ON FUCKING (WELL)
A STUDY OF SOME QUASI-PERFORMATIVE EXPRESSIONS

TINA BOPP (Mrs. Franz)
Donnybrook College

In this paper evidence will be presented for treating as members of the same lexical class the words fucking, bloody and shitting, and for considering these to have the predictable variants (in some dialects) fucking well, bloody well, and shitting well. Examples of this class are:

(1) a. {fucking (well)}
   You! bloody (well) took your time.
   {shitting}

   b. {Fucking (well)}
   {Bloody (well)} make up your mind.
   {shitting}

(2) a. Turn off that bloody radio.
   {shitting}

   b. {Some} fucking idiot left the top off the brandy bottle.
   {The} {bloody} idiot left the top off the brandy bottle.
   {shitting}

   c. Bloody idiots, forgetting the blasting caps.
   d. Fucking sons of bitches, they wrecked my car.
   e. Shitting cats, always yowling all night.

These expressions have been demonstrated to be related to the 'quasi-verbs' rather than the real verbs shit and fuck (Quang, 1969:49ff, esp. note 9). The real verbs shit and fuck will henceforth be designated shit and fuck, as opposed to shit and fuck. There are no relative clauses containing either shit or fuck, nor shit and fuck, and furthermore none with bloody as predicate adjective, corresponding to (2).

(3) *Turn off that radio which is shitting.
   {bloody}

(4) *Turn off that radio which {fuck, shit on}.

To continue the possible tests for determining the syntactic properties of fucking, bloody and shitting, which one would superficially want to compare with adjectives, we note that Ross (1969) demonstrates that (non-stative) adjectives behave like NPs in undergoing pseudo-

However, the example Harry chopped off Sue’s head and had to clean it up, referring to the attendant mess, does. There were several other bad (for our proposals) cases, but we are saving those for a review of Roman de Clef’s forthcoming book, Le français vivant, Gallimard, to appear, 1972.

NOTES

1 Rabid generative semanticists may read "semantic representation".

2 In keeping with standard scientific practice, what we don’t at all understand we carefully disregard.

3 The argument based on the fact that you can’t say sentence (i) we are saving for a forthcoming article 'Abstract decretive nouns in English', to appear in Papers in Linguistics, volume 18 (1972). The rest we are saving to read at a couple of future conferences.

   (i) *Harry blew Shirley’s nose into his (or her) handkerchief.

4 It is true that (2) could marginally be interpreted as, for example, (ii), and (3) likewise as (iii), but this does not affect the argument here.

   (ii) Harry ****s blood.
       {bile}

   (iii) Harry ****ed blood.
       {bile}

5 Although (iv) is a good transform of (iv), (vi) is not. Therefore (iv) must be ambiguous; in one reading in Jane’s mouth is a 'motive' adverb, in the other locative.

   (iv) Harry **** in Jane’s mouth.
   (v) In Jane’s mouth, Harry ****.
   (vi) *In Jane’s mouth Harry ****.
clefting:
(5) a. What John did was obnoxious.
   b. What John did was tall.

But such sentences are not possible with the class of words under discussion:
(6) *What the idiot did was be shitting bloody
    fucking
(7) *What the radio was was shitting bloody

Likewise fucking well, shitting well and bloody well, as in (1), are superficially similar to adverbs. But most adverbs, other than those like very, extremely etc. and directional adverbs, can be preposed.
(8) Quietly
    Deftly
    With a curious tool
    For King and country

(9) *Fucking
    *Bloody (well), you took your time.
    *Shitting

Adverbials not in the verb phrase can be contrasted, and the second occurrence of VP in conjoined sentences can be pronominalized by do so.
(10) John left quickly and Fred did so quietly.

(11) a. *John fucking well paid up and you'd better do so bloody well.
    b. John fucking well paid up and you'd bloody well better do so.
    c. John fucking well paid up and I advise you to bloody well fucking well do so.

The preposing test and the do so test thus yield conflicting results, except when fucking etc. are stressed and/or follow do so. Note that in (11b) and (11c), fucking and bloody well are unstressed; the lack of stress on the second occurrence of a member of our hypothetical class may indicate that each of the members has approximately the same meaning or equivalent meaning. This question will be discussed somewhat later in this paper. We will conclude that fucking etc. are syntactically unlike the usual types of adjective and adverb, though there are some similarities to be explored shortly, and on the principle established by Quang, we will call them quasi-adjectives and adverbs. It still remains for us, of course, to establish (1) their meaning and (2) the syntactic and other constraints on their use.

