THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ENGLISH INTENSIFIER PHRASE: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

HIROSHI OHASHI

University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

This paper examines the factors that have contributed to the category shift observed in the English phrase schematically represented as “all X wants/likes,” from its basic usage as an NP that occurs as the subject or the copula complement, to the derived adverbial usage as an intensifier. I maintain that the factors include reanalysis triggered by the sentential position of the phrase that allows for ambiguity as well as the very restricted types of context in which the phrase occurs. Properties of the phrase relating to the category shift are presented through an examination of spontaneous examples from two major corpora. Also, several properties of the intensifier usage that reveal subjectivity are pointed out.*

Keywords: *intensifier, category shift, subjectification, grammaticalization, corpus*

1. Introduction

While the question of semantic shift has always been a topic of interest, the past twenty years have been particularly productive in the research of this topic using the framework of grammaticalization. Whereas original attention focused on articles, prepositions, conjunctions, and modal auxiliaries, more recently studies in the grammaticalization of intensifiers have appeared (cf. Powell (1992), Partington

* Early versions of this paper were presented on various occasions, including the 8th and 9th International Cognitive Linguistics Conferences held at the University of Rioja on July 20–25, 2003 and at Yonsei University on July 17–22, 2005, respectively. I would like to thank all the people who gave me valuable comments and suggestions during and after the presentations. I am grateful to Christopher P. Carman, Jay Ercanbrack and Joseph Tomei for careful reading of the manuscripts and for suggesting stylistic improvements. I am also indebted to two anonymous *EL* reviewers for their comments and suggestions. All remaining inadequacies are my own.

(1993), Traugott (1995), Adamson (2000) and Lorenz (2002)). These studies have concentrated on the semantic shift of adjectives, the primary source of intensifiers.

This paper will deal with a secondary source of intensifiers in English, noun phrases that function as an intensifier. The phrase I will examine is illustrated by the following (*italics mine*; the same is true in the following examples):

- (1) a. "Disbelieve me *all you want*, but I know what I saw."
(WB ukbooks0045)¹
- b. Jack and Arnie can kiss and hug in staged news conferences *all they want*, but there are those who will never let the rivalry die.
(WB ukmags0068)
- c. "... Well you can apologize *all you like*, because I'll never believe you mean it, and I'll never accept your apology!"
(BNC AEB)²
- d. Rank could blame the government *all he liked*, but it was his own policies which had antagonized the Americans, alienated audiences and significantly increased the company's overdraft.
(BNC A7L)

The phrase may be schematically described as *all X wants/likes* (hereafter, AXW/L). It consists of the universal pronoun³ *all* as its head, which is modified by the relative clause *X wants/likes*,⁴ thus it has the form of a noun phrase. However, in circumstances such as in (1), the phrase functions as an intensifier adverb. Here, the instances of the phrase are used to intensify the meaning of the verb phrases and can be paraphrased as "as much as X wants/likes."

In this paper, I will argue that this phrase has two distinct usages, and that the relation between those two usages of this phrase involves a case of category shift⁵ from noun phrase to adverbial phrase that associ-

¹ WB stands for *The Collins Wordbanks Online*. The words and the numbers that follow refer to the category that the example belongs to.

² BNC stands for *the British National Corpus Online*. The letters that follow refer to the category that the example belongs to.

³ The term "universal pronoun" is adopted from Quirk et al. (1985: 380–382).

⁴ As will be exhibited in Section 4, statistics displays the predominant occurrence of the second person pronoun as an instantiation of X, as in (1a, c).

⁵ The term "category shift" was also used in the same meaning in Adamson (2000).

ates subjectification, and also examine how the shift has been motivated. In the discussion I will point out the partial idiomatic status and skewed distribution of this phrase by examining data from two major corpora.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, I will review several previous studies on the development of intensifiers and take a brief look at the implications of grammaticalization and subjectification on the development of intensifiers. In Section 3, I will discuss several properties of AXW/L and hypothesize three stages through which the phrase has developed the adverbial usage as an intensifier. In Section 4, I will observe spontaneous usages of AXW/L by analyzing examples from corpora. The observation will make it clear that the sentences that co-occur with AXW/L in the intensifier meaning appear in extremely local and limited types of context, and I claim that the restricted distribution has motivated the shift from its basic usage as a noun phrase to the adverbial usage as an intensifier as well as examine the subjective properties of AXW/L. Section 5 will summarize and review my argument.

2. Intensifiers, Grammaticalization, and Subjectification

2.1. Intensifiers and Previous Studies

In this paper I use the term “intensifiers” to refer to certain kinds of adverbs that “serve to strengthen or weaken the meaning of a particular part of sentence” (Declerck (1991: 230)). Quirk et al. (1985: 589–603) classifies intensifiers into two types: “amplifiers” and “downtoners.” Amplifiers are subdivided into “maximizers” such as *absolutely*, *completely*, *extremely*, *fully*, *perfectly*, *quite*, and *utterly*, and “boosters” such as *badly*, *greatly*, *highly*, *so*, *well*, and *a lot*. On the other hand, “downtoners” consist of “approximaters” (e.g. *almost*), “compromisers” (e.g. *more or less*), “diminishers” (e.g. *partly*) and “minimizers” (e.g. *hardly*).

Intensifiers, as adverbs, form an open class. However, what is noteworthy about intensifiers is that new items are always being created, since, “all means of emphasis quickly grow stale and need to be replaced” (Bolinger (1972: 18), quoted in Lorenz (2002: 146)). It is of great interest, from the viewpoint of meaning change, to investigate how certain items start to be used as intensifiers and have the newly-acquired usage conventionalized. Let’s take a look at several studies in the past that investigated the development of intensifiers.

Powell (1992) discusses metalinguistic and interpersonal usages of English stance adverbs such as *actually*, *exactly*, *generally*, *loosely*, etc. It is argued that the pairing of the two functions are highly systematic in the sense that the interpersonal value of each item respecting the degree of the speaker's commitment toward the message may be inferred from its semantic, metalinguistic value, which defines a type of "linguistic fit." For example, *strictly*, which stipulates a close, tight linguistic fit, invites an assumption that the speaker is closely committed to the message it qualifies. Powell investigates the diachronic development of these usages in ten stance adverbs and concludes they have developed in a way predictable by Traugott's (1989) hypothesis on unidirectionality in semantic change.

Traugott (1995) adds degree modifiers such as *very*, *pretty*, *awfully*, and *virtually* to Powell's list of adverbs having "undergone a shift from manner adverbs to particles indicating the speaker's assessment of the normative referentiality of the lexical item selected" (Traugott (1995: 44)).

