases the

the absence of an explicit

of (24) is the pre-form which

obligatorily deleted from

cannot be the direct object

occurring in this frame and
to the fact that (24)

(26) a. *Un carajo me importa
    b. *Se me importa

(27) *Lo que me importa

---


(2) For a study of this phenomenon see the proceedings of the 12th International Congress for the History of Logic, Philosophy, and the History of Science, Bucharest 1970, pp. 549-59.
The examples in (22) clearly show that (19) is not derived through the deletion of an underlying phrase like (22a). The phrase más que el carajo cannot be taken as an ellipsis, but must be regarded as an integral entity. Therefore, these facts suggest that the underlying structure of (19) be very roughly analyzed as:

\[ S \rightarrow NP \rightarrow V \rightarrow \{DEGREE\} \rightarrow VP \]

Similarly, consider a sentence like

(24) Me importa un carajo.

In view of the ungrammaticality of the ‘normal’ order

(25) *Un carajo me importa

it is clear that carajo is not the subject of (24). This is further illustrated by replacing un carajo by a ‘plural’ variant such as dos carajos, tres pebeteros, etc., in which cases the verb invariably remains singular. In fact, in the absence of an explicitly indicated subject, the grammatical subject of (24) is the pro-form which may be denoted as ello (1), and which is obligatorily deleted from the surface structure. On the other hand, carajo cannot be the direct object of (24), due to the impossibility of other nouns occurring in this frame (other than such nonsense forms as un contino) and to the fact that (24) may not be passivized (26), clefted (27), etc. (2).

(26) a. *Un carajo me es importado.
   b. *Se me importa un carajo.

(27) *Lo que me importa es un carajo.


(2) The sentence se me da el carajo is not a passivized form of (24) or anything like it, but appears to be an unanalyzable idiom.
Importar is an inherently intransitive verb which takes only an indirect object, like interesar, gustar, parecer, placer, constar, etc. In fact, the only additional modifiers which may be adjoined to (24) are adverbs such as mucho ‘much’; consequently, we may assume that un carajo plays the role of a verbal modifier, giving very roughly the following structure:

(28)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{carajo} \\
\text{me} \\
\end{array}
\]

importa

A similar analysis seems to hold for carajo in prepositional phrases, such as in examples (10)-(12) and in interrogative phrases such as (1), and (2), where the formative carajo may be subjoined to the interrogative marker. In fact, the only remaining type-form which cannot be accounted for by postulating a logico-semantic formative of the sort suggested above is the class of expressions of the form qui — ni qui qui carajo, which imply a negation or rejection of the word fitted into the blank. I have no idea of the deep structure of this highly idiomatic expression, but in its most rudimentary logical form, it seems that the representation is something like

(29) \( \sim (X \lor Y) \)

read not \((X \lor Y)\), where \(X\) is the word being negated and \(Y\) is the class comprised of carajo, coño, pañeta, etc., which, by De Morgan’s laws, yields

(30) \( \sim X \land \sim Y \)

The precise nature of the transformations required to produce the correct surface structure remains one of the unsolved problems of semantic theory.

7. Clearly, the examples presented above are no substitute for a detailed analysis, which is, however, beyond the scope of this brief study. The purpose of the present work has been to trace the semiotic development of carajo and to hint at its functions in modern Spanish. The conclusions which tent to be summed up as follows: carajo has no lexical vi the various expressions unification, united in the mi be fitted into a unified its most feasible repre deep structure. None o certain whether they e. In particular, the prec should be inserted into able conjecture. In the was offered as to how th worth exploring also su carajo as a constituent gation, rather than as a velly, one might wish to intermediate interpretive have to account for the v consistent with the o be, at least in Spanish, exions of the sort which discoursal, and this diff adequate grammar.

Michigan State Univer
conclusions which tentatively emerge from the preceding discussion may
be summed up as follows. First, in the dialects under consideration,
carojo has no lexical value, but purely symbolic potential. Second, that
the various expressions involving carajo are, on some plane of represen-
tation, united in the minds of Spanish speakers, and should consequently
be fitted into a unified description. Finally, that carajo appears to find
its most feasible representation as a logico-semantic formative in the
depth structure. None of these assertions has been proved; and it is not
certain whether they ever will be, due to their metatheoretical nature.
In particular, the precise point at which a logico-semantic formative
should be inserted into the deep structure remains a matter of consider-
able conjecture. In the preceding paragraphs, a rudimentary suggestion
was offered as to how this might be effected, but other alternatives well
worth exploring also suggest themselves. It may be possible to introduce
carojo as a constituent of the entire sentence, like negation or interro-
gation, rather than as a modifier of a particular substructure. Alternati-
ively, one might wish to insert instances of carajo by means of surface or
intermediate interpretive rules. Whatever the eventual solution, it will
have to account for the data which have been reported above, in a manner
consistent with the other facts of the Spanish language. There seems to
be, at least in Spanish, a qualitative difference between colloquial expres-
sions of the sort which have been discussed and more usual non-emotive
discourse, and this difference will have to be accounted for by any
adequate grammar.
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