MONOSEMY, STAGE-LEVEL PREDICATION AND THE ADVERB *ALL*[*]

Christine M. Pittman
University of Toronto

In this paper we will consider the adverb *all*. Examples of the kind of sentences that will be examined are given in (1)-(5).

(1) Hey-hey! Oh, look at you, <u>all</u> sexy.

(2) This is how you like your guys, <u>all</u> GQ'ed up huh?

(3) You don't see Ross getting <u>all</u> chaotic and twirly every time they come.

(4) The problem is, what kind of girl is gonna go out with a guy who's acting <u>all</u> joe regular by day and then turns <u>all</u> demon-hunter by night?

(5) No, I just feel <u>all</u> funky.

The main claims of this paper are a) that *all* in its adverbial form only occurs in predication environments, b) the predicate used with *all* must be interpreted as stage-level, c) the core meaning of the adverb is equivalent to the meaning of the word *remarkably* or *completely* and d) while it seems like there could be three distinct adverbial *all*s, these are actually a single lexical entry. Before discussing the distribution and meaning of *all*, the corpus that was used in this study will be discussed. Following this will be a discussion of Waksler's (2001) analysis of the adverbial *all* and then the evidence that supports the claims listed above will be considered.

1.   The Corpora and Data Collection

The purpose of this paper is to determine the syntax and semantics of the adverb *all*. Three corpora were discovered on the internet in the form of transcripts of three television shows: 'Friends', 'Buffy the Vampire Slayer' and 'The Gilmore Girls'. Over 200 instances of the adverb *all* were collected from these transcripts.

The limitation of these transcripts is that we cannot use the corpus to determine if another potential example (one not found in the transcripts) is grammatical or not. We can only infer that examples similar to those in the transcripts would likely be grammatical. If there is no similar example in the

corpora, we cannot determine if this is because the construction is ungrammatical or because it was simply not used in any of the scripts. When it was necessary to determine if a particular sentence was ungrammatical, consultants were sought for grammaticality judgements.

2.   Waksler's (2001) Account of *All*

Waksler (2001) conducted the only known study on adverbial *all* exemplified in (1)-(5). In this section we will consider two of her claims. The first is that the adverbial *all* exemplified in (1)-(5) is new. I will argue that it is not actually new but is an extension of a more traditional usage of *all* as an intensifier. The second claim made by Waksler involves her actual analysis of the function of *all*. I will agree with Waksler's analysis in many respects however, the analysis she gives is not very formal. Much of the remainder of this paper, following the discussion of Waksler's claims, will therefore involve formalizing the analysis of the adverbial *all*.

2.1.   The Adverbial All is New

Waksler claims that the examples in (1)-(5) involve a new use of the word *all* in the discourse of San Francisco teenagers and young adults.[1] However, this "new" use of *all* bears some striking resemblances to the adverbial[2] *all* found in more traditional examples like those (6)-(8).

    (6) The child is all wet.
    (7) She is all alone.
    (8) Are you all finished with that project?

    Waksler claims that the *all* in (6)-(8) is distinct from the new adverbial *all* exemplified in (1)-(5). She claims that there are two differences between these more traditional examples and the new adverbial *all*.[3] First, she claims that new *all* does not have any semantic restrictions on the adjectives that it can precede[4] while the more traditional *all* only occurs with a subset of adjectives. The adjectives in (6)-(8) are therefore grammatical with the traditional *all* but the sentence in (9) is

---

[1] Note that the new use of the word *all* is not only found in San Francisco. I have heard it used in two Canadian cities: Toronto and Winnipeg. Also, it has been used extensively on at least the three American television shows whose transcripts were used in this study.

[2] The *all* exemplified in (6) – (8) is sometimes considered an intensifier, like *very* or *really*.

[3] While it is not entirely clear that the adverbial *all* in (1)-(5) is new, I will adopt Waksler's terminology and continue to call it new to distinguish it from the *all* in (6)-(8), which I will call 'traditional *all*'.