Partington (1993) claims the importance of diachronic study to an understanding of how intensifiers have developed the meanings they have today. He demonstrates the delexicalization process, whereby items lose their independent meaning, with intensifiers that have undergone the "modal-to-intensifier" shift. Intensifiers such as *truly*, *genuinely*, *very*, *utterly*, *entirely*, and *absolutely* are shown to have had "some modal semantic content, through which speakers comment on their assessment of the truth of the matter under discussion or vouch for the sincerity of their words" (Partington (1993: 181)) and to have come to be used exclusively for adding emphasis.

Adamson (2000) addresses the relation between the position of an adjective in a noun phrase that includes multiple adjectives, and its meaning. Drawing on the semantic classes proposed by Dixon (1982) and his hypothesis on the linear order of adjectives,⁶ Adamson argues that Dixon's VALUE adjectives such as *good*, *nice*, and *excellent* are

⁶ Dixon (1982: 16) classifies English adjectives into seven types: VALUE (*good*, *bad*, *proper*, *perfect*, *pure*, and hyponyms for *good* and *bad* such as *excellent*, *fine*, etc.), DIMENSION (*big*, *large*, *little*, etc.), PHYSICAL PROPERTY (*hard*, *heavy*, *rough*, etc.), SPEED (*fast*, *quick*, *slow*, etc.), HUMAN PROPENSITY (*jealous*, *happy*, *kind*, etc.), AGE (*new*, *young*, *old*), and COLOUR (*black*, *white*, *red*, etc.). He further suggests that when they appear in pronominal position, there is a preferred, from-left-to-right ordering among them, reflected above in the order of appearance (Dixon (1982: 24–26)).

affective and speaker-oriented, while adjectives in the other classes are descriptive and reference-oriented, in that “their function is not to describe properties in the referent but to express speaker-response to it” (Adamson (2000: 44)). To investigate whether the ordering in terms of semantic types, in which value adjectives are assigned the left-most position, has been constant diachronically, Adamson explores the meaning change of *lovely* and examines if there has been any syntactic change correlating to the semantic shift. *Lovely* is found to originally have had Dixon’s HUMAN PROPENSITY meaning (“amiable”) in Old English. In Middle English it came to have his PHYSICAL PROPERTY sense (“physically beautiful”), and in the 17th century, it started to be used as a VALUE adjective. Finally in the 19th century it acquired its intensifier usage. Further, to explain a sudden striking increase in *lovely*’s co-occurrence with other adjectives in the period 1850–1900, she argues that the rise reflects the semantic shift that had already taken place in which *lovely* developed an intensifier function, accompanied by syntactic shift to the left-most peripheral position.

Lorenz (2000) explores the mechanism of semantic change by which English adverbs delexicalize and grammaticalize as they lose the original meaning derived from the corresponding adjectives.⁷

2.2. Grammaticalization and Subjectification

The recent studies on intensifiers we looked at above suggest that the meaning change and category shift can be observed in the development of intensifiers through grammaticalization and subjectification. Thus it

⁷ It depends on one’s notions of grammaticalization and intensifiers whether or not one regards the category shift from an adjective to an intensifier as a case of grammaticalization. If one regards the intensifier as a distinct grammatical category and its very restricted function as a qualifying property for being classified as function words, the category shift can be considered to be a case of grammaticalization. On the other hand, if one thinks that the term “intensifier” should be used to refer to a specific function of a certain type of adverbs and place significance on the fact that in some intensifiers the original meanings are easily traceable, then it may be reasonable to regard the shift as not a case of grammaticalization.

Here, I use the term “intensifier” to refer to a grammatical function, rather than a distinct category, while at the same time I admit that the potential meaning of intensifiers is very reduced, to the extent that it can be appropriately treated as a function word. In other words, I remain open to other interpretations, though I do not think this affects my arguments. See Traugott (1995: 50) for a related view.

would be in order, in passing, to consider the implications of these notions on the intensifier development.

There is a large body of research in grammaticalization, or grammaticization as it is also called, in English (cf. Traugott (1982, 1989, 1995, 1997), Traugott and Heine (1991), Hopper and Traugott (2003), and Traugott and Dasher (2002)). For grammaticalization, I adopt the following definition of the term, given by Hopper and Traugott (2003: xv):

- (2) [T]he change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions.

Grammaticalization is often found to be associated with subjectification. Here, I will use the term in a sense following the characterization by Traugott (1995: 32):⁸

- (3) It [subjectification in grammaticalization] is a gradient phenomenon, whereby forms and constructions that at first express primarily concrete, lexical, and objective meanings come through repeated use in local syntactic contexts to serve increasingly abstract, pragmatic, interpersonal, and speaker-based function.

Here, “interpersonal” function can be interpreted as having the same meaning as the “expressive” function, in that both refer to the function of “expressing personal attitudes to what is being talked about, to the text itself, and to others in the speech situation.” (Traugott (1982: 248)). Lexical items that have been explored extensively regarding their increasing subjectivity in a diachronic grammaticalization process include modal auxiliaries, prepositions, conjunctions, and some verbs that have acquired epistemic meaning. (See, for example, Traugott (*ibid.*)).

Returning to intensifiers, intensification is, as Lorenz (2002: 143) maintains, “a lexico-grammatical category that is mainly employed to

⁸ Another definition of “subjectification” that has been widely acknowledged and exploited in cognitive linguistics literature is by Langacker (2000), among others, in terms of realignment of objective-subjective axis, in his terms. Since the usage I examine in this paper is more concerned with the expressive function of utterance in conveying a message than with the degree of grounding in the perspective of the speaker, I employ the term in Traugott’s sense. Regarding an attempt to identify points of convergence of the two concepts, see Carey (1995).

achieve expressivity.” To the extent that intensification is not concerned with the truth condition of a sentence but is involved with the speaker’s intention and attitude regarding which part of a sentence should be emphasized in communicating a message to the hearer, intensifiers can be regarded as essentially subjective and expressive. Therefore, the development of intensifiers through usage can be regarded as accompanying a process of subjectification.

The previous studies on intensifiers that we reviewed in the last section are also concerned with how the intensifying function is acquired. They consider the process a case of subjectification in grammaticalization, which identifies the development of intensifiers as another example of the widely attested direction of meaning change, from objective to subjective, that has been shown in research by, among others, Traugott (1982, 1995, 1997).

These previous studies have argued that the primary source for intensifiers is adjectives. In contrast, the original source of AXW/L is a noun phrase and it has come to be used as an intensifier adverb. Though the following discussion will be almost exclusively concerned with synchronic data, a close look at the way AXW/L occurs in spontaneous sentences and utterances suggests a pathway, along which the phrase has come to increase subjectivity. Lorenz (2002: 143), in arguing for intensification as a lexico-grammatical category aimed at achieving expressivity, notes that it “is typically heralded in the more dynamic text-types, occurring in spoken rather than written language, in informal rather than formal conversation.” These general observations on the usage and the environment are also true for the specific case of AXW/L, as we will see later in 4.4, but first we will examine several properties of the phrase in the next section.

