The lady was al demonyak: historical aspects of Adverb all

ISABELLE BUCHSTALLER
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

and

ELIZABETH CLOSS TRAUGOTT
Stanford University

(Received 9 January 2006; revised 23 March 2006)

In this diachronic study, we shed light on the development of the functions and structural properties of Adverb all, and suggest that degree modifiers in general should be analyzed in similar terms. We show that the harmonic relationship between Adverb all and its head is best accounted for in terms of boundedness rather than gradability (see Kennedy & McNally, 2005; Paradis, 2001). The stability over a millennium of indeterminacy between bounded and unbounded readings of Adverb all + head sequences, and of the ambiguity in many contexts between Adverb and Quantifier-floated all, shows that a division of labor over time between ambiguous meanings is not necessary (Geeraerts, 1997). Despite its long history, Adverb all has been treated as conversational or an innovation (Bäcklund, 1973; Waksler, 2001). We address the question why certain items like all come to be stereotyped as ‘new’ when in fact they are not.

1 Introduction

In its quantifier, determiner, and predeterminer functions, all has received considerable attention. By contrast, it is rarely discussed in its adverbial function, and if it is, it is classified in a number of different ways. In the semantic tradition, where issues of quantifiers and quantifier-float are of focal concern, distinctions are made between the quantifier as in (1a), the floated quantifier in (1b) and a ‘completive’ adverb as in (1c) (e.g. Bobaljik, 1995; Gouro, 2000):

(1) (a) All whales are mammals.
     (b) Whales are all mammals.
     (c) John is all wet.

In the grammatical tradition, Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 548–9) also mention Adverb all as a ‘modifier in an AdvP’ that means ‘completely’, but do not subclassify it in their discussion of types of adverbs. Others subclassify Adverb all in a number of different ways. For example, Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik (1985: 447) include it among
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1 A shorter version of this paper was presented at the SHEL 4 conference in Flagstaff, Arizona (30 September – 1 October 2005). We would like to thank the members of the audience as well as the other members of the Stanford ALL project (John Rickford, Zoe Bogart, Tracy Connor, Kelly Drinkwater, Rowyn McDonald, Thomas Wasow, Laura Whitten, and Arnold Zwicky) for many fruitful discussions from which this paper has greatly benefited. Thanks also to David Beaver, Kristin Davidse, and Florian Jaeger for comments and references. Two anonymous reviewers also provided helpful suggestions.
‘emphasizers’ that ‘add to the force (as distinct from the degree) of the adjective’. By contrast, Borst (1902) and Bäcklund (1973) discuss it in terms of a member of the group of degree modifiers (also often referred to as ‘intensifiers’) that fix their complements at the top of the scale and collocate with nongradable adjectives. Such top-of-scale modifiers may, however, also occur with gradable heads that denote properties that are increaseable or decreaseable. Thus while Bäcklund considers the Adverb all roughly equivalent to ‘completely’, and cites examples with nongradable heads such as set, settled, he also gives examples with gradable heads such as mad, upset, and neat.

One of the reasons that all is often not mentioned in grammatical studies may be that it is considered ‘colloquial’ or ‘new’. For example, Bäcklund says of absolutely, all, and perfectly that they are ‘used primarily in conversational language’ (1973: 217), and in a discussion of all in conversational Present-day English, Waksler considers the adverbial and quotative use of all in (2) as new (2001: 128):

(2) (a) So I opened it, and my mother was all mad. (Adv, pre-Adj)
     (b) She was all screaming about the guy. (Adv, pre-progressive)
     (c) She’s all, ‘I didn’t tell you to call him’. (Quotative)

Note Waksler’s examples involve gradable heads: mad in (2a) is clearly gradable, in (2b) was screaming is noncompletive, and in (2c) Quotative all evokes Quotative like, which has been said to signal that the speaker is approximating (not totally representing) the quotation (Romaine & Lange, 1991).

Functionally, Adverb all has collocated with both nongradable and gradable heads throughout the history of English, although the types of gradable contexts available have significantly increased in number over time. Structurally, usages of Adverb all with adjectives (2a) and with progressives (2b) are, in fact, very old. In terms of register, throughout the history of English, Adverb all has occurred in written texts that do not necessarily represent conversation. In the nineteenth century there is some evidence that its use in certain collocations came to be associated with women and children. Its quotative function (2c), is, however, new. It may be the case that the recent functional and structural extension of all, and its partial register restriction, have triggered the (clearly mistaken) perception that all of all’s adverbial functions are new.

In a diachronic case study of Adverb all, we intend to shed light on the multiple adverbial functions of all, and on the question why it might be that certain items such as all come to be stereotyped as ‘new’ when in fact they are not. We will also support the proposal that the distributional and semantic properties of all and other top-of-scale modifiers in combination with their heads are better conceptualized in terms of the boundedness rather than the gradability of the head (see Kennedy & McNally, 2005; Paradis, 2001).

The outline of the article is as follows. We start by establishing the categories relevant for this study (section 2) followed by an account of Adverb all from Old English through

---

2 We prefer the term ‘degree modifier’ to ‘intensifier’ since this avoids possible confusion of ‘intensifier’ with the subset of degree modifiers that scale their heads high (Quirk et al., 1985: 567 include ‘downtoners’ as well as ‘amplifiers’ in their class of ‘intensifiers’).

to Present-day English in corpora (section 3). In section 4 we turn to some broader theoretical issues: the persistence of ambiguities and indeterminacies over time, and why an item like intensifier all as in (2a) might be considered ‘new’, even though it is in fact very old. Section 5 summarizes.

2 Distinctions relevant for this study

Various distinctions will be of importance in our account of the development of Adverb all. We begin by discussing the distinction between scalar and totality modifiers and show that it is heuristically advantageous to conceptualize these modifiers as harmonizing with their syntactic heads (adjectives, participles, nouns, etc.) in terms of boundedness and nonboundedness. Then we mention the ambiguity between quantifier-floated all and Adverb all.

2.1 Scalar vs totality modifiers

Degree modifiers are a set of adverbs that modify the concepts denoted by their heads in the sense that they scale their heads from bottom to top (for different subclassifications, consider Allerton, 1987; Bäcklund, 1973; Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad & Finegan, 1999; Bolinger, 1972; Borst, 1902; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Paradis, 1997; Quirk et al., 1972, 1985; Stoffel, 1901).

Semantically, a subset of degree modifiers which has been termed ‘reinforcers’ (Paradis, 2000), are associated with high degree, e.g. adverbs such as all, quite, very, etc. Functionally, they are operators in the sense that they modify their heads by scaling them up an imaginary scale. Hence, reinforcers assign a high value on a scale to their heads. Paradis (1997, 2000) argues that degree modifiers as well as the adjectival heads they modify can be conceptualized according to two ‘modes of construal’, which she terms ‘scalarity’ and ‘totality’. There are two types or reinforcers that scale upwards. Scalar ‘boosters’ (e.g. greatly, very), which push their complements up the scale, tend to modify gradable adjectives. By comparison, ‘totality modifiers’ (e.g. totally, utterly) fix their properties on the ‘extreme of the scale’ (Quirk et al., 1985: 590) and may co-occur with nongradable adjectives (e.g. dead, pregnant).