Leaving aside the question of meaning for the moment, there are a number of interesting syntactic properties to be noted. Reflexes of

fucking, and shit on, turn up as surface quasi-adverbs, quasi-adjectives and nouns. Fucking behaves very much like bloody, and turns up in the prenominal positions occupied by adjectives:
(10) I'm a fucking artist, I'm not a fucking P.R. agent. (John Lennon, Rolling Stone 1-21-1971, p.4)

For some speakers, including Lennon, who may not count here because he speaks a dialect of British English, fucking is also possible with verbs and some adverbs.
(11) I'm not technically good, but I can make it fucking howl and move. (Ibid, p.35)
(12) Everybody was probably thinking they're not going to fucking work on it. (Ibid, p.47)
(13) He fucking went home instead of waiting.
(14) He can't fucking (well) make it today.
(15) He fucking (well) can't make it today.
(16) I'm not going to wait fucking (well) forever.

In the most liberal dialects, the quasi-adjective fucking seems to go with any sort of noun, and the number of occurrences in a sentence is not necessarily restricted to one.
(17) Fucking sincerity will get you nowhere. (abstract noun)
(18) He was full of fucking arsenic. (mass noun)
(19) The fucking cats are under the fucking bed. (count nouns)
(20) (That) fucking Charley refuses to admit he works for the CIA.
(21) Who did you expect, the fucking Three Musketeers?

The position of fucking after the article and number sometimes indicates a difference of emphasis and meaning. For some speakers the following are synonymous:
(22) Hamlet is a fucking hard part to play.
(23) Hamlet is a hard fucking part to play.

Others distinguish a meaning in which fucking emphasizes hard
(24) That part is fucking hard to play. (as in (22))

from the meaning which associates fucking with the whole NP or perhaps just part, as in
(25) It's hard to play that fucking part right.

Similar distinctions are, I think, to be found in the use of the adverbial fucking (well). I find it hard to find separate meanings for
(26) Shut the door and fucking (well) do it quietly.
(27) Shut the door and do it fucking (well) quietly.
(28) Fucking well take out the trash now.
(29) Take out the trash fucking well now.
because of the fact that sentences like the above can have a reading in which the adverbial is asserted (cf. Lakoff 1970, Jackendoff lecture 1968). It is hard for me to assign different readings to (26)-(29) in which the disapproval of the whole proposition is distinct from disapproval associated with the adverbial. But with more than one adverbial, some differences do emerge.

(30) Fucking (well) empty the trash now in the backyard quietly.
(31) Empty the trash fucking (well) now, in the backyard, quietly.
(32) Empty the trash now in the fucking backyard, quietly.
(33) Empty the trash now in the fucking backyard quietly.

The appearance of fucking, and not fucking well, in (32) brings up the point of how the syntactic category, or quasi-category, of fucking is determined. Adverbials consisting of a preposition and NP allow only the quasi-adjective form:

(34) a. The skunk fucking well was in the backyard.
    b. The skunk was fucking well in the backyard.

(35) *Those woodducks were eating the beans fucking well in the basement.
(36) Those woodducks were eating the beans in the fucking basement.
(37) Do it fucking well discreetly.
(38) Do it with some fucking discretion.

These facts of course concern only those idiolects which distinguish between fucking, bloody and fucking well, bloody well.

I have claimed that fucking well does not precede preposition + NP combinations, and that in these cases fucking precedes the NP. This is not the case in (39) and (40), and in just those cases where the NP is pronominal, either unstressed and anaphoric, or contrastively stressed:

(39) He can't blow up the Empire State Building singlehandedly
    {fucking well go with him.}
    so I'll have to {go fucking well with him.}
(40) Charley was mad
    when I told him I wouldn't
    {fucking well go with him.}
    *{go with fucking him.}
    {fucking well go with him.}

Although (41) is grammatical, in general fucking can't precede a low or unstressed NP:

(41) Go with {the fucking bastard.}
    {*fucking him,}
(42) Fucking well go with {the bastard.}
    {him.}
(43) Go fucking well with {the bastard.}
    {him.}

Bastard has some stress in (41) though it is used anaphorically, and him in (40) is contrastively stressed, so restricting fucking only to positions before stressed elements does not account for the ungrammaticality of fucking and any personal pronoun.

The alternative explanation which immediately suggests itself is that fucking is itself part of the NP replaced by the pronoun. In that case, the pronoun him refers to that fucking Charley in

(43) a. That fucking Charley was mad when I told him I wouldn't go with him.
    b. *That fucking Charley was mad when I told fucking him
       that I wouldn't go with him.
    c. *That fucking Charley was mad when I told him I wouldn't go with fucking him.

But is there any justification for deriving (43a) from (43d) rather than (43d)?

(43) d. That fucking Charley was mad when I told that fucking Charley, that I wouldn't go with that fucking Charley.
   e. That fucking Charley was mad when I told Charley that
      I wouldn't go with Charley.

It seems to me that it is a matter of choice on the part of the speaker whether any or all of the tokens of a NP in a sentence has fucking etc. associated with it, not a condition that has to be met in order for certain NPs to be identical for some purpose. But it is also true that fucking etc. never precede any sort of pronoun, which would be true if fucking etc., were just a part of the entire NP which was identical in reference to the pronominalized NP. In the absence of clearer facts about the anaphoric identity of NPs in (43) I will simply assume it to be felicitous for fucking to precede a pronominalized NP, of the ordinary sort. Destressed pronoun nouns may be combined with fucking quite freely:

(43) f. Charley, got mad when I told the fucking idiot to
    {emph.Charley}.
    {go with him.}

(43) g. Charley, got mad when I told the fucking idiot to
    {emph.Charley}.
    {go with him.}

So if one of the constituents happens to be an ordinary anaphoric pronoun, fucking can be associated only with the whole proposition or with some pronominalized constituent, and not with the constituent it is semantically associated with. Thus many semantically possible combinations cannot be said grammatically.

The question which naturally arises is what possible explanation or explanations are to be found in the theory of syntax for the manifestation of something which means 'speaker disapproves of x' where x is a proposition or an NP within a proposition. Of course, 'DISAPPROVES' is not sufficient to characterize the meaning of fucking in (10), which contains clauses in which fucking is used with two different meanings. I do not think that in (10) Lennon disparages artists, but he does, probably, intend to disparage P.R. agents by contrast. Furthermore, (44) is not contradictory:

(44) He never said that fucking was a scandal.
is possible to permute the fucking modifying a constituent between certain parts of the constituent which need not themselves be constituents. Most people are familiar with abso-fucking-lutely; abso and lutesly are clearly not constituents. But this permutation is possible only if the primary word-stress follows fucking.

(48) It's auto-fucking-mática.
(49) *I ate at the auto-fucking-mátic.
(50) He's a snob because he's diplo-bloody-mático.
(51) *He's a snob because he's a diplo-bloody-mátic.

Compounds with final stress also allow the permutation, and normal initially stressed compounds do not:

(52) He's the vice-fucking-président.
(53) *He doesn't get to live in the White fucking House.
(54) He's the fucking vice-président.

I maintain that (48)-(53) are the result of a permutation rule because I see no difference in meaning between (54) and (52). It seems that just a strong phonological constraint which conspires to produce certain sorts of rhythmic patterns prevents the permutation from applying.

NOTES

An earlier version of this paper was read at the Hallowen meeting of the Linguistic Circle of Staten Island under the title "***ing, "***ing and "****". I am grateful to Dr. Adelaide Hahn for calling my attention to interesting corresponding forms in Tocharian and Hittite, which it was, however, beyond the scope of this paper to include. I am grateful also to several friends who provided information and judgments of grammaticality; through no fault of theirs one of them is currently being prosecuted by the telephone company for using the telephone for obscene purposes, because of one of our telephone discussions of the material in this paper.

My debt to the great trailblazers in this field, Quang Phuc Dong and his follower V. S. Anantalingam, is of course obvious.

1 People I have gotten judgments of grammaticality from seem to have very strong conflicting opinions, perhaps even more so than on the usual sort of syntactic data. The cultural prohibitions against this style of speech may have inhibited some people I consulted. I myself, though a graduate of a girls' college, have only a passive command of this style, but even so, I find I have fairly strong notions of what could be said and what could not.

2 Shitting (well) may be considerably more restricted than the others for most speakers. For instance Quang (1968) notes that shitting is not freely substitutable for fucking, though shit on and fuck are mutually substitutable.

Other restrictions on shitting are of an interesting nature.
(a) He's a shitting prick. (not used anaphorically)
(b) He's a fucking ass-hole.

are both grammatical,

(c) *He's a shitting ass-hole.
(d) *He's a fucking prick.

are both ungrammatical. I guess this is because of the ambiguity of
fucking and shitting in (c) and (d) with the verbs fuck and shit, which
would seem to refer to the actions of anatomical structures, rather
than indicating that an individual, who is either an inept or idiotic person,
or someone offensive and obnoxious, is disapproved of by the speaker. On
the other hand, the existence of a personal pronoun he should presuppose
that the referent of prick and ass-hole is human, at least animate.