3. The *All X Wants/Likes* (AXW/L) Phrase

3.1. Three Functions

In this section we look at several properties of AXW/L in some detail. First, I will argue that the instances of AXW/L fall into three groups in terms of their function in the sentence: a noun phrase that occurs as subject or complement of a copula; an object noun phrase of a transitive verb; and an adverb. First, in each of the examples in (5), AXW/L is the sentential subject and in (6) it is the complement of the copula. In all the examples the phrase is a noun phrase and functions

as a referring expression:

- (5) a. *All you want* is revenge. (BNC FR5)
- b. "When I'm back home *all I like* to do is go out with my mates ...". (WB sunnow0055)
- (6) a. Is that *all you want*? (WB ukspoken0721)
- b. "It's *all she likes*, Dad," Mack said defensively. (WB usbooks0020)

Next, there is the second category where AXW/L functions adverbially, as illustrated in (7) and (8) below:

- (7) a. "But you can go out into the basin *all you want*," Mic broke in. "And over to the old watchtower ...". (WB ukbooks0045)
- b. "... Pounce away *all you like*, we don't mind in the least." (BNC CFJ)
- c. Pound can talk *all he likes* about the cultural lag in America ... but he's got a 200 year political lag in himself. (BNC AIB)
- (8) a. "You can defend him *all you want*, I really don't care," Nicole retorted. (WB ukbooks0070)
- b. Garin shrugged mightily. "Disbelieve me *all you want*, but I know what I saw." (WB ukbooks0045)
- c. He could torture her *all he wanted*, but he would not succeed in breaking her a second time. (BNC JXS)

In each of the examples in (7), AXW/L co-occurs with an intransitive verb, so it cannot be regarded as an object NP, which would not be licensed by any sentential elements. Rather, the phrase is taken to qualify the verb phrase as an adverb and has the meaning which roughly corresponds to a paraphrase "as much as X wants." In each of the examples in (8), on the other hand, the phrase occurs with a transitive verb but the slot for the object NP is occupied. Therefore, as in the cases with an intransitive verb, these instances of AXW/L can be regarded as functioning as adverbials and intensifying the verb phrases.

In (7) and (8) AXW/L is unambiguous with regard to its grammatical status. There are also cases where the phrase appears to be the object of the verb. Consider the following example in (9):

- (9) Mr McKendry said Cr Soorley had complained about visual pollution from business signs, but refused to define what it was and accused businesses of whingeing.

"Queensland prides itself on being a low-tax state but this makes a mockery of that. It is unbridled hypocrisy to say visual pollution is bad, but if you pay a fee you can pollute *all you like*," he said. (WB oznews0008)

The sentence with *all you like* can be considered to have a missing object that is recoverable from the context, which Fillmore (1986) calls "definite null complement," and here, the missing object is most likely *the view*. That AXW/L is not a verbal object is shown by the fact that the sentence in which *all* in AXW/L is replaced with its synonym *everything* is not equivalent to the original sentence. Compare the following sentence with its corresponding sentence in (9):

- (9) "..., but if you pay a fee you can pollute everything you like."

Therefore, the example in (9) can be regarded as functioning as an intensifier adverb.

On the other hand, the AXW/L phrases that occur in the object position with no candidate for null complements are potentially ambiguous between the NP and adverbial interpretations. It depends on other factors to decide whether the phrase is an NP or an adverb. For example, in cases such as those in (10), the interpretation is quite straightforward:

- (10) a. If the algorithm is to do *all we want*, contexts should be allowed to include some variables ... (BNC FNR)
 b. She did *all we wanted*. (WB times0039)
 c. Germany is now ready, we have been told, to give *all we want* in these respects. (WB ukbooks0020)

Here, AXW/L is taken to be the object of the verb. In each of the examples, the agent referred to by the sentential subject is different from the referent of *X* which is the subject of the relative clause that qualifies *all*. Since the sentential subject agent is not considered to be able to control the action carried out by the relative clause subject referent, it is difficult to interpret the AXW/L phrase as allowing for the adverbial interpretation.⁹ Instead, the phrase induces a natural NP interpretation, because one can do what someone else wants to do in

⁹ The only exception in the corpora is the following:

(i) And we can talk and catch up all you want. (WB usbooks0023)
 Here, the referents of *we* include the referent of *you*. Therefore, "we" can have what "you" do under control.

appropriate situations. Thus it is quite natural to paraphrase each sentence in (10) as “If the algorithm is to do everything we want, ...” “She did everything we wanted,” and “Germany is now ready, ..., to give everything we want. ...” Therefore, in each of the above sentences where the main subject and the relative clause subject are different, the AXW/L phrase can be treated as a noun phrase.

In contrast, in other examples where the subjects have the same referent the judgment is not as straightforward.¹⁰ Look at the examples in (11) below:

- (11) a. Buy *all you want* at the show without weighing yourself down. (WB ukephem0905)
 b. You can say *all you like*, but it’s clear that soul music is more popular than it has ever been, worldwide.
 (BNC AB3)

These examples can be regarded as allowing for both an object interpretation and an adverbial interpretation. For example, (11a) can be taken to mean either “Buy everything you want” or “Buy as much as you want.” Also in (11b), the italicized phrase can be interpreted in the same way. There are two possible tests to disambiguate the meaning of these potentially ambiguous sentences. One is to see if AXW/L is referred back to by a pronoun, and the other is to check its acceptability in the focal position of a cleft sentence.

First, we look at the possibility of pronominal reference. As shown in (12) and (13), each AXW/L in (10) as well as (11) can be referred to by a pronoun:

- (12) a. The algorithm is to do *all we want* and do *it* very quickly.
 b. She did *all we wanted* and her sister did *it*, too.
 c. Germany is now ready to give *all we want* and give *it* without expecting anything in return.
 (13) a. Buy *all you want* at the show and send *it* home.
 b. You can say *all you like*, and write *it* too.

Therefore, according to this test, in addition to the instances in (10), those that occur in (11) are regarded as noun phrases.

¹⁰ In fact, disambiguation crucially depends on context. For example, in (11b) where AXW/L appears in the same type of context as other adverbial instances, the intensifier reading seems to be dominant.

(14) a. *It was completely that he ignored your request.
(Quirk et al. (1985: 597))
b. *It was even that John was not happy about it.
(Declerck (1992: 216))

(15) a. It is all we want that the algorithm is to do.
b. It is all we wanted that she did.
c. It is all we want that Germany is now ready to give.

(16) a. It is all you want that you can buy at the show.
b. It is all you like that you can say.

Thus there is no way, at least at the moment, to determine the grammatical status of AXW/L in ambiguous sentences such as in (11). Their interpretation crucially depends on context. Therefore, I will not attempt any further to specify their grammatical status and will treat them tentatively as NPs in this paper.

In this section I have shown that the AXW/L phrase has three types of functions: as an unambiguous NP that occurs in the subject and copula complement positions; as an unambiguous adverbial phrase that is used with an intransitive verb or a transitive verb that is followed by the NP object; and as a potentially ambiguous NP that occupies the object position of a transitive verb. Next, we turn to discuss how the

adverbial function has developed from the noun phrase function.

3.2. Category Shift and Reanalysis

Now, regarding the functions we have observed in the last section, I propose a relation in terms of the development of the adverbial usage as represented below:

$$(17) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{I} & \text{II} & \text{III} \\ [[V][AXW/L]_{NP}]_{VP} > [[V][AXW/L]_{NP/Adv}]_{VP} > [[V][AXW/L]_{Adv}]_{VP} / \\ & & [[[V][NP]]_{VP}[AXW/L]_{Adv}]_{VP} \end{array}$$

In Stage I, AXW/L is unambiguously assumed to be an NP as in the case of the examples in (10).

Stage II is the transitional stage where AXW/L is potentially ambiguous, as in the examples in (11). Here, there is room for reanalysis to take place that interprets an NP as an adverb. The reanalysis is possible, I maintain, because there can be cases where the two interpretations are virtually equivalent. More specifically, in the original NP interpretation, the act the VP denotes applies to the exhaustive referents referred to by *all*. On the other hand, in the derived adverbial reading, AXW/L acts to impose a scalar measurement on the act the VP denotes, and points to the highest degree of the scale. It would be reasonable to assume that in certain situations, the NP interpretation and the adverbial interpretation can be considered to express virtually the same event. For example, in (11a), there can be situations in which “buying everything you want” and “buying as much as you want” can be used to denote the same idea. Thus Stage II is taken to be the locus where the shift to the adverbial usage takes place and its conventionalization starts.

Finally, Stage III is where the adverbial usage comes to be conventionalized and where the phrase occurs either with intransitive or transitive verbs, functioning unambiguously as an intensifier.

The developmental process proposed here may be straightforward, but it is necessary to examine supporting evidence on the derived status of the adverbial usage, which is what we will do in the next section.

3.3. Evidence for the Derived Status of the Adverbial Usage

3.3.1. Diachronic Data

The development process I have assumed seems intuitively obvious and straightforward, but to prove that this is really the case, it has to be tested against historical data. However, the present paper is a syn-

chronic study, primarily because AXW/L in its adverbial usage seems to have a relatively short history. For example, there is no entry of its adverbial usage in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter, OED) and there are only three examples of AXW/L that are found scattered in different entries, which are cited in (18) below:¹¹

- (18) a. 1899 We'll join hands end lay ourselves flat on the rock
so that you can hike your head over, and look *all you want to*.
- b. 1929 Jazz'em *all you like*, but get the money.¹²
- c. 1977 Skip-read *all you want* through the book, but go
though the last page word by word.

Therefore, I have no way at the moment to verify the hypothesis with diachronic data. However, there are several facts that suggest that the developmental process proposed above is really the case.

3.3.2. Frequency

The most striking piece of synchronic evidence that bears out the assumption that the adverbial meaning is a derived usage is provided by a statistical analysis in the subsequent corpus study. As will be noted in Section 4, the NP usage of *all X wants* accounts for about 90% of all the occurrences of AXW/L. On the other hand, the unambiguous, adverbial usage accounts for only 3.4% of all occurrences, suggesting that its prototypical and central usage is as a noun phrase, while the adverbial usage should be regarded as peripheral, which stands as evidence of the adverbial usage as being derived.

3.3.3. Constraints on the Adverbial Usage

A further data point to consider is that there are several constraints on the adverbial usage that do not apply to the NP usage.

Firstly, in the NP usage, as shown in (19), the phrase head *all* can be replaced with its synonym *everything* with almost no difference in meaning. In contrast, this replacement is not accepted in the case of the adverbial usage, as illustrated by the sentences in (20) and (21):

¹¹ In this connection, the first example of the noun phrase usage of "all + relative clause" construction recorded in OED dates back to 827.

¹² Here, the definition of the verb *jazz* is given as follows:

(i) 'jazz': trans. and intr. To have sexual intercourse (with) slang.

- (19) I will give you {all/everything} you want.
- (20) a. You can agree *all you want*.
- b. You can deny it *all you want*.
- (21) a. *You can agree everything you want.
- b. *You can deny it everything you want.

Each example in (21), in which *all* in (20) is replaced with *everything*, turns out to be unacceptable.

Secondly, as shown in (22), in the NP usage, modifiers such as *really* can co-occur with AXW/L. On the other hand, such modification is unacceptable in the adverbial usage, as shown in (23):

- (22) a. All you really want is a good night's sleep.
- b. A good night's sleep is all you really want.
- (23) a. *You can agree all you really want.
- b. *You can deny it all you really want.

Thirdly, verbs that appear in AXW/L in the corpora I have examined are restricted almost exclusively to *want* and *like*, while other verbs are possible in the NP usage. For example, there are abundant instances of *all X needs*, as the following citations in (24) show:

- (24) a. All you need is joy in your heart. (WB npr0046)
- b. At first the valuation survey will be all you need.
(BNC BNL)
- c. The kit contains all you need to build your own water-
ing system. (BNC ACX)

As for the adverbial usage, the only candidate from BNC and WB is found to be used with the verb *wish*, as cited in (25):

- (25) As for testing the gold, take *all you wish*: here are fifty of
the coins. (WB ukbooks0010)

However, for the same reason as we observed in the example of (9) in 3.1, the sentence is regarded as involving a noun phrase, not an adverbial phrase. In this connection, one will find examples on Web pages with verbs such as *wish*, *desire*, and *choose*, as illustrated in (26):

- (26) a. You can freely use the script and modify it *all you wish*,
but always retain the copyright notice in each file, ...
(<http://scripts.dbmasters.net/faq.php?id=14&fid=1>)
- b. Weight gain is all about calories. You can lift weights
all you desire, but if your calorie intake is insufficient,
you'll get hard muscles, but not big muscles.
(<http://www.vegsource.com/talk/raw/messages/9956.html>)
- c. You Auburn fans can continue to try to ruin an Alabama

web site *all you choose*, but unless your comments are for basketball and they have a valid email, they will be deleted as a matter of policy. Sorry to ruin your day.
(<http://bamabasketball.net/Forum/postview2.asp?function=view&ID=120>)

These sentences seem to be unnatural, at least to some native speakers, so the use of these verbs in the place of *want* and *like* should be regarded as not being sufficiently conventionalized, compared with the phrases with *want* and *like*.¹³

These three types of constraints on the adverbial usage of AXW/L show that the phrase is conventionalized to the extent that it can be regarded as being partially idiomatic. Additionally, as will be discussed in detail in section 4, the adverbial usage is found in very limited types of context. This is in striking contrast to the noun phrase usage, which does not exhibit any notable asymmetries in distribution.

In this section we have seen that the adverbial usage has constraints that do not apply to the noun phrase usage. Partington (1993) examines diachronic change in the syntactic environments of the occurrence of intensifiers such as *very*, *exceedingly*, *extremely* and *absolutely*, and concludes that as these items delexicalize and their semantic content is “bleached,” the syntactic frames they can appear in becomes more restricted.¹⁴ If this is true for intensifiers in general and, the AXW/L phrase in particular, then one can conclude that the reduced semantic content and functioning as an intensifier suggests that it has been derived from a nominal usage with independent meaning and more semantic potential, providing support for the process of category shift proposed in 3.2.

Next, we will analyze naturally occurring instances of the phrase and examine how a category shift to an intensifier adverb might be motivated.

¹³ However, seen in a different light it can be said that AXW/L has been conventionalized to the extent that the above-mentioned sentences with other verbs that have similar meanings to *want* and *like* are appearing derivatively with the instances including these verbs as their base.

¹⁴ For example, according to his investigation of the collocation of *extremely*, it almost exclusively premodifies adjectives. In contrast, OED records examples in which it occurred both before and after the verb it modified, as well as before a prepositional phrase. See Partington (1993: 189–191).

4. Occurrence of AXW/L in Specific Contexts: A Corpus-Based Study

4.1. Data

To observe spontaneous usage, I have used two online corpora, the British National Corpus Online (BNC) and The Collins Wordbanks Online (WB). BNC contains about 100 million words of written (90%) and spoken (10%) British English, and WB about 56 million words of written (75%) and spoken (25%) British and American English. Tables 1 and 2 represent the tokens of *all X wants* and *all X likes* in the respective corpora. First, let's look at Table 1:

Table 1. Occurrence of *All X Wants* in BNC and WB in Terms of Their Functions

Person	Corpus	Total	I. Subject NP & Complement NP	II. Object NP	III. Intensifier Adverb
			Occurrence (%)	Occurrence (%)	Occurrence (%)
1st	BNC	305	290(95.1)	13(4.3)	2(0.6)
	WB	213	201(94.4)	11(5.2)	1(0.5)
2nd	BNC	83	62(74.7)	14(16.9)	7(8.4)
	WB	52	31(59.6)	6(11.5)	15(28.8)
3rd	BNC	225	202(89.8)	20(8.9)	3(1.3)
	WB	109	96(88.1)	7(6.4)	6(5.5)
sub total	BNC	613	554(90.4)	47(7.7)	12(2.0)
	WB	374	328(87.7)	24(6.4)	22(5.9)
total		987	882(89.4)	71(7.2)	34(3.4)

The number of tokens is divided in terms of the person of the pronoun that instantiates X, as indicated in the left-most column. The total number of tokens in each corpus is represented in the third column from the left, and in each of the three columns to its right, occurrence is shown according to the function AXW/L assumes in the sentence.

In Table I, what is noticeable at a glance is that in the overwhelming number of instances *all X wants* is unambiguously used as a noun phrase that occupies the subject or copula complement position, accounting for 882 out of 987 instances, or approximately 90%. On the other hand, the unambiguously adverbial usage accounts for only 3.4%.¹⁵ As I already mentioned, this extreme difference in the frequency of actual tokens is considered to suggest the derived status of the adverbial usage.

Regarding the person of the phrase in Category I, the first person singular pronoun appears most frequently. The forms *all I want* and *all I wanted* together account for 423 out of 882 instances, or 48% of the total. About 98% of these are used as a subject or a complement, while only 2 instances are used as an intensifier.

On the other hand, the intensifier adverb most frequently occurs with the second person pronoun *you*, which accounts for 64.7%. In contrast, the first person occurs in only 3 instances.

These observations make it clear that there is a remarkable contrast between the noun usage and the adverbial usage in the most frequent collocational patterns. While the noun phrase most frequently appears in *all I want*, the adverbial usage is most frequently used in *all you want*. We will see in the next section that this is because of the way the adverbial phrase is exploited in actual usage.

Next, let's look at Table 2, which represents the occurrence of *all X likes* in BNC and WB in terms of their functions:

¹⁵ Instances in Category III with the 1st-person pronoun for X include the following two cases with the variant form of *all you want to*:

- (i) "... Look and listen all you want to, but don't try to interfere in any way." (BNC HPR)
- (ii) As we approached the bridge he stopped the truck.
"Right, Piper, you get off here and blow your fucking pipes all you want to. I'll pick you up on the way back." (BNC A61)

Table 2. Occurrence of *All X Likes* in BNC and WB in Terms of Their Functions

Person	Corpus	Total	I. Subject NP & Complement NP	II. Object NP	III. Intensifier Adverb
			Occurrence (%)	Occurrence (%)	Occurrence (%)
1st	BNC	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	WB	1	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
2nd	BNC	11	0 (0.0)	1 (9.1)	10 (90.9)
	WB	7	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (100.0)
3rd	BNC	10	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (90.0)
	WB	5	1 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (8.0)
sub total	BNC	21	1 (4.8)	1 (4.8)	19 (90.5)
	WB	13	2 (15.4)	0 (0.0)	11 (84.6)
total		34	3 (8.8)	1 (2.9)	30 (88.2)

Several interesting differences emerge between Table 1 and Table 2. First, the total number of tokens of *all X likes* is 34, which is much smaller compared with 987 of *all X wants*. What is also noticeable is that the majority of the instances, 30 out of 34, or about 88%, occur as an intensifier, while the counterpart is only 3.4% in the case of *want*.¹⁶ Thus the function of the form *all X likes* is virtually limited to the

¹⁶ Although the total number of words of WB is about half of that of BNC, there is no striking difference in the number of tokens of the adverbial usage instances in the two corpora. This is taken to reflect the difference in organization and speech genre. WB contains 2.5 times as much spoken English and, as I will point out in 4.4, this phrase appears mainly in informal speech and discourse.

adverbial usage. Taken together, it might be the case that the intensifier variant *all X likes* has been developed based on the more frequent collocation of *all you want*, and has been delexicalized to the extent that it has virtually lost its original semantic content. However, this remains merely a hypothesis until more data can be found.

Next, here again, the second person *you* appears most frequently with the phrase, accounting for 17 out of 30 instances, or 56.7%. This is, of course, a reflection of the way it is used, as in the case of *all X wants*.

We will see, in the next section, the actual examples and how the usage has motivated the development of the intensifier adverbial meaning.

4.2. Two Types of Context: Permission/Invitation and Acceptance/Concessive

In this section we examine the contexts in which sentences with the intensifier adverbial usage appear. The contexts are divided into two types in terms of the illocutionary acts the sentences with the phrase are employed to perform. One is a "permission/invitation" (PI) type of context, and the other is an "acceptance/concessive" (AC) type of context. Table 3 represents the occurrence of *all X wants* and *all X likes* in each of the two types of context:

Table 3. The Number of Context Types in Which AXW/L Appears

context type	<i>all X wants</i>	<i>all X likes</i>	total
Permission/Invitation(PI)	3	1	4
Acceptance/Concessive(AC)	31	29	60
total	34	30	64

The table shows that only four instances appear in the PI context and the remainder occur in the AC context. One thing that should be noticed here is that the difference between the two types of context is not categorical but a matter of degree. In actual speech situations, there would be cases where it is difficult to determine whether an utterance is meant to be permission or acceptance. With this qualification

in mind, we will examine the instances in turn.

4.2.1. Permission/Invitation (PI) Context

Observe the examples below:

- (27) Babe: Oh, I remember he said for us to eat *all we wanted*.¹⁷
I think I ate about five! He kept shoving them down us!
(WB usbooks0046)
- (28) “It is unbridled hypocrisy to say visual pollution is bad, but if you pay a fee you can pollute *all you like*,” he said.
(WB oznews0008)
- (29) “But you can go out into the basin *all you want*,” Mic broke in. “And over to the old watchtower. It’s kind of interesting. The door-keeper’s been told to let you in and out.”
“Just don’t go wandering too far, ...” (WB ukbooks0045)

The complement of *said* in (27) is understood to represent the speech that is paraphrased as “Eat all you want.” Here the speaker is giving permission to, or, one might say, inviting, the hearer to eat as many “banana splits,” which are given in the preceding context, as possible. As Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 931) note, the use of imperatives for expressing invitation is conventionalized.¹⁸

Also, in (28), the speaker says people are permitted to spoil the view under a certain condition,¹⁹ and in (29), the speaker is giving permission

¹⁷ According to Konishi (1980: 1321), *say* in colloquial American English can be followed by a *to*-infinitive that expresses an imperative complement like *tell* does with a *for*-phrase.

¹⁸ Their examples and explanation are as follows:

- (i) a. Come over and see my etchings.
- b. Bring your family too if you like.
- (ii) a. Have some more soup.
- b. Feel free to call in at any time.

“These have some similarity with advice in that you can choose whether or not to comply (accept) and doing so is intended to be primarily for your benefit—but it is a matter of what you would like, rather than what is calculated to be in your best interest. Invitations may lie at the boundary between the willful and non-willful categories, since compliance may be something I would like too. Where this is not so, they tend to merge with offers, where the speaker has an initiating and enabling role.” (Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 931))

¹⁹ Here, the speaker is not encouraging the hearer to pollute, but assumes a rather negative or critical attitude toward doing so. In this sense, this can be an example of “acceptance,” which I deal with in the next section. However, as I mentioned,

to, or inviting the hearer to, wander within a specified area.²⁰ The modal auxiliary *can* has conventionalized the usage that expresses permission and invitation, and the above sentences that include AXW/L are used on the part of the speaker to convey this notion.²¹

These sentences are addressed to the hearer and are employed as the speaker acts toward him or her. In this sense, the primary function of these sentences is considered to be interpersonal rather than descriptive. Also here, the designated acts that are permitted or that one is invited to do are in the interest of the hearer. That is, eating banana splits and wandering in the town are considered to be in the hearer's interest, and polluting the view is supposed to be in the interest of people or companies that are interested in putting up business signs. In conveying the intended illocutionary force, the speaker uses AXW/L to underline the hearer's interest. In this way the use of AXW/L, which means "as much as X wants," is motivated by the purpose these sentences are employed for.

4.2.2. Acceptance/Concessive (AC) Context

As we saw in Table 3, the overwhelming majority of the examples with AXW/L occur in the AC context. The examples are from (30) through (40), and they can be further classified into several types. In these examples, the sentences that include AXW/L refer to events that have appeared in the preceding discourse, and the speaker accepts them or assumes indifference to their occurrence. Consider the examples in (30) and (31):

this difference is a matter of gradience.

²⁰ In the following utterance, the speaker adds qualification to what the hearer can do. One might regard that this part functions like a concessive clause and thus this whole discourse can be interpreted as closer to the concessive construction. However, this utterance appears to be more independent of the preceding part, thus I include this example in the PI type.

²¹ The more straightforward permission-giving auxiliary *may* and the periphrastic form of *be free to* which conveys the same force are found, on Web sites, to be used in this construction, although these seem to sound odd to at least some native speakers.

- (i) You may view the files all you want—you can even save them on your hard drive.
- (ii) Linux is free. You are free to copy it all you want.

- (30) “Thanks very much for the diagnosis, Doc,” Rory returned wryly. “But you’re way off the mark. Now—are we going to get on with planning this party, or are you just going to sit there and make stupid remarks?”
Candy shrugged.
“Suit yourself. You can deny it to me *all you like*—I just hope you’re not trying to deny it to yourself.” (BNC JY5)
- (31) “So give,” Steve husked, obviously still feeling his loss and talking about it not helping one bit.
“What do you want to hear, a repeat of what you have just told me?”
“If you think it will help, repeat *all you like*,” Ruth sighed.

(BNC JY4)

In (30) the sentence that includes AXW/L refers to the hearer’s denial of the speaker’s “diagnosis” and the speaker “accepts” what the hearer did. I call this type of context “acceptance,” distinguished from permission or invitation, because the speaker is not actively or positively committed to encouraging the hearer to act in any way, and also because the speaker does not believe that the act in question is in the hearer’s interest. In this sense “acceptance” is meant to be used in a passive rather than active sense, and in a negative rather than positive sense. As for (30), Candy is not urging Rory to deny what she said, nor does she believe that denying is in his interest. On the contrary, in the following sentence she reveals her real intention: that denying himself is not what he should do.

Basically the same notion applies to the example in (31). Here, in uttering a sentence that contains AXW/L, Ruth accepts what Steve has mentioned as something he might do. However, as suggested by the way she utters the sentence—she “sighed”—what she says is not interpretable as her real intention. Rather it is interpreted as meaning that she thinks repeating does not help.

Regarding form, the sentence with *all you like* in (30) is a declarative with the second person subject and the modal auxiliary *can*, the same form as the relevant sentences in (28) and (29), but the speaker’s directive force toward the hearer is weaker than in the previous examples. On the other hand, (31) has the imperative form, but it does not have the commanding force characteristic of prototypical imperatives. This usage of the English imperative sentence seems to have drawn little attention. One of a few exceptions is Huddleston and Pullum (2002),

from which I borrowed the term “acceptance.”²² The sentences in (32) are the examples they provide:

- (32) a. Well, tell her if you want to—it’s all the same to me.
b. OK, buy it if you insist—it’s your money, after all.

(Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 931))

The imperative form accounts for 19 instances out of 64 sentences that include the phrase. Both declarative and imperative sentences are often followed by sentences in which the speaker states that the realization of the designated event will not change the existing situation or will fail in producing the intended effect. This context corresponds to the “concessive.” For example, in (33), referring to the hearer’s attitude toward him, the speaker states that it will not affect what he believes in:

- (33) “Disbelieve me *all you want*, but I know what I saw ...”

(WB ukbooks0045)

The same is true with example (34):

- (34) She laughed with a toss of her silver hair.

“Well, mock me *all you like*, but I’ve never fancied being up this high.”

(WB ukbooks0045)

The speaker mentions the hearer’s attitude toward her, and in the second sentence headed by the conjunction *but*, she implies that what the hearer does will not affect her present state of mind.

The sentences that include AXW/L, combined with the sentences that follow, create discourse that is virtually equivalent to the concessive conditional that is used with subordinators such as *even if*, or *no matter how/what*. Therefore, the imperative sentence containing AXW/L functions as a concessive subordinate clause. This usage is also discussed in Huddleston and Pullum (2002). They observe that “the acceptance use is not sharply distinct from that where the imperative is more or less equivalent to an exhaustive conditional,”²³ offering the sentences in (35) as examples (Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 931)):

²² Another exception is Takahashi (2004), which provides a unified, cognitive-functional account for a range of usages of English imperative sentences.

²³ The term “exhaustive conditional” is used to refer to conditional sentences that include subordinate clauses with expressions like *whether or not*, *no matter, whoever*, etc., because these clauses include conditions that constitute an exhaustive set. See Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 761).

- (35) a. Say what you like, it won't make any difference.
 b. Double your offer: I still won't sell.

They state that "[i]t is arguable that the imperatives here have lost all directive force, and that such examples are instances of indirect speech acts, with direct directive + statement indirectly conveying a concessive statement" (Huddleston and Pullum (*ibid.*)).

In (33) and (34), concessivity is explicitly marked by the conjunction, *but*. The same type of context is brought about by the declarative sentences in (36) and (37).

- (36) You can point the finger at the manager and coaches *all you like*, but now is the time for the players to stand up and be counted and get in there for Everton Football Club.

(BNC K97)

- (37) The Americans must have felt as if he was taking revenge on them for what had happened, but they had the final laugh since most of Rank's films weren't very good.

Rank could blame the government *all he liked*, but it was his own policies which had antagonized the Americans, alienated audiences and significantly increased the company's overdraft.

(BNC A7L)

In (36), the writer claims that "pointing the finger at the manager and coaches" is irrelevant in changing the present situation for the better, and in (37) the writer states that "blaming the government" is irrelevant in seeking the real cause that has brought about the situation.

There are cases in which concessivity is not marked explicitly with *but*, but rather contextually induced, as illustrated in (38) and (39):

- (38) "If you think I'll fall for that, you must think me very stupid indeed. Well you can apologize *all you like*, because I'll never believe you mean it, and I'll never accept your apology!"

(BNC AEB)

- (39) But Zagallo, winning coach in 1970 and assistant in 1994, remains defiant. He said: "People can criticise *all they like*, it brings me luck."

(WB sunnow0066)

In (38) the *because*-clause is given as a reason why the speaker has uttered the preceding sentence. The *because*-clause virtually modifies the main clause of a concessive conditional, rendering the whole sentence interpretable as meaning "No matter how you apologize, I'll never accept your apology, because I'll never believe you mean it." The same thing applies to (39). Here, the sentence that contains AXW/L can be

paraphrased as meaning "No matter how they criticize, I won't care at all, because it brings me luck," with the implicit clause corresponding to the main clause of the concessive subordinate clause.

Concessivity is implicit also in (40), but the concessive interpretation is straightforward from the context:

(40) "I'm sorry I pounced on you before," the dog told them.

"I get a little carried away sometimes."

"Think nothing of it," said the ducks.

"We understand completely. Pounce away *all you like*, we don't mind in the least." (BNC CFJ)

I hope I have demonstrated that in the examples discussed above AXW/L is used in the context in which the speaker's acceptance or concessivity is expressed either explicitly or implicitly. If one describes a concessive conditional as "EVEN IF S1, S2," in which the realization of S1 is assumed to be irrelevant to the realization of S2, the maximum effect of concessivity can be acquired by giving the exhaustive listing of possible S1s. Here, I consider the AXW/L to be exploited to achieve that effect.

Seen from a different perspective, the concessive sentence involves "surprise," which is caused by an unexpected change of character of the situation expressed in the sentence. As for the relation between S1 and S2 in the above schema, following the event described by S1, the event denoted by the negation of S2 is normally expected to happen. However, what will happen is supposed to be the event described by S2, and therefore "surprise" is involved. In this sense, in uttering a sentence that contains AXW/L, the speaker is creating surprise by negating the expectation created by the preceding sentence.

In this connection, it would be noteworthy that *all* has been grammaticalized into part of the concessive connectives such as *although* and *albeit*.²⁴ In addition, *all* often co-occurs with an idiomatic construction *having said that*, which expresses meaning similar to concessivity, illustrated in the following examples from BNC:²⁵

²⁴ See König (1985) and Harris (1988). I am indebted to Izutsu Narita Mitsuko for bringing these papers to my attention, as well as for discussion of the relation between the concessive construction and expressions that denote universality.

²⁵ See the following definition of LDOCE (2003: 1460):

(i) *having said that*: used to say that something is true in spite of what you have just said.

- (41) a. Having said all that, there is usually something you can do to redeem a place. (BNC ADK)
 b. Having said all that, you should keep your hands and nails in good condition for yourself and be proud of them rather than try to hide them away from view. (BNC C9P)

These facts seem to suggest that the use of *all* in the concessive context is well motivated, and I claim that it is because of the function of *all* as expressing exhaustivity.

4.4. Subjectification

Before concluding this section, I would like to summarize the subjectivity that the adverbial usage of AXW/L has come to assume. First, I will repeat the definitions of subjectification and interpersonal function that were adopted in 2.2:

- (42) It [subjectification in grammaticalization] is a gradient phenomenon, whereby forms and constructions that at first express primarily concrete, lexical, and objective meanings come through repeated use in local syntactic contexts to serve increasingly abstract, pragmatic, interpersonal, and speaker-based function.
- (43) “[I]nterpersonal” function can be interpreted as having the same meaning as the “expressive” function, in that both refer to the function of “expressing personal attitudes to what is being talked about, to the text itself, and to others in the speech situation.”

Here, I will employ the term “subjectivity” or “subjective function” as specifically referring to the “interpersonal” character and function mentioned in (42) and denoted in more detail in terms of “‘expressive’ function” in (43).

First, AXW/L does not affect the truth condition of a sentence, thus its primary function is neither propositional, descriptive nor objective.

Second, it is exclusively used in sentences that are addressed toward the hearer, and the speaker is acting toward that hearer. The speaker may be giving permission or invitation, which means the speaker is permitting the hearer to do something. Another possibility is that the speaker may be conveying acceptance or concessivity, which involves more of the speaker’s emotional attitude toward what the hearer has done, said, or is likely to do, rather than objective description. In this

sense, it has an interpersonal function.

Third, in conveying these illocutionary forces, AXW/L contributes to maximizing the expected effects: maximizing the hearer/reader's interest in the PI context and maximizing "surprise" in the AC context. This usage is regarded as having being brought about from the speaker's involvement with text organization, which can be considered to be a characteristic of subjectivity.

Lastly, it is easily observed from the examples we examined that AXW/L appears more frequently in conversations than narratives, and in more colloquial type of conversation rather than in formal speech. The narratives in the corpora in which AXW/L mostly occurs are categorized as being of informal, rather than formal, type, which includes leaflets, junk mail, advertisements, and popular magazines. This suggests that it is more liable to be an innovation.

All of the above-mentioned characteristics of AXW/L can be regarded as showing it has increased subjectivity in the sense I have adopted, and, therefore, has undergone subjectification. Thus, its syntactic category shift is associated with subjectification, which shows that its development has followed the general pattern of the category shift found in the cases of other intensifiers.

5. Concluding Remarks

I hope I have demonstrated that the AXW/L phrase has developed an adverbial usage as an intensifier from its basic NP usage, causing category shift. By means of the examination of synchronic facts about the distribution of the phrase in a sentence and also about its partial idiomaticity, I maintain that the development has gone through the transitional stage in which reanalysis was induced. The reanalysis was made possible, partly because of the lexical meaning of the phrase head *all* and partly because of the way AXW/L is actually employed. The examination of two major corpora reveals that the phrase is used in extremely restricted contexts: i.e. the PI and AC contexts. In both types of context, the phrase contributes to maximizing the effect the sentences that involve it are expected to bring about. As summarized in 4.4, from the way it is used, it has become clear that the phrase has undergone subjectification.

As I noted in the beginning, it is apparent that AXW/L is subjective, since it is an intensifier. However, by taking a very close look at how

it is actually used, a pathway along which meaning change has taken place suggests itself. I argue that the limited usage of the phrase has promoted the development of the intensifier meaning and motivated the category shift.

Regarding the examples of NPs that have the adverbial usage, one might first think of temporal adverbs such as *today*, locative adverbs such as *home*, and those that express direction and manner such as *way* in *this way*. However, the AXW/L phrase discussed in this paper offers a different type of category shift from that of these lexical items.²⁶

The discourse that involves a sentence that includes AXW/L can be seen as a locus where multiple schemas instantiated in actual sentences are interrelated: a schema that represents “universal” meaning, which, in this case, is instantiated by *all* which contributes to maximizing the intended effect in conveying a message; a schema of constructions that is related to the force of “command” which involves continuum, including domains such as permission, invitation, acceptance, etc. which is instantiated as imperative sentences and declarative sentences with the modal auxiliary “can”; and finally, a schema of concessivity, instantiated as a sentence that includes AXW/L, followed by a sentence that functions as the main clause of the concessive. By examining spontaneous usage, I hope I have demonstrated how these instantiations of schemas interact in the development of semantic and syntactic shift of the intensifier phrase.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, Sylvia (2000) “A Lovely Little Example: Word Order and Category Shift in the Premodifying String,” *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, ed. by Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach and Dieter Stein, 39–66, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Altenberg, Bengt (1991) “Amplifier Collocations in Spoken English,” *English*

²⁶ Another example is *big time* in the spoken and informal register. The following examples are from LAAD (2000: 122), and (i) contains the nominal usage and (ii) the adverbial usage:

- (i) He played in clubs for years before making it to the big time.
- (ii) I lost, big time, on that investment.

- Computer Corpora: Selected Papers and Research Guide*, ed. by Stig Johansson and Anna-Brita Stenström, 127–147, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1972) *Degree Words*, Mouton, The Hague.
- Bybee, Joan and Paul Hopper (2001) *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Carey, Kathleen (1995) "Subjectification and the Development of the English Perfect," *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*, ed. by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 31–54, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Declerck, Renaat (1991) *A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Dixon, Robert Malcolm Ward (1982) *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone?*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1986) "Pragmatically Controlled Zero Anaphora," *BLS* 12, 95–107.
- Harris, Martin B. (1988) "Concessive Clauses in English and Romance," *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, ed. by John Haiman and Sandra Thompson, 71–99, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Hopper, Paul and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (2003) *Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- König, Ekkehard (1985) "On the History of Concessive Connectives in English: Diachronic and Synchronic Evidence," *Lingua* 66, 1–19.
- Konishi, Tomoshichi, ed. (1980) *Eigo Kihon-Dooshi Jiten* (A Dictionary of English Word Grammar on Verbs), Kenkyusha, Tokyo.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2000) "A Dynamic Usage-Based Model," *Grammar and Conceptualization*, ed. by Ronald W. Langacker, 91–145, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Lorenz, Gunter (2002) "Really Worthwhile or Not Really Significant?: A Corpus-Based Approach to the Delexicalization and Grammaticalization of Intensifiers in Modern English," *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, ed. by Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald, 143–161, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Partington, Alan (1993) "Corpus Evidence of Language Change: The Case of the Intensifier," *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, ed. by Mona Baker, Elena Tognini-Bonelli and Gill Francis, 177–192, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Powell, Mava Jo (1992) "The Systematic Development of Correlated Interpersonal and Metalinguistic Uses in Stance Adverbs," *Cognitive Linguistics* 3, 75–110.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, Longman, London.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.

- Takahashi, Hidemitsu (2004) *The English Imperative: A Cognitive and Functional Analysis*, Doctoral dissertation, Hokkaido University.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1982) "From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization," *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 245-271, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1989) "On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change," *Language* 57, 33-65.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1995) "Subjectification in Grammaticalization," *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*, ed. by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 31-54, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1997) "Subjectification and the Development of Epistemic Meaning: The Case of *Promise* and *Threaten*," *Modality in Germanic Languages*, ed. by Swan Toril and Olfa Jansen Westvik, 185-210, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard B. Dasher (2002) *Regularity in Semantic Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Bernd Heine (1991) *Approaches to Grammaticalization* vols. I, II, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Corpora

- The British National Corpus Online (<http://scn02.corpora.jp/~sakura04/cgi-bin/login1.cgi>) [BNC]
- The Collins WordBanks Online (<http://scn02.corpora.jp/~wb03/cgi-bin/login1.cgi>) [WB]

Dictionaries

- The Oxford Dictionary of the English Language* [OED] (2nd ed.).
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (New edition) [LDOCE] (2003).
- Longman Advanced American Dictionary* [LAAD] (2000).

School of Medicine

University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan
(Sangyo-Ika University)

1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku

Kitakyushu-shi 807-8555

e-mail: ohashi@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp