

INTENSIFIERS IN LATE MODERN ENGLISH

A Sociopragmatic Approach to Courtroom Discourse

CLAUDIA CLARIDGE

University of Augsburg

EWA JONSSON

Mid Sweden University

MERJA KYTÖ

Uppsala University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> xii
<i>List of Tables</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxi
<i>List of Abbreviations and Notations</i>	xxiii
1 Introduction: Pleading the Case	I
2 Theoretical and Methodological Considerations	9
2.1 The Corpus Linguistic Approach: The Old Bailey Corpus	9
2.2 Historical Pragmatics: The Courtroom Setting	18
2.3 Language Variation and Change	27
2.4 Grammaticalization and Pragmatic-Semantic Change	29
2.5 Concluding Remarks	34
3 Intensifiers: Forms, Features, and Functions	35
3.1 The Realm of Intensifiers: Intensification, Degree, and the Like	35
3.2 The Classification of Intensifiers	39
3.3 Forms and Meanings	49
3.4 Syntactic and Lexical Patterns	53
3.5 Pragmatic Contexts and Functions	60
3.6 Chapter Summary: Intensifiers of This Study	63
4 Corpus Methodology and Overview of Data	64
4.1 Material: The Old Bailey Corpus	64
4.2 Principles and Process of Data Collection	67
4.3 Overview of Data	73
4.4 Chapter Summary	89
5 Maximizers	90
5.1 Introduction	90
5.2 An Inventory of Forms	92
5.3 The Semantic Inventory of Maximizers	102

5.4	Targets of Intensification and Collocational Features	106
5.5	Chapter Summary	118
6	Boosters	120
6.1	Introduction	120
6.2	An Inventory of Forms	121
6.3	The Semantic Inventory of Boosters	137
6.4	Targets of Intensification and Collocational Features	143
6.5	Chapter Summary	162
7	Downtoners	163
7.1	Introduction	163
7.2	An Inventory of Forms	168
7.3	The Semantic Inventory of Downtoners	174
7.4	Targets of Intensification and Collocational Features	180
7.5	Chapter Summary	193
8	Multivariate Analysis: Intensifiers in a Bird's-Eye View	195
8.1	Introduction	195
8.2	Results: An Overall View and Category-Specific Use	198
8.3	Concluding Remarks	210
9	Intensifiers across Time	212
9.1	Introduction	212
9.2	Time	213
9.3	Concluding Remarks	228
10	The Pragmatics of Intensifiers	230
10.1	Introduction	230
10.2	Characteristics of Late Modern Trials as an Activity Type	230
10.3	Functional Speaker Roles	234
10.4	A Case Study of Two Legal Speeches	256
10.5	Concluding Remarks	261
11	The Sociolinguistics of Intensifiers	263
11.1	Introduction	263
11.2	Previous Research on Gender and Class	264
11.3	Gender and Social Class in the Late Modern Period	266
11.4	Intensifiers and Gender in the Old Bailey Corpus	272
11.5	Intensifiers and Social Class in the Old Bailey Corpus	281
11.6	Concluding Remarks	287

12 Conclusion: Summing Up the Evidence	288
<i>Appendix A</i>	298
<i>Appendix B</i>	302
<i>Appendix C</i>	305
<i>Appendix D</i>	306
<i>Appendix E</i>	307
<i>Bibliography</i>	308
<i>Index</i>	328

Figures

1.1	Popular intensifiers across time (from Tagliamonte and Roberts 2005: 282, based on Mustanoja 1960)	<i>page 2</i>
3.1	Scalar (Quirk et al. 1985) versus boundedness (Paradis 2008) models	42
4.1	Facsimile from <i>Old Bailey Online</i>	66
4.2a	Example of proceeding from the searchable edition of <i>Old Bailey Online</i>	67
4.2b	Excerpt of XML-annotated Old Bailey Corpus file, with utterance marked off within <u>...</u> tags	68
4.2c	Screenshot of part of concordance in the OBC2Conc tool (Nissel 2016)	69
4.3	Diachronic distribution of the full inventory of intensifiers across the period studied (1720–1913) per 100,000 words	76
4.4	Diachronic distribution of the intensifier categories across the period studied (1720–1913), frequencies normalized per 100,000 words	77
4.5	Distribution of the ten most frequent intensifiers per 100,000 words. Raw frequencies and the proportion of a type among all intensifiers are listed in the right margin	78
4.6	Distribution of top six intensifiers in the Old Bailey Corpus, by subperiod (frequencies normalized per 100,000 words)	79
4.7	Zero-form proportions of <i>wide(ly)</i> , <i>great(ly)</i> , other boosters with zero form, maximizer zero forms, and downtoner zero forms, among all occurrences of each item or category	80
4.8	Gender and role of the 129,176 speakers annotated for gender and role	82
4.9	Gender and class of the 79,653 speakers annotated for gender and class	82

4.10a	Boosters and maximizers by gender across subperiods, and the average of all speakers annotated for gender (frequency-labelled, broken line); frequencies per 100,000 words	86
4.10b	Downtoners by gender across subperiods, and the average of all speakers annotated for gender (frequency-labelled, broken line); frequencies per 100,000 words	86
4.11a	Boosters and maximizers per social class across subperiods, and the average of all speakers annotated for social class (frequency-labelled, broken line); frequencies per 100,000 words	87
4.11b	Downtoners per social class across subperiods, and the average of all speakers annotated for social class (frequency-labelled, broken line); frequencies per 100,000 words	87
5.1	Distribution of the maximizers per 100,000 words, shown as bars. Raw frequencies and the proportion of a type among all maximizers are listed in the right margin	94
5.2	Distribution of the seven most frequent maximizers across the period studied (1720