Quang (1969, footnote 9) notes that there is no sentence cor-
responding to the structure

(a) Drown that cat

\{F*ck that cat, 
\}
\{Sh*t on that cat\}

such as

(b) Drown that cat which \{f*ck \}
\{s*hit on \}

It should be noted that in this respect, fuck and shit on are not dis-
similar from imperative verbs and questions. The following are ungram-
matical, though synonymous sentences with different surface structures
are acceptable:

(c) which I found interesting.
which I promise to give you. (=a promise)
*which don't read.
(d) which I advise you not to read

*I insist that you don't read."

which I wonder what you think of.
which I would like to know what you think of your opinion of
*which what do you think of (it)?

Here's the book.

Note that the relative clauses in (c) are non-restrictive, in which overt
performatives and perhaps declarative sentences have illocutionary force
and are grammatical. Commands and questions which have undergone subject
deletion and question-word preposing and inversion respectively are not
even grammatical. This fact seems closely related to the ungrammaticality
of shit on and fuck in relative clauses. It is an interesting question as to
whether restrictive relative clauses are even semantically well-formed,
that is, whether the speaker can define something on the basis of his dis-
approval of it, or whether he can only refer to some definite entity and
indicate that he disapproves of it. The only counter-example to the rela-
tive clause restriction that I can think of is non-restrictive:

(d) That's spinach, which the hell with.

Preposing of a question word is impossible in a sentence containing fuck
or shit on. Instead the same order is used for echo questions, but
with different intonation (falling rather than rising).

(e) Sh*t on what?
(f) Fuck the man who invented what?
(g) *What shit on?
(h) *What fuck the man who invented?

By the way, I am not going to conclude that the above facts at all
contradict Quang's assertions about the syntactic categories of shit on,
fuck etc., but I do think that they indicate that some information is to
be found in the murky realm of the performative verb.

British English allows bloody as a predicate adjective, but not in
those cases where relative clause reduction and adjective preposing
could derive Adj N combinations. Fucking and shitting are never pre-
dicate adjectives, in any dialect.

(a) Don't be bloody.
(b) He was bloody to me.
(c) Opening night was bloody. (not synonymous with 'disapproved
of')
(d) The bloody opening finished us off.

compare (c) and (d) with the synonymous

(e) Opening night was {horrible.}

\{blasted\}
\{goddamn\}

(f) The{horrible} opening night finished us off.

Nouns include shit, fuck:

(a) John is a shit.
(b) That stupid fuck tried to sell me insurance.

I do not see much difference in meaning between (b) and
(c) That fucking idiot tried to sell me insurance.

Nouns like shit and fuck referring to persons generally have full stress,
and it this regard are unlike unstressed or low-stressed semi-pronominal
nouns like bastard, which can be used anaphorically. Such use of fuck
and shit sounds odd to me:

(d) John called and \{the fucking idiot \}
\{the stupid fuck \}
\{the silly shit \}
\{the bastard \}

if completely stressed. In view of the fact, noted later, that fucking
etc. cannot precede an unstressed element, it may be that stressed fuck
and shit in contexts like (d) consist of DISAPPROVED + PRONOUN. If so,
then the use of such nouns referring to persons may be an alternative to associating fucking with the entire proposition, when the semantic representation associates it with a phonologically unacceptable NP.

Notice here that fucking seems to have clear perjorative meaning only in the second clause. This subject will be discussed, or rather evaded, in later sections of the paper.

Compare J. Bitxskrps insightful remark, 'The mystery and beauty of the English verbal system lies in the fact that the marked member of the opposition has purely privative meaning.' (1938:212).

Normally fucking follows numbers, but it precedes names. When a number is an integral part of a name, like the Three Bears, Seven Dwarfs, etc., the whole name includes the number. This also applies to times and sums of money:

(a) I waited until 4 O'clock in the morning
(b) You didn't give me any fucking ten dollars, but I won't pay ten fucking dollars for it.

Fucking well versus fucking appears with sentences which have for-to and possess complementizers, with deletion of subjects by Equi-NP-Deletion, showing that S-pruning has not taken place. Plain nominalizations take fucking.

Uttered by Mike Kohn in 1961, in you should pardon the word Paris, at a rehearsal of this rather recondite and fey work of W. B. Yeats'. This is probably the genesis of the present work.

See similar copious examples in Jespersen, Nexus. pp. 99-101. I am grateful to S. Robbins for bringing this work to my attention.

This conclusion was arrived at somewhat independently of McCawley (1970), where it is presented in very brief form. McCawley is, of course, one of Quang's favorite students.
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