Since degree modifiers collocate not only with adjectives, but also with verbs and nouns, it has recently been pointed out that the terms ‘bounded’ and ‘nonbounded’ might be more useful than ‘nongradable’ vs ‘gradable’ in capturing the similarities among adjectives, verbs, and nouns and the contextual effects relevant to adverbial modifiers (see e.g. Kennedy & McNally, 2005; Paradis, 2001; also Suzuki & Yamagishi, 1999).

3 Suzuki & Yamagashi (1999) provide a useful comparison of classifications provided by Bäcklund (1973) and Quirk et al. (1972, 1985).
4 Quirk et al. (1985) call them ‘amplifiers’.
5 The term ‘booster’ is used by Quirk et al. (1985), Altenberg (1991), Paradis (2000), among others.
6 Quirk et al. (1985) call this subclass ‘maximizers’; Allerton (1987) uses the term ‘absolutes’.
The properties denoted by adjectives are either bounded (identical, dead) or nonbounded (nice, boring). Paradis (2001) speaks of a ‘definite boundary’; Kennedy & McNally (2005) use the term ‘closed end of scale’. Telic and ingressive verbs (e.g. finish, eat up, begin) represent actions that can be conceptualized as bounded, whereas the actions and states represented by incompletive verbs (e.g. run, sing) are nonbounded. Likewise count nouns refer to bounded entities (‘individuals’), while mass nouns refer to entities conceptualized as homogeneous and nonbounded; compare plant with milk: the former can be construed as a mass noun by quantifying it as in There is a lot of plant in this picture, and the latter can be construed as a count noun by delimiting it as in a bottle of milk, but these are considered to be special uses.

Crucially, degree modifiers tend to harmonize with the boundedness of the heads they modify, as schematized in (3):

(3) (a) Totality degree modifiers collocate with bounded heads.
    (b) Scalar degree modifiers collocate with nonbounded heads.

Individual degree modifiers vary considerably regarding how constrained they are with respect to (3a) or (3b), and within these broad schemas, to specific lexical heads (Altenberg, 1991; Kennedy & McNally, 2005). Some, such as absolutely or perfectly, have been shown to collocate mainly with bounded heads (absolutely clear, perfectly true). Very, which is generally referred to as a prototypical degree modifier, is preferred with nonbounded heads (cf. very difficult, very happy).

Some degree modifiers can pattern with bounded as well as nonbounded heads, e.g. perfectly closed (bounded), perfectly nice (nonbounded). When all collocates with a bounded head it reinforces the boundedness and signals that the properties denoted by the head are construed as being at the highest end/top of the scale, as in all closed, all caught up, all anemic. When Adverb all collocates with heads with nonbounded meaning, however, it boosts the gradable property up the scale, as in all hot, all sad, all mad.

Altenberg (1991: 142) suggests that ‘words that are basically scalar can be reinterpreted as nonscalar and vice versa’. Historically, though, it is more common for bounded and nonscalar words to be given nonbounded meanings than vice versa. This has become especially evident for adjectives in the twentieth century, when a relativistic ideology led to the construal of true, unique, etc. as nonbounded in some of their uses, and medical technology made various degrees of dead possible. Over time, top-of-scale totality modifiers may become scalar modifiers, cf. very ‘truly’ > ‘to a high degree’, and, more recently, truly, but not vice versa (Paradis, 2000; Stoffel, 1901; Traugott, 2006). In this article, we will demonstrate that the historical record shows just this progression for Adverb all.

7 Ideological battles over the boundedness of certain terms like true or dead can have major cultural and legal consequences, but in general speakers seem to cope well with the nonabsoluteness of the distinctions outlined here between totality and scalar modifiers.
2.2 Quantifier-floated vs Adverb all

In Present-day English most clauses with mass nouns, plural count nouns or even singular countable nouns that can be conceptualized as divisible into subcomponents (such as family) + copula + all are ambiguous between ‘floated quantifier’ and adverb constructions as in (4) with a plural count subject, and (5) with a singular mass subject:

(4) The players were all sexy.\(^8\)
   = (a) All the players were sexy. (Quant-float: Adj all = ‘every’; scope over the players were sexy)
   (b) The players were totally sexy. (Adv = ‘completely’; scope over sexy)

(5) The water was all dried up.
   = (a) All the water was dried up.
   (b) The water was completely dried up.

Quantificational all, however, cannot co-occur with singular countable nouns that are conceptualized as nondivisible, as discussed in Gouro (2000: 91, citing Bobaljik, 1995):

(6) (a) *All the boy might be wet.
   (b) *The boy might all be wet.

(7) is, however, possible:

(7) The boy might be all wet.

As (6b) and (7) illustrate, in Present-day English, syntactic cues help disambiguate between quantifier and intensifier function. When an auxiliary is present, Adverb all follows the auxiliary cluster and precedes the main verb; if no auxiliary is present, it follows the main verb (usually be or other copular).\(^9\) Because of the distributional and semantic differences, Gouro (2000) proposes that there are two different items, one a quantifier, the other an ‘intensifying’ degree modifier.

Drawing further on Bobaljik (1995), Gouro implies that Adverb all is ‘intensifying’ with an adjective, but ‘completive’ with a verb. (8b) is a quantifier-floated variant of (8a) (note the position of all between the auxiliary and the main verb); (8c), in which all is in postauxiliary position, is not possible since Adverb all is completive, but (8d) is possible, as eaten is here understood as eaten up (completive).

(8) (a) All these apples have been eaten by the children.
   (b) These apples have all been eaten by the children.
   (c) #These apples have been all eaten to some extent.
   (d) This apple has been all eaten. (based on Gouro, 2000: 91)

\(^8\) We may note that this example, which appears to be entirely acceptable to users of all, falsifies Bolinger’s claim that all as an ‘intensifier’ collocates with participles and adjectives ‘that indicate accident rather than essence’, hence: The can is all empty but *Those ideas are all empty (Bolinger, 1972: 47–8). As we will see, adjectives indicating ‘essence’ appear from OE to the present day.

\(^9\) We will discuss constructions such as She all walks in, which have only started to appear in PDE, in section 3.5.
As we will see, the distributional distinction between Adverb *all* as ‘intensifier’ with adjectives and ‘completive’ with verbs tells only part of the story: it can occur with both adjectives and verbs as either a totality modifier or as a scalar modifier, depending on the boundedness of the head.

3 The history of Adverb *all*

We turn now to a brief history of the development of Adverb *all*, basing our discussion on the large number of diachronic studies of degree modifiers, e.g. Stoffel (1901), Peters (1994), Denison (2001), Lorenz (2002), Nevalainen & Rissanen (2002). We will use the periodization found in the Helsinki Corpus: Old English (OE) c. 650–1150, Middle English (ME) 1150–1500, Early Modern English (EModE) 1500–1750, Modern English (ModE) 1750–1970, and Present-day English (PDE) from 1970 onwards.

‘Adjective’ *all* has been used from the earliest texts on with approximately the same meaning of ‘collective totality’ (Jespersen, 1965 [1949]) or ‘total distributivity’ (Roberts, 1987), depending on the nature of the head (see *all women, all milk vs all covered*). Despite the label ‘adjective’ in most dictionaries and grammars of earlier English, *all* is throughout its history more properly analyzed as a Quantifier or Predeterminer (with postdeterminer uses in certain OE constructions).\(^{10}\) Examples of this *all* will be given mainly for the OE period only. Adverb *all* (hereafter Adv*all*) has coexisted with Quantifier *all* (hereafter Quant*all*) from the earliest records. However, the kinds of constraints on syntactic position in the VP illustrated in (6) arose considerably later, after the development of syntactic auxiliaries in the sixteenth century.

It is hypothesized by the *OED* (*all* C. adv., I, 1), that Adv*all* in English is historically derived from Quantifier float (Quant-float). Since both are available in OE, we have not tested this. However, the similarities in meaning between the Quantifier and the Adverb in its totality meaning are too close for it to be plausible that they are unrelated, especially in view of the fact that ambiguity between a construction with floated-quantifier *all* and an adverbial degree modifier *all* is crosslinguistically attested (Gouro, 2000 cites Japanese, Straits Salish, and French). We may hypothesize that a change prior to OE would have involved reanalysis from Quantifier/Determiner in noncanonical (floated) position to adverb in canonical position; the reanalysis would automatically have allowed Adv*all* to occur in clauses with singular subjects.

Because of the distributional properties of Quantifier and Adverb constructions outlined in 2.2 above, in this article we have focused on tokens of *all* with singular count noun subjects and, from ME on (when word order became relatively fixed), in postcopular position. Prosodic factors might help distinguish Quant-float and Adv*all*. Quirk et al. (1985: 599) point out with respect to *quite* that ‘as compromiser, it is usually stressed only lightly; as diminisher it is heavily stressed or actually made

\(^{10}\) However, David Denison (2006) discusses reasons to doubt the full applicability of the term determiner prior to ME.
nuclear’. Something similar might be the case with all. However, as we do not have direct information for the earlier stages of English, we have not included prosody in our considerations here, even of PDE.

3.1 Old English

In OE the Quantifier eall (inflected for gender, number, and case) is a Predeterminer with nominals (9a), but usually a Postdeterminer with pronouns (9b); we refer to this as Quant-eall. If the subject is a pronoun and the verb is a copula, the Quantifier is preferred in postverbal position (9c), a position that in PDE would be considered Quant-float, but which in OE is less clearly so because of the word-order flexibility:

351

By contrast, the Adverb eall (‘Adv-eall’) was uninflected. Forms with adverbial derivational morphology also occur: ealle, ealles, and eallunga. This means that the Adverb was potentially ambiguous with the Quantifier in nominative singular or accusative neuter singular (eall), with nominative and accusative plural, and feminine accusative singular (ealle), and (much less frequently) genitive masculine and neuter singular (ealles). This potential ambiguity occurs primarily in postcopular contexts where Quant-float may have occurred. As in contemporary data, context may help favor a Quant-float or Adv reading, as in the case of (9c) and (9d). If hie wæron ealle gefylled, or his æhta wæron ealle amyrrede were read out of context, we might assume ealle is fully ambiguous (‘all of them were filled’ or ‘they were completely filled’; ‘all his possessions were scattered’ or ‘his possessions were all scattered’). However, in (9c) the context of ealle in the prior and ætgædere in the following clause renders the Quantifier reading of eall highly preferred. Likewise, in (9d) the prior context

11 Examples in this section are all from the DOE.
enumerates the possessions (sheep, oxen, etc.), in terms of hundreds and thousands, so the Quantifier reading seems preferred.

The most likely position in which Adveall in the sense ‘completely’ is a possible reading is between a be-verb (copula or auxiliary) and a past participle, as in (9c, d). Most of the past participles with which eall collocates have a bounded meaning, and are stative/resultative. The derivational prefixes ge-, a- in (9c, d), for-, to- in (10a), be- in (10b), of- in (10c), ofer- in (10d), and ymb- in (10e) denote completion, in other words telic or bounded Aktionsart according to Quirk & Wrenn (1957: 118) and Brinton (1988: 204–12). Brinton points out that be- and ymb- are less regularly telic than for-, to-, ofer- (1988: 209–10), but all are directional in origin and consistent with telicity.

(10) (a) He eall innan samod forsweled ðæs and toborsten
He all inside entirely burned-up was and burst-apart (= ’all of him’/’he was completely’) (ÆCHom I. 221.127)
(b) Eall ic ðæs mid blode bestemed
All I was with blood covered (’all of me’/’I was entirely’) (Dream Rood 48)
(c) Eald is þæs eorðsele, eall ic com oflongad
Old is this barrow; all of me is oppressed with longing (= ’all of me’/’I am entirely’) (Wife’s Lament 29)
(d) & þæs muntes cnol mid þeosterlicum gehnipum eall oferhangen
and that mountain’s summit with dark clouds entirely overhung
ðæs was (ÆCHom I: 467.55)
(e) þeah he were mid irne eall ymbfangen
although it [the tomb] were with iron entirely surrounded (Christ and Satan l. 515)

Eall in (10a–d), in which the participle is clearly bounded, is ambiguous between Quant-float and Adveall. In (10e) Quant-float is implausible, at least from a modern perspective, partly because an adverb intervenes between the copula and eall.

Another context in which the Totality Modifier reading is possible is before Totality Modifying adverbs such as (full ‘fully’). In (11) a Quantifier reading (’All of her is faithful’) is implausible, but the Adv reading seems appropriate, if slightly redundant (’She is completely utterly faithful’):

(11) Heo is swaðeah eall full geleaflic
She is however all fully faithful (ÆCHom II: 298.16)

The DOE data base suggests that Adveall could also be used in OE with the Scalar Modifier function, but examples are rare. Contexts in which this reading seems likely include the present participle bifigende ‘shaking’ (12a), and the presumably nonbounded adjective cene ‘bold, arrogant’ (12b):

12 Ge- and a- are the least strongly associated with telicity of the set of prefixes given here and in the works cited. If eall in (9c, d) is read as Adv, its collocation with a past participle of a root with a ge- or a- prefix may be assumed to reinforce or even evoke a telic reading of the participle.
While our concern in this article is with Advall as an independent word, its development in compounds and fixed (idiomatized and univerbated) phrases also sheds some light on how it was understood (see Brinton & Traugott, 2005 for a study of such forms with all as the first element; also Borst, 1902: 28–33). In OE there are some compounds derived from eall and a nonbounded adjective (e.g. ealgrene ‘all green’), and a set of religious terms, largely calqued from Latin (most notably eallmihtig/œlmihtig ‘almighty’). However, there are no compounds with bounded adjectives or participles. It appears that in all instances the first element of the compound is Advall with Scalar Modifier function, which scales the adjective high up on the scale.

In the grammatical domain there is one fixed adverb phrase which appears to involve Quantall: ealne weg > ealneg > elneg ‘always’ (originating in ‘all (the) way’, i.e. a spatial expression). Interestingly, here we can see a semantic shift from ‘to the fullest extent of time’ (a bounded meaning) to ‘repeatedly’, in other words, from temporal completiveness to temporal nonboundedness (iterativity) as the term came to be extended from individual actions to plural actions. Quantall also combines with swa as a concessive connective meaning ‘although’; we will return to this in the ME section below, since several concessives with all- developed in that period. In a few instances Advall combines with another expression to form a quantifier or adverb which, though boosted, is not scaled to the highest degree (e.g. ealfela ‘very many’, eall mœst ‘almost’).

In sum, as an independent word, Advall in OE is primarily used with bounded, telic heads where it reinforces the boundedness/completeness of the resultant state denoted by the participle. It also co-occurs in a few instances with nonbounded heads such as adjective cene in (12b), where it means ‘exceedingly’. The preponderance of collocations with bounded heads suggests that, assuming reanalysis of Quant-float was the source of Advall, this reanalysis had occurred not long before, perhaps in Proto-Germanic. An alternative hypothesis is that a far older original quantifier meaning of collective totality or total distributivity was stable and still constrained the use of the Adv.
With respect to distribution, by the beginning of the first millennium, Adveall was available in the following string:

be-verb – Part/Adj/AdvMod

By very late OE it came to be extended to prepositional phrases expressing full extension, as in (14):

(14) Se kyng . . . lai þære eall ofer Pentecostewuce
   ‘The king . . . lay there all/entirely through Pentecost week’ (1123, ChronE)

Possibly this was the result of reanalysis of collocation with participles of verbs with aspectual derivational prefixes that originated in directional and spatial prepositions and adverbs, e.g. eall [oferhungen] > eall ofer [X].

3.2 Middle English

In OE past participles (both adjectival and participial) with bounded meaning are the prime collocates of eall. During the ME period there was an increase in collocations with adjectives, either bounded as in (15):13

(15) þou ært al dead, butan þou do mine read
    ‘You will be entirely dead unless you take my advice’ (a1225 (?a1200), Lay Brut 690 [MED al Adv 1])

or nonbounded as in (16):

(16) Of him-self he wex al sad
    ‘By himself he became all/very sad’ (a1400 (a1325), Cursor 1240 [MED ibid.])

Collocations with adverbs were extended from adverbal modifiers to manner adverbs (Mustanoja, 1960), as in (17), where it appears to function as a Scalar Modifier:

(17) Al priuely behinde his bak
    ‘all secretly behind his back’ (Gower CA I. 2069 [ Mustanoja, 1960: 316])

There was also a dramatic increase in fixed phrase and univerbated adverbs. Some involve Quantall, e.g. al aboute(n) ‘in all directions’, almost < OE eall + mast ‘all + most’, and a set of adverbs meaning ‘always’ of which the first three were spatial in origin: al-wi(e)es < OE ealne + weg ‘always’; algate(s) < Old Norse all götu ‘all ways’; alwise < OE (on) ealle wise ‘in every way’; al-times ‘all times’. Of these, the first, always, won out.14 Particularly interesting is the use of eall in concessive expressions, cf. although; albeit; al if, and even all by itself (18a):

13 An anonymous reviewer suggested that there may have been influence from Old Norse, in which there was a very productive prefix, al-, that could be attached to both bounded and unbounded participles, adjectives and adverbs.

14 The -s in always and the other adverbs is etymologically adverbial -es, not plural.
(18) (a) *al* were he ifulled of þe hoste ... yet ne dorste he wunien among men
   ‘although were he filled with the holy-ghost ... yet not dared he live among men’ (c.1225 *Ancrene Riwle* 70/10 [Molencki, 1997])
(b) *Albeit* that the Frenche Kyng’s Revenuz be ... miche gretter
   ‘although the French king’s revenues are ... much larger’ (c.1460 Fortescue *Abs. & Lim. Mon* [OED])

This is not the appropriate place for an analysis of the steps by which *all* came to be used in concessives. We may note, however, that in OE concessive clauses with *peah* ‘though’, *eall* often appeared in the predicate (see (10e)). König (1985: 9) considers that ‘emphatic elements like *all*’ originally strengthened the concessive and eventually combined with it (see also Borst, 1902). We may suppose that *all* was used to ‘give a factual character’ to the antecedent p (König, 1985: 13) and to mark its presuppositional nature: ‘given the entire condition that p, yet q’.15

Other fixed phrases and univerbated adverbs derive from Adv*eall*: *alone* < ME *eall ane* ‘completely one’, *al out* ‘utterly’, *alredi* ‘completely ready’ > ‘by this time’ (perfective temporal). For the most part these forms have bounded meaning.

### 3.3 Early Modern English

Mustanoja (1960: 318) claims that Adv*all* ‘becomes uncommon’ with adjective and adverb heads after the ME period. This is partially confirmed by Peters’ (1994) study of degree adverbs in EModE: he cites six occurrences of *all* in the very late ME *Shillingford Letters* (fifteenth century), but only one in his EModE data bases. However, it clearly did not die out, as the examples in (19) show. Many, especially those in Shakespeare’s works, are ambiguous with Quant-float. Note, however, that in (19e) the redundancy of *whole* ... *all* suggests that ‘completely’ is the preferred reading of *all*. The special interest of (19d) is that *all* is present in the Quarto edition (cited here), but not in the Folio edition of 1623.

(19) (a) The lady wente oute of her wytte and was *al* demonyak (= possessed by the devil) a long tyme (1483, Caxton, *G. de la Tour Cvij* [OED])
(b) Said thus, with eyes *all* trembling, faint and wasted (1600, Bodenham, *Englands Helicon* [LION, EEBO])
(c) Watching breedes leanenesse, leanenesse is *all* gaunt (1595, Shakespeare, *Richard II* II.i.78; John of Gaunt is punning on himself [EAS])
(d) Her husband hath beaten her that she is *all* Blkke and blew poore soule (c.1597, Shakespeare, *Merry Wives Windsor* IV.v.117 [EAS])
(e) our whole discourse/Is *all* of her (a.1598, Shakespeare, *Much Ado* III.i.5 [EAS])
(f) *Iohn.* We meete like men that had forgot to speake.
   *War.* We do remember, but our argument/*Is all too heauy* to admit much talke (1598, Shakespeare, *II Henry IV* V.ii.22 [EAS])
(g) He speaks, and looks, and loves, like any God!/*All fine and gay, all manly, and all sweet* (1682, Behn, *The City Heiress* [UVa])