[4] I will be claiming that new *all* is restricted to occurring with stage-level predicates. However, it can also occur with individual-level predicates if these take on a stage-level interpretation. In this way, I agree with Waksler that new *all* is not restricted in the same was as traditional *all*

ungrammatical with the traditional *all*. Note that the sentence is (9) is grammatical with the new adverbial *all*.[5]

(9) She's all hungry.

Traditional *all* is more restricted however this does not preclude the possibility that the new *all* is an extension or generalization of the more traditional usage. The other possibility (the one endorsed by Waksler), that we have two <u>different</u> *all*s that both serve an adverbial function, is fairly difficult to rationalize.

There is evidence to support the idea that the two *all*s are in fact the same. First, as we will see in section 4, the new adverb *all* can only occur with a predicate bearing a stage-level interpretation. Stage-level predicates comprise a temporal slice of an individual at a particular time while individual-level predicates refer to objects or kinds (i.e. more permanent properties) (Carlson 1980). Traditional *all* also has this restriction. Let us consider the adjectives above. First, the adjective *wet* when used with *all* requires a stage-level interpretation. At the time of the statement in (6) the subject is wet. The sentence does not and cannot mean that the subject is always wet. It is my claim that such an interpretation is incompatible with the use of *all*. This can be illustrated if we consider an instance where *wet* seems to have an individual-level interpretation, as in (10).

(10)   The ocean is (very) wet.

Here *wet* is a permanent quality of the ocean. However, as we see in (11), *all* cannot occur in this sentence.

(11)   # # The ocean is all wet.

Taditional *all* can only occur with *wet* when *wet* is a stage-level predicate. This also seems to be the case with the adjective *alone*. In (7) the interpretation of the sentence must be that the subject is alone at that moment in time. We also see this fact with the adjective *finished* in (8); being finished cannot be a permanent quality since, to finish something, at some point previously it was not finished.

---

[5] The question that arises here is how do we know which *all* is being used? This is determined by consulting with speakers who do not use the new adverbial *all*; speakers who only use *all* with a small subset of adjectives. If they deem a construction with *all* to be grammatical, we know that we are dealing with the traditional *all*. If, however, they deem the construction ungrammatical while speakers who use the new *all* find it to be grammatical, we know that we have an instance of the new adverbial *all*.

Traditional *all* must therefore occur with stage-level predicates. As we will see in section 4, this is also the case for the new adverbial *all*. This is potential evidence that the two *all*s are in fact the same. The difference between them is simply that the new *all* is able to occur with a larger number of adjectives.[6]

A second piece of evidence in favour of treating the two *all*s as the same entity involves the meaning they denote. For both the traditional *all* and the new adverbial *all* the meaning can be paraphrased as *remarkably* or *completely*. So the meaning of *The child is all wet* can be paraphrased as *The child is completely/remarkably wet*. This, combined with the fact that both types of *all* precede stage-level adjectives, points to the likelihood that they are in fact the same lexeme that has become more generalized. Otherwise, we would have two words with the same phonological form, the same meaning and preceding the same kinds of adjectives that are considered different. What about them is different other than the fact that one occurs in more limited environments? Furthermore, if they were different, we would expect some form of ambiguity in environments where both the traditional and the new *all* can occur. In a sentence such as *The child is all wet*, which should be a possible sentence using both the traditional *all* and the adverbial *all*, there is only one interpretation. It therefore seems to be the case that the two *all*s are the same. *All* is simply able to occur with more adjectives in certain dialects.

Waksler's second argument in favour of treating the traditional *all* and the new *all* as different is that new *all* can have scope over phrasal APs whereas traditional *all* cannot. An example, taken from Waksler, of new *all* with scope over a phrasal AP is given in (12).

(12)   I'm *all proud of myself* for getting the question right.

The ability of new *all* to have scope over phrasal APs could simply be another facet of the larger distribution of *all* that we have already seen. Traditional *all* could only occur with a small number of adjectival predicates. New *all* can occur with nearly any (stage-level) adjectival predicate, even phrasal APs. The fact that new *all* can occur with phrasal APs is therefore not evidence that it is distinct from the traditional *all*. It is simply more evidence that the distribution of *all* has increased.

---

[6] It would be ideal if we could discover what restricted the use of the traditional *all* to its small subset of adjectives. The adjectives it occurred with were clearly stage level but not all stage level predicates could occur with *all* (as exemplified in (9)). However, I have not been able to uncover what the adjectives that traditionally occurred with *all* had in common that was distinct from other adjectives. Further investigation should be conducted to uncover what was involved in this restriction.

It therefore seems likely that the traditional *all* and the new adverbial *all* are actually the same. The only thing that is new about *all* is that it can occur in a greater number of environments.

2.2.   Waksler's (2001) Analysis of All

Waksler (2001) analyzes the new *all* as "a discourse marker introducing the speaker's unique characterization of an individual or entity in the discourse as being fully represented by some salient property or properties at that time in the story" (p. 135). Note that she states, "at that time in the story". I believe that this is a crucial part of the analysis. This is the analysis that I will be developing in section 4: *all* occurs with stage-level predicates.

It is also likely that her idea that *all* introduces the speaker's unique characterization of an individual ties in with my analysis that *all* only occurs with predicative adjectives since a predicative adjective is seen as directly linked to its subject or the element it modifies.[7]

Another interesting facet of Waksler's analysis, which she does highlight in her paper, is that it also explains instances of the quotative *all*. Examples of the quotative taken from my television show corpus are given in (13)-(15).

(13) Oh, I think about the other day with you guys and I was <u>all</u> "Oh, Paolo, he's so great, he makes me feel so..." Oh, God, I'm so embarrassed!

(14) …you're like <u>all</u> "Oh, define me! Define me! Love me, I need love!"

(15) He's gonna stay with her and she's going to be <u>all</u>, "Hi, I'm Julie, Ross picked me, and we're gonna to get married, have a lot of kids and dig up stuff together."

What is interesting to note about these quotations is that they are not usually direct quotes. Instead, they seem to be a characterization made by the speaker. They are a way of "putting words in people's mouths" that characterize them in some way. These quotations are more like adjectives than like direct quotes.[8] *All*

---

[7] Note that Waksler also gives examples of *all* modifying VPs and PPs. Instances of *all* modifying PPs and VPs were not found in my corpus. It is likely that the use of *all* has become more generalized in San Francisco to include more types of predicates. However, the PPs *all* occurs with are predicative and the VPs are participles, which are fairly adjectival. For the remainder of this paper I will only be discussing *all* when it modifies predicative adjectives because data of the other type was unavailable to me. Also, it seems for at least some dialects the use of adverbial *all* is limited to predicative adjectives.

[8] Even when *all* is used with a direct quotation, the quotation is not an ordinary quotation. If the speaker uses *all* with a direct quote, this quote must show some unique characterization of the individual being quoted. The speaker also usually takes on the voice of the person they are quoting to further characterize them. For example, the quotation below is likely a direct

seems to allow the speaker to use the quote as an adjectival predicate. I call these quotations "depictive quotations".

What we have seen is that, while the adverb *all* is not necessarily new, Waksler's general analysis is very similar to the one that we will use. In the following section we will further consider the distribution and meaning of the adverbial *all*.

3. The Distribution and Meaning of Adverbial *All*

In this section we will determine the distribution of the adverbial form of *all*. We will discuss the kinds of verbs that *all* seems to occur with and the elements that *all* modifies. We will see that *all* occurs with predicative adjectives that are usually linked to their subject (or element they modify) through the use of a very small number of copular-like verbs. I will also argue that new *all*, traditional *all* and quotative *all* have the same meaning.

3.1. The Verbs All Occurs With

The vast majority of instances of the adverb *all* found in the corpus occur with the copular *be*. An examples is given in (16).

> (16) …Except for maybe Laurie Schaffer, who I don't talk to anywhere, 'cause she's <u>all</u> bitter now that she lost the weight…

There are also numerous examples that occur with a small set of other verbs. Three of the most frequent, besides the copular *be*, are the verb *to get*, as in (3), with the meaning *to become*, the verb *go*, as in (17), which also seems to have the meaning *to become* as well as examples with *to become* itself, as in (18). These are of course very similar to the copular.

> (17) So what I'm wondering is, does this always happen? Sleep with a guy and he goes <u>all</u> evil. God, I'm such a fool.

> (18) Y'know, before you become <u>all</u>... obsessive.

---

quotation. We can see that the speaker is characterizing her mother's thoughts by quoting what she has previously said, possibly on numerous occasions. Also, when this was uttered, the speaker's voice rose and the quotation was spoken in a 'sing-song' voice.

> (i) ...the way you owned up to everything, it just showed me how much you've grown. Y'know? I mean my Mom never thought this would work out. It was all, "Once a cheater, always a cheater."

The corpus also contains several examples with the verb *to act*, which seems to encode a temporary version of *to be*.

> (19) The problem is, what kind of girl is gonna go out with a guy who's acting <u>all</u> joe regular by day and then turns all demon-hunter by night?

There are also examples with verbs from the class that Levin (1993) calls 'Stimulus Subject Perception Verbs'. This class is made up of the following five verbs: *feel*, *look*, *smell*, *sound* and *taste*. The only verb from this class that was not found in the corpus is *taste* but consultants seem able to use *all* with this verb. Examples of *all* with verbs from this class are given below.

> (20) 'Cause I'm not well. Uh, I feel <u>all</u> oogy.

> (21) You mean the cammo and stuff? I thought about it but, I mean, it's gonna look <u>all</u> 'Private Benjamin.'

> (22) I was hugging her as a friend. It's not my fault her-her hair got in my face, she's got a lot of it and it smells <u>all-all</u> uh…coconutty.

> (23) What's up? Your voice sounded <u>all</u> squeaky on the phone.

Levin (1993) describes these verbs as intransitive perception verbs that, unlike other kinds of perception verbs (like *peer*, *gaze* and *snoop* for instance), do not take their perceiver as the subject. Instead, the stimulus is the subject for these verbs. The perceiver can be expressed in a *to* prepositional phrase (as in *He sounded all serious to me*). Also, these verbs take an adjective phrase as their complement. This adjective phrase is predicated of the stimulus. This is fairly interesting since it is likely not the case that *all* can occur with these verbs because they are of this specific class. Rather, it is likely that *all* requires an adjective phrase predicated of the subject. If you consider all of the examples with the adverbial form of *all* given thus far you will see that they all modify predicative adjectives. It is possibly a restriction on *all* that it modify such predicates.[9] It therefore can only occur with verbs, like the copular *be* and the other verbs that are in some ways similar to the copular, that allow adjectival predicates.[10]

---

[9] Recall however that this restriction does not apply to all dialects. At least in one dialect of English, that spoken in San Francisco and studied by Waksler (2001), *all* appears to modifies a wider variety of predicates.

[10] All of the verbs that *all* occurs with (given above) are part of the class of verbs that Johns (2002) has found are involved with noun incorporation in Inuktitut. Copular *be*, *become*, *get*, *go*, *act*, *taste*, *smell*, *sound*, *look* and *feel* therefore pattern together elsewhere.

Similarly, *all* occurs in secondary predication environments. Examples of this were given in (1) and (2). Note that *all* is modifying predicative adjectives in these examples as well. We can conclude from this that *all* modifies predicative adjectives and is thus in environments where predicative adjectives are licit.

3.2. Quotative 'All' and Predication

There are several reasons to believe that the quotative *all* behaves identically to the adverb *all*. As we have already mentioned, the quotations used after *all* are usually not direct quotes. Instead, they represent a characterization of the individual being quoted. They are therefore used like the adjectives that follow *all* in that they depict or describe the way the "quoted" individual was acting.

The quotative *all*, like the adverb, seems to appear only with verbs that contain the meaning of the verb 'to be'. Actually, the quotative appears in the corpus almost exclusively with the verb 'to be', like the examples in (13)-(15). However, there is one example in the corpus with the verb *to get*, as in *to become*.

(24) …he was just afraid that I was gonna <u>get all</u>, y'know, like, 'ohh, is he gonna call me the next day' and…

The fact that no other examples with the quotative in the corpus involve other 'to be' type verbs is likely because it is difficult to form a quotation with these other verbs. It would be somewhat odd to use a verb like *to smell* or *to feel* before a quotation although informants claim that the following sentences, while not perfect, are at least marginal.

(25) ?I was feeling all, "I can't believe this is happening to me."
(26) ?He was acting all, "I'm such a tough guy."

It therefore likely is not something about *all* that restricted the verbs in the corpus but something to do with quotations.

3.3. *All* things being equal

I have argued that new *all* is simply an extension of traditional *all*. As such, these two *all*s have the same meaning, which is equivalent to *remarkably* or *completely*. The question is whether or not the quotative *all* shares this meaning. Following the 'One Form / One Meaning Principle' formulated by Johns (1992), given in (27), and the 'Principle of Strong Monosemy' formulated by Cowper (1998), given in (28) we should expect the same meaning for quotative *all*.

(27) *One Form / One Meaning Principle*:
Where morphemes are identical or similar in phonological properties, in the unmarked case, they are identical or similar in all lexical properties (Johns 1992, p. 84).

(28) *Principle of Strong Monosemy*
The conceptual structure of a lexical entry may contain no disjunctions and no optional elements. If the coneptual structures of two uses of a lexical item cannot be unified through underspecification, then they must be treated as distinct lexical entries (Cowper 1998, p. 6).

If quotative *all* is simply a quotative, we should expect its meaning to be something akin to the verb *to say*. However, if we consider how people actually say the quotation following *all* it is clear that there is much more to its meaning. They tend to take on characteristics of the individual being quoted by mimicking their voice and mannerisms. It is as though the are saying "the entire person is like this" or "the person was completely…." In this way, it seems that even quotative *all* carries the meaning *completely* in some sense and thus conforms to the principles in (27) and (28).

In this section we have considered the distribution and meaning of the adverb *all*. I have argued that *all* has the meaning *remarkably/completely* and that it must occur with predicative adjectives.

4. Stage-Level Predication and *All*

Above I have argued that new *all* is not actually new but is simply an extension of traditional *all*. However, there is something very new about this adverb. In this section I will show that new *all* can only occur with predicates that have a stage-level interpretation. Further, when it occurs with a predicate that would normally be considered individual-level, *all* acts on the event structure of the predicate to give it a stage-level interpretation.

As mentioned, stage-level predicates are a temporal slice of an individual while individual-level predicates refer to objects or kinds (Carlson 1980). Brassil (1998) uses two tests to determine whether a predicate is stage-level or individual-level. Only stage-level predicates can occur in the progressive:

(29) Graz is acting drunk. drunk = stage-level
(30) *Graz is being/acting tall. tall = individual-level

All can occur in this construction:

> (31) Graz is acting all drunk.

On the other hand, only individual-level predicates can occur in a *consider* small clause construction:

> (32) I consider Graz tall. tall = individual-level
> (33) *I consider graz drunk. drunk = stage-level

All cannot occur in this construction because *all* is only licit where stage-level predication is licit.

> (34) *I consider Graz all tall.

4.1. Stage-Level Coercion

While it is clear from the above sentences that *all* occurs with stage-level predicates, there are examples in my corpus of *all* with what would normally be considered individual-level predicates, as in (35).

> (35) Well y'know what they say, the 23rd time's the charm. (Chandler enters.) Aww, look at you <u>all</u> handsome!

Handsome would normally be considered an individual-level predicate because it is not a temporary property. However, in (35) *handsome* does have a temporary interpretation. Crucially, when (35) was uttered, Chandler had entered the room wearing a tuxedo. He is not always handsome but is newly handsome (surprisingly handsome) in his outfit. Thus, *handsome* is stage-level in (35).

To account for the stage-level coercion found when *all* occurs with an individual-level predicate, we will look at an analysis put forth by Brassil (1998) regarding the intensifiers *so* and *way* in Southern California English. In this dialect, when *so* occurs with a predicate the predicate has a stage-level interpretation. When *way* occurs with a predicate the predicate must have an individual-level interpretation.

> (36) Morgan is so cool. cool = stage-level
> (37) Morgan is way cool. cool = individual-level

Brassil uses a synthesis of Kratzer (1995) and Pustejovsky (1995) to account for *so* and *way*. Kratzer (1995) claims that stage-level predicates have an additional argument position for events that individual-level predicates do not have. This extra argument position ranges over spatiotemporal locations. Kratzer uses the variable **l** to denote this position. Kratzer's analysis explains why temporal and spatial modifiers can only occur with certain predicates.

(38)　a. Manon is dancing on the lawn.
　　　b. [dancing(Manon,l) Λ on the lawn(l)]

(39)　a. Manon is a dancer.
　　　b. dancer(Manon)
　　　c. *Manon is a dancer on the lawn.

The stage-level predicate *is dancing* in (38a) has the additional argument **l**. The locative *on the lawn* takes **l** as its argument and is thus related to the predicate. The individual-level predicate *is a dancer* in (39a) does not have the **l** argument. We therefore see in (39c) that it cannot be modified by a locative.

　　　Brassil (1998) claims that adjectives like *cool* sometimes have an **l** argument and sometimes do not. We could say that they have two separate lexical entries but this would be missing a generalization: something in the context determines the interpretation.

　　　Brassil claims that *so* is only licensed if a predicate has an **l** argument. He claims that the progressive can license a function that supplies the **l** in a sentence like (40).

(40)　Morgan is acting so cool.

However, it is not clear in his analysis how *so* is licensed in (36), in the absence of the progressive. I instead think that so itself can supply an **l** argument to a predicate. *All* also has this ability. Assume that stage and individual-level predicates have the structures in (41) and (42) respectively.

(41)　[drunk] = λe λx λl [DRUNK (e, x, l)]

Drunk is a state e, of an individual x, at some spatiotemporal variable l.

(42)　[tall] = λe λx [TALL (e, x)]

Tall is a state e of an individual x.

Then we can say that *all* (and *so*) licenses the function in (43) which takes an individual-level predicate and supplies an additional argument, the spatiotemporal variable.

$$(43) \quad \lambda e \, \lambda x \, [ADJ \, (e, x)] \rightarrow \lambda e \, \lambda x \, \lambda l \, [ADJ \, (e, x, l)]$$

5. Summary and Conclusions

In this paper I have claimed, contra Waksler (2001), that there is a single adverbial *all* in English. While it is clear that the lexical entries speakers have for *all* are different (some speakers can only use *all* in its traditional form while others can use it as discussed in this paper), speakers who can use the three types of *all* have a single lexical entry for this word. The three types have the same meaning of *remarkably* or *completely* and occur in basically the same environment. The adverb *all* exemplified in (1)-(5) is therefore not new but is simply an extension of an older usage of the word.

But, there is something very new about *all*. This is its ability to coerce a stage-level interpretation when it occurs with a normally individual-level predicate. This may cast doubt on the idea that the three *all*s are the same. However, this too seems to be an extension of the traditional use of *all*. Recall that it was also restricted to occurring with stage-level predicates. It therefore seems that this restriction was extended as *all* began occurring with a greater number of adjectives so that new *all* as well could only occur with stage-level predicates. And further, if it did occur with an individual-level predicate, the restrictions placed on *all* resulted in a stage-level interpretation.

References

Brassil, D. 1998. Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicate Constraints on Adjectival Intensifiers: The *so/way* distinction in Southern California English. Ms., University of California, San Diego.

Carlson, G. 1980. *Reference to Kinds in English.* New York: Garland.

Cowper, E. 1998. English Participle Constructions. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 40: 1–126.

Johns, A. 1992. Deriving Ergativity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 57–87.

Johns, A. 2002. Restricting Noun Incorporation. Ms., University of Toronto.

Kratzer, A. 1995. Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates. In *The Generic Book*, eds. G. Carlson and F. J. Pelletier, 125–175. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Levin, B. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon.* Cabridge, MA: MIT Press.

Waksler, R. 2001. A New *All* in Conversation. *American Speech* 76: 128–138.