15 König (1985: 10) points out that universal quantifiers and ‘emphatic particles’ are among crosslinguistic sources of concessive markers, many of which, like *although*, are composite in form.
During this period, as the syntactic AUX system came into being (with the well-known properties of inversion in questions, negative placement, and do-support) adverbs came to occupy their present positions with respect to the tensed verb (Jacobson, 1981). Negative not, temporals such as always, epistemics such as probably, and manner adverbs such as willingly came to follow the finite auxiliary or precede the main verb (see She would willingly have changed it, She willingly changed it). However, most degree modifiers, including all, did not participate in this shift (see You may be pretty/very sure they won’t come, *You may pretty/very be sure), since they modify their immediate heads. As a result, the distributional difference noted in section 2.2 between Advall and Quantall developed. By the seventeenth century we find the beginnings of the present distribution of postverbal Advall (20a) and post-auxiliary Quantall (20b):

(20) (a) The King did also send two gilt Keyes to his Highnesse . . . to the end that his Palace might be all open vnto them (b.1623, Bristol, A True Relation and Journall [LION, EEBO])
(b) but they must all be voluntarie, that they might all be meritorious (1604, Bilson, The Survey of Christs Sufferings [LION, EEBO])

Remaining as it did in postverbal position, Advall was extended to more copular verbs such as become (21a). A new syntactic environment also became available: preceding a nominal head, typically a mass noun (21a, b) or a count noun understood in an abstract sense (21c). This occurs in predicates that attribute abstract or sensory properties to the subject:

(21) (a) remarked to him the great change in the temper of her daughter, ‘who from being,’ she said, ‘one of the liveliest, merriest girls in the world, was, on a sudden, become all gloom and melancholy.’ (1749, Fielding, Tom Jones [UVa])
(b) Sir, I am all Obedience. [Bowing and sighing.] (1682, Behn, The City Heiress [UVa])
(c) Mrs. Modern. . . .the Moment she enter’d the Stage, I have wish’d my self all Eyes (= all seeing) L. Richly. And the Moment A la Fama sung, I have wish’d my self all Ears (= all hearing) (1732, Fielding, Modern Husband III.i [LION, English Prose Drama])

If independent all became less common, compounding with all became more productive in the EModE period. Compounds appear not only with adjectives (all-eloquent), but also nouns (all-heart, all-star). According to the OED (all, C. adv, II, E 6), since 1600 all- has ‘become a possible prefix, in poetry at least, to any adj. of quality’. It is adjoined to many past and most present participles (all-armed, all-binding, all-convincing) and adjectives (all-good, adjust). Nevalainen (1999: 419) cites EModE all-admired, all-dreaded, all-honoured, all-praised with what she calls ‘intensifier all “fully”’ (i.e. Advall).

In sum, by the end of the EModE period, Advall was still potentially ambiguous with Quant-float except in the context of auxiliaries, and could occur in the string:

\[ \text{Copular V} \quad \text{Adj/Part/Adv/PP/NP} \]
3.4 Modern English

In the ModE period examples of Adv in the same contexts abound, as illustrated in (22). In (22a) all modifies a bounded Adj, in (22b) a nonbounded one, in (22c) a bounded and in (22d) a nonbounded past participial, in (22e) a present participle. It is interesting to note that, in our data prior to PDE, if all collocates with a present participle, it is most likely to be a verb of trembling (see OE bifigende in (13b), trembling in (22e)). (22f) illustrates Advall modifying a Prepositional Phrase, and (22g) modifying a mass N:

(22) (a) Her curiosity was all awake (1814, Austen, Mansfield Park [UVa])
(b) Her silky coat was all sweaty and muddy (1915, Bryant, How to Tell Stories to Children [UVa])
(c) ‘Yes, indeed,’ answered the child. ‘I am all tired out’ (1900, Baum, Wizard of Oz [UVa])
(d) Morel felt his body flame with pain, as he realised what he was all bewildered (1913, Lawrence, Sons and Lovers [UVa])
(e) I could see him all trembling and twitching, like a man with palsy (1886, Stevenson, Kidnapped [UVa])
(f) I found myself face to face with a prim little old maid. She was all in a flutter, the poor old dear! (1905, Stevenson, Essays of Travel [UVa])
(g) Mr. Elton was all obligation and cheerfulness (1815, Austen, Emma [UVa])

Some expressions, such as all tired out (22c), and all upset, all excited, appear to be mainly associated with children, women, and speech in the ModE corpus (UVa). Others, such as all N (22g), are particularly common in novels of manners. In other words, there appear to be some register effects that are worthy of investigation.

The ModE period also witnessed extension of Adv all in two domains. One is predicate nominals. As we have seen, in EModE these uses were constrained primarily to predicates with mass nouns and expressions that denote cognitive and psychological attitudes, experiences, and manners. In the earlier ModE period we also find them with predicates denoting types of people, as in (23); here the first conjuncts appear to be adjectival (Jacobin, Federal in values, affiliation or beliefs), but the third is nominal (Lumination, or ‘light/lighting’):

(23) ‘What!’ said Isabel, ‘I thought you didn’t belong to the French Party, Tony.’ ‘Oh, no, I’m all Jacobin, all Federal, all Lumination, only I an’t no dum Tory’ (1851, Judd, Margaret [UVa])

In all these cases, the nominal provides a definite description of the subject. By the twentieth century personal names begin to appear as in (24), where it is understood that the subject is acting like or adopting characteristics associated with N that are relevant to the discourse:

(24) If Mr. Morley does go all Rider Haggard for a few pages (1935, Punch [OED])

Such usages support the hypothesis that a personal name has a partial meaning, at least ‘base level’ meanings such as human, male (Van Langendonck, 1999), and is loosely
‘connected with characteristics of the object to which they refer’ (Searle, 1969: 170). While a personal name is not the equivalent of definite descriptions, ‘[t]he immense pragmatic convenience of proper names in our language lies precisely in the fact that they enable us to refer publicly to objects without being forced to raise issues and come to an agreement as to which descriptive characteristics exactly constitute the identity of the object’ (ibid.: 172). In (24) the speaker is evoking Rider Haggard as a type of writer (presumably one who uses a colorful style and African adventure content).

(24) also illustrates the second domain of extension: the general class of copular verbs. In these constructions the head is construed as having ‘current or resulting attributes’ (Quirk et al., 1985: 1171). In addition to be, which was used from OE on, and become, that became a collocate in later EModE (see (20b)), in ModE we find go (24), turn (25a), get (25b), and feel (25c):

(25) (a) I no longer know my own house. It’s turned all topsey-turvey (1773, Goldsmith, She Stoops to Conquer; act IV [LION, 18thC drama])
(b) don’t I come from London? – don’t I act Hamlet, and to what? – not enough to pay the lighting? – but can’t stay – must go look after the tricks – must get all smooth’ gainst great man’s arrival (ibid.)
(c) She put me in them new clothes again, and I couldn’t do nothing but sweat and sweat, and feel all cramped up (1884, Twain, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn) [UVa])

The ModE period was also one of expansion and idiomatization of fixed phrases such as all over the place (‘distributed over space’ > ‘muddled, disorganized’). Note that this involves semantic shifts from totality to scalar meaning.

In sum, the ModE period was one of increase in the lexical types of heads that Adv all could occur with, and of the composite lexicalizations in which it participated, but no new structural patterns emerged.

3.5 Present-day English

For the present day we used two databases that are not strictly comparable with those for earlier periods. One was the Tape-Recorded Corpus of the Stanford ALL Project (TRC) which consists of sociolinguistically accountable interview data collected in 1995–2005 from California high school and college students (ages 15–25). The other was the Multisource ALL Corpus of the Stanford ALL Project (MSAC), which includes overheard examples from natural conversation and media sources, IRC messages, blogs, and the results of Google searches (therefore mostly written).

Two context types that were available in earlier English are used with greater frequency in these corpora. One is present participles as in (26), which show that the construction is no longer associated with verbs of trembling (this earlier restriction may, however, be an artifact of the data used, not of the linguistic system). Note that in (26b) there are three types of all: Predeterminer (all the family), Adv (all giving; presence of the initial all favors an Adv over Quant-float reading), and the new Quotative all (discussed below).
HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF ADVERB ALL

(26) (a) I’m watching it and I’m all laughing and whatever (TRC)
(b) All the family’s all giving me hugs, I’m all ‘Uhhhh’ (MSAC)

The other context type that is more frequent than in the ModE data is following a copular verb and preceding a proper name:

(27) (a) Little Joe is all Walter Mitty at the other end of the apartment (MSAC)
(b) I think she is feeling all Joan Crawford because of the other night (MSAC)
(c) Yeah, when we went to deal with that vampire nest, she got all Rambo and torched the place (Buffy the Vampire Slayer [MSAC])
(d) Are you gonna come here and go all Dawson on me every time I have a boyfriend? (Buffy the Vampire Slayer [MSAC])

Two new constructions are attested in the data. One is Adv'all followed by a tensed verb (28). Here the class of heads that all can modify has been extended; note this is not an extension of the class of copulars, since the latter are not heads of all; it is an extension to a new syntactic position.

(28) (a) and the guy was scared and he all jumped and snatched his news article! (MSAC)
(b) yeah i all screamed when we hit the skunk i never hit anything before… (MSAC)

It is possible that this new position arises out of a new reanalysis of a quantifier-float construction, this time not in copula contexts such as They were all sexy (2), but in constructions like (29) where the quantifier occurs after the subject and before the verb:16

(29) The women all went to the beach (= all the women went to the beach)

Since this is the canonical position for most adverbs in PDE, however, there may well simply be analogical shift to the position available for most other adverbs.

The other new construction is the use of all as a quotative marker. It has been attested since 1982 (Alford, 1982; Igoe, Lamb, Gilman & Kim, 1999; Waksler, 2001; Wimmer, 1990) as a new option in a set of reported speech and thought introducers such as go (attested with sounds and gestures since the eighteenth century, but only in PDE with quotations, see Butters, 1980), be like (attested since 1982 in the US, see Butters, 1982), in addition to say, think. Quotative uses of all are exemplified in (30). (30d) illustrates use of all alongside the competing Quotatives say and like:

(30) (a) And he’s all ‘Hook me up with free food’. I said no and asked why I should do that for him and he’s all ‘Cuz cute girls are supposed to hook me up with free food.’ Yeah whatever. (Webpage: Tomatonation [MSAC])
(b) Harmony: I knew you’d take this personally. You are so sensitive! How are you going to kill her? Think! The second you even point that thing at her, you’re

---

16 Analogy to this position might seem unlikely if Quant-float is regarded as involving quantifier/predeterminer all. However, if Bobaljik (2003) is correct and quantifier-floated all is structurally an adverb, then the analogy seems straightforward. Note that such analogy could not have been the path of change in preOE since preverbal position is not criterial before auxiliaries developed in the sixteenth century.
Table 1. Distribution of quotatives in interview database (in frequency percentage of sum of quotative variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>3 SgPersPro (not it)</th>
<th>Present tense</th>
<th>Speech, thought</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to investigate the structural characteristics of Quotative all in our database and to compare its patterning with its competitor Quotatives like, go, say in the TRC, we performed distributional statistics, the results of which are seen in table 1.

Table 1 is to be read as follows: out of all tokens of Quotative all used, 69 per cent occur with third person singular pronominal reference (he, she, but not it); out of all tokens of Quotative like used, 27 per cent occur with third person singular pronominal reference, etc. In our corpus, Quotative all is used mainly in the present tense, and with reported speech rather than thought (see also Rickford, Buchstaller, Traugott, Wasow & Zwicky, 2005). The factor group ‘speech, thought’ might need clarification. It is meant to capture the fact that quotes can introduce unspoken mental activity such as thoughts or opinions as well as outwardly occurring speech. As table 1 shows, all patterns most like the traditional Quotative say in the latter respect, occurring 93 per cent of the time with reported speech. Hence, we find more examples such as (31a), where the quote was clearly uttered and is not just the speaker’s report of some kind of attitude, and fewer instances of examples such as (31b), where ‘what?!’ seems to be the expression of previous unspoken thought or attitude:

(31) (a) He’s all ‘Hook me up with free food’ (MSAC)
(b) I slept 11 hrs on Sunday, and when I got up, I was all, ‘what?!’ (MSAC)

Table 1 further shows that like dominates the set of quotative introducers; other types occur with low overall frequencies. This is true for the old established option say as well as for the newer variants all and go. In fact, Quotative say seems to have given way to like as the default quotative of the young California speakers in our sample (77 say tokens versus 394 like tokens).

---

17 Barbieri (2005) independently found similar results in a study of quotatives; in contrast, Biber et al. (1999: 1120) found that quotative all was favored with past tense, say with present.
Furthermore, in our classification of the quotative variants, we came across a number of quotes that had the sequence Quotative Verb + like ‘quote’ (32).

(32) And she says like ‘What do you have on?’ (MSAC)

In such cases we treated like as a second quotative, which functions as an approximative, hence collapsing these tokens into the category for the respective quotative (say in this case). With respect to all, 19 of the 43 instances of all were all like, as in (33):

(33) W went up to S and he was all like, umm ‘S, I need to wear socks on my ears for uh, for my prank’ (TRC)

For reasons of consistency, these variants were included in the category of Quotative all, which means we treated all as a quotative signaling (relative) accuracy and approximative like as of secondary significance.

It has been argued that Quotative like might have been developed to signal that the quote is an approximate, hence less than perfect, fit between the original speech act and its rendering as a quote (Buchstaller, 2004). There are contexts that call for a verbatim quotation of previous linguistic production (e.g. court cases, academic citations). However, in other situations quotation seems to be based on an unspoken agreement that ‘constructed dialogue’ (Tannen, 1986), i.e. a rendering that is sufficiently close to the original, is close enough (Clark & Gerrig, 1990). This happens especially in talk-in-interaction and its representations in a wide variety of forms of reporting, and in biographies, fiction, etc. In line with this reasoning, we hypothesize that just as like operates on a scale of accuracy, all scales its head (the quote) very close to the previous speech act, at the top of the accuracy scale, i.e. it signals that speakers are making a best effort to reproduce the quote with as much exactness as is called for by the purpose of the quotation. All therefore marks that the following quote contains all the contextually relevant characteristics of the previous speech act, as it does when it precedes proper nouns.

In sum, by PDE Adv all is still potentially ambiguous with Quant-float except in the context of auxiliaries, and can occur in strings of the type:

\[ \text{Copular V ___ Adj / Part / Adv / PP / NP / Quote} \]

\[ ___ V+Tense \]

Previous research has investigated degree modifiers with a focus on their syntactic (e.g. Bäcklund, 1973) and social constraints, zooming in on one position, usually before adjectives (e.g. Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003), or on recurrent collocational sequences (e.g. Altenberg, 1991; Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003; Stenström, 2000), or on specific

18 We acknowledge that there is another way of analyzing this sequence, namely that like functions as the primary quotative, being preceded by all in intensifier function. An anonymous reviewer has suggested that all should be interpreted as the antonym of like in the sense that all has the function of emphasizing what is in its scope whereas like hedges its contents. We agree that this is a valuable hypothesis. However, a test for correlation of quote and quotative in terms of ‘attitude or emotion’ did not show any tendency for all to occur with more emotionally heightened or intense quotes.
sentence types such as declaratives and interrogatives (e.g. Stenström, 1987). While the distributional possibilities evidenced by Advall are unusual, they suggest that degree modifiers may best be understood in their broadest syntactic distribution.

4 Some theoretical issues

The present study raises two questions: how might the ambiguities between quantifier-float and Advall, and indeterminacies between the Totality and Scalarity Modifier function of Adv, have arisen and persisted so long, and why might an item like intensifier all as in (2a) be considered ‘new’, even though it is in fact old?

The myth of Achilles’ heel addresses the first question – if a mother immerses her baby in the magic waters of the river Styx in order to endow him with immortality, she plans to immerse all of the baby, and thereby completely cover him in water. However, if she holds the baby by the heel to achieve this complete immersion, her hand prevents the water from covering part of the heel; nevertheless she (wrongly) thinks the child is ‘all covered in the water’ and that she has been successful in her mission. Linguistically speaking, the shift from quantifier-float to adverb can be understood as a reanalysis of scope: the adverb reading focuses on the result rather than on the whole situation. The indeterminacy between Totality and Scalar Modifier, and the expansion of Scalar Modifier uses, can be understood in terms of cooperative conversational interactions. If we say or hear Johnny was all covered in mud, we do not have to commit ourselves to the truth of the proposition that Johnny was covered in mud everywhere, including his eyes, ears, and hair. We may not even know to what extent Johnny was covered, but all covered in mud serves the purposes of the interaction.

The stability over a millennium of the indeterminacy between Totality and Scalarity readings of Advall and of their ambiguity in many contexts with Quant-float all raises an interesting theoretical issue for historical linguistics. Indeterminacy and especially ambiguity are often assumed to be factors that speakers try to avoid and hence eliminate over time. According to the theory of ‘homonymyphobia’, one of two ambiguous meanings should be lost. The best-known example is Gilliéron’s (1918) suggested replacement of gat ‘cock’ by a form like bigey, when Latin cattus ‘cat’ and gallus ‘cock’ became homonyms. Gilliéron thought of homonymy as a pathological situation that calls for curative devices (Geeraerts, 1997: 123), but seems to have failed to notice that the use of bigey for ‘cock’ itself produced a new ambiguity, since bigey was a local variant of vicaire ‘curate’ (ibid.: 92–3). Geeraerts cites a number of studies which suggest ‘polysemiophobia’ as well: resistance to continued use of polysemies. While division of labor can occur over long periods of time, nevertheless, homonyms and polysemies abound in languages, and can be quite stable, as, for example, the use of many degree modifiers and focus markers shows (cf. pretty, fairly, even). Sometimes even contradictory meanings may coexist, as in the case of sanction ‘approve, give permission’ and ‘impose punitive measures’ (Traugott & Dasher, 2002: 53–4). In many cases what would seem like an ambiguity out of context can be resolved in
context, or by drawing on encyclopedic knowledge, but this is not always possible, and is, of course, the *sine qua non* of puns and riddles.

The theory of homonymyphobia, and of its variants such as ‘pernicious ambiguity’ in syntax (Bever & Langendoen, 1972), rests in part on a theory of isomorphism and ‘one-form-one-meaning’. This in turn rests on the hypothesis that speakers seek to be maximally clear to their addressees, and that addressees assign unique interpretations to input. There is, however, growing evidence from processing studies that production is not always motivated by the perceived needs of the addressee. Rather, speakers use ambiguities, and addressees resolve the ambiguity from contextual information (see e.g. Roland, Elman & Ferreira, 2006; also Wasow, 1997). Such work provides a natural explanation for why it is that ambiguities can persist over time, and not trigger loss of polysemies, homonyms, or ambiguous constructions.

As we mentioned at the beginning, some researchers have considered *all* ‘new’ or ‘conversational’. This may be in part because it has recently been noticed in contexts where the head itself draws attention because it is reconceptualized as nonbounded (e.g. *She’s all pregnant in this episode*),19 where Totality *all* makes little sense or is redundant, e.g. *all totally excited* (Waksler, 2001: 129).20 In such contexts hearers may mistakenly believe that *all* cannot be old because Scalar *all* could not have been ambiguous with Totality Modifiers or with Quant-float for any length of time.

Another possibility is that degree words are conceptualized as ‘a picture of a fevered invention and competition that would be hard to come by elsewhere, for in their nature they are unsettled’ (Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003: 258, citing Bolinger, 1972: 18). This may be in part because Bolinger (1972: 149–53) associated innovative uses of degree adverbs with hyperbole – speakers express themselves in exaggerated ways, which leads to the well-known change called ‘broadening’ (Stern, 1968 [1931]: 310–14) exhibited by such adverbs as *terribly* and *awfully* (see *She’s terribly/awfully happy*). Recent sociolinguistic work has highlighted use of ‘new’ or ‘non-standard’, largely monomorphemic degree modifiers by teenagers, e.g. *enough, well, dead, pure*.21 Although these are said to have totality or ‘maximizer’ use that scales their heads to the very highest point of the scale, which suggests a hyperbolic interpretation, only *all* does in fact appear to be used this way, cf. *all cramped up*. Most examples of these adverbs in their new uses are actually given with nonbounded adjectives, cf. *enough funny, well tacky* (Stenström, 2000), *dead fat, pure close* (Macaulay, 2002).22 We should note, however, that degree modifiers are

---

19 In this example, taken from the MSAC, the speaker refers to Sarah Jessica Parker, the actress who plays the character Carrie in the series *Sex and the City*. While Parker was pregnant in real life, her on-screen character was not. The speaker is discussing the fact that, as Parker was quite far along in her pregnancy – hence looked ‘very pregnant’ or ‘all pregnant’ – she had to conceal her midriff during filming.

20 But see an equivalent locution in OE of around 1000: *eall full geleaflic* ‘all fully faithful’ (11).

21 Many of these appear to be preferred in British rather than American English.

22 Stenström mentions *well kept/known/managed/removed/trailed* among collocations used by adults in the spoken part of the British National Corpus, and *well attended/equipped/prepared* in the written part; these have primarily bounded readings, and seem rather well entrenched. Her main interest is in the use of *well, enough, etc.* by teenagers, in adjectival contexts, and these are mostly nonbounded.
not unique in being highly subject to renewal; many noninflectional grammatical forms are.\(^{23}\)

Factors such as these may have contributed to a linguistic selective attention effect, which Zwicky (2005a) has termed the ‘Recency Illusion’, whereby people believe that ‘things YOU have noticed only recently are in fact recent’. Relatedly, Milroy (forthcoming) finds that changes which have been widely distributed for a very long time become more or less salient at different times (cf. prescriptivism regarding split infinitives and speaker-oriented hopefully).

A further possibility is that the perception of newness is due to a social selective attention effect, a phenomenon that Zwicky (2005b) has called the ‘Adolescent Illusion’. Zwicky points out that people tend to be hyperattentive to adolescent speech. In fact, the collocational patterning of all might have contributed to the selective attention. As mentioned in section 3.4, in ModE certain collocations such as all upset appear to have been associated with women and children. In our PDE corpora, all tends to collocate with lexemes considered typical for younger speakers (bad-ass, hot, perv, hyper, crazy), amongst which we find many derivations in -y (echoey, cuddly, dominatrixy, dressy, freaky, payback-y, poofy, pissy, sketchyspazzy, stay-inny, superhero-y, bendy, cheerleadery). It also features prominently in media representations of young adults and adolescent speech (such as the cartoon Zits or the comic series The Simpsons). In a controlled perceptual experiment,\(^{24}\) Buchstaller & Deeringer (2005) have shown that all as a degree modifier (and as a quotative) is indeed salient as a feature of adolescent speech amongst their 75 respondents.

Whoever perceives a given feature as mainly used by adolescents is faced with the dilemma of how to interpret this patterning; this is the ‘apparent-time problem’, a heuristic problem intrinsic to variationist sociolinguistic analysis. If Adverbial all patterns with high frequencies amongst adolescent speakers and progressively lower frequencies amongst older speakers this might be indicative of two underlying scenarios (Buchstaller, 2006; Chambers, 2003; Labov, 2001; Sankoff, in press). It could be due to a change in progress, whereby innovations start being used by younger speakers only and gradually ripple through the whole community as these speakers grow older. Alternatively, the process underlying the fall in variant-use across the generations could be age grading, a regular process whereby some variants are used by younger speakers only and regularly get lost at a certain age due to societal pressures in a certain life stage (e.g. swear words, nonstandard variants such as walkin’ and talkin’;

\(^{23}\) As Meillet (1958 [1915–16]) pointed out long ago, there are many areas of renewal in language. He cited negation and conjunctions, but in fact most grammatical domains are highly subject to renewal; the expansion of variants in the domain of speech and thought reporting has attracted much attention lately, such as I’m sitting here + Quote (Stein, 1990), done that + Quote (Macaulay, n.d.), in addition to go/be like + Quote; modality is also currently highly active, as the development of quasi-modals (e.g. fixing to, better, in addition to ought to, be going to, got to, etc.) attests; see e.g. Cort & Denison (2005); Krug (2000).

\(^{24}\) Based on a social attitudes questionnaire with 75 US informants, 50 per cent of whom are above and 50 per cent below 25, from all over the USA.
Table 2. Distributional expansion of Advall with respect to syntactic context types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Cop</th>
<th><em>Adj</em></th>
<th><em>Part</em></th>
<th><em>Adv</em></th>
<th><em>PP</em></th>
<th><em>NP</em></th>
<th><em>Quote</em></th>
<th><em>V</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(be)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EModE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cf. Bourdieu & Boltanski, 1975; Sankoff & Laberge, 1978). A definite answer as to which of the two processes underlies the perceived patterning requires diachronic information: if the feature has been around in earlier times with similar frequencies, this points to age grading; alternatively, if the feature is much less frequent before or unattested, this points to a change in progress. As we have shown in this article, Quotative all is definitely a case of change in progress. All as a degree modifier, however, has been attested since OE. Token frequencies may have changed (e.g. there was a dip in token frequency in EModE), and the contextual type (syntactic categories of head and also lexical heads) has been consistently expanded. However, functionally, Adverb all is definitely not new. We hypothesize that the advent of newcomer Quotative all might have increased the saliency of Adverb all and triggered a perceptual generalization whereby some people have overextended the process that underlies Quotative all (a change in progress) to Adverb all.

5 Summary

In this article we have shown that Advall has had a long history. Over time the types of predicate it can follow and the types of head before which it can occur have been expanded as shown in table 2.

We have also shown that the harmonic relationship between Advall (and presumably its congeneres, completely, entirely, totally, utterly, etc.) and its heads is best conceived in terms of boundedness rather than gradability (see Kennedy & McNally, 2005; Paradis, 2001). When all scales its head at the extreme upper end (top-of-scale), it is a Totality Modifier, hence it collocates with bounded heads. When it collocates with nonbounded heads, it is at the high end of a continuum with other Scalar Modifiers (see also Altenberg, 1991). While Advall was primarily a Totality Modifier in OE, its uses as a Scalar Modifier expanded over time. Unlike some earlier Totality Modifiers such as quite and very it has, however, continued to index the relatively high end of the

25 Yet another factor may be social class. Macaulay (1995, 2002) shows that in Glasgow and Ayr, Scotland, middle-class adults and adolescents are more likely than working-class speakers to use adverbs and adjectives to make emphatic statements or hedges.
scale, often being paraphrasable by ‘exceedingly’. It is possible that this is due to its homonymy with Quantall.

We suggest that a full understanding of how degree modifiers function and develop would ideally require as broad an analysis as possible, taking into account structural and functional perspectives as well as considerations such as processing and sociolinguistic selection.

Sources of data from OE to ModE

*DOE Dictionary of Old English.* http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/o/oec/
*LION Chadwyck Healey website.* http://lion.chadwyck.com
*MSAC Multisource ALL Corpus, Changing ALL Project, Stanford University:* includes overheard examples, IRC messages, blogs, results of Google searches
*TRC Tape-Recorded Corpus, Changing ALL Project, Stanford University:* Interview data from California high school and college students (ages 15–25), collected in 1995–2005
*UVa. University of Virginia, Electronic Text Center, Modern English Collection.* http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/modeng/modeng0.browse.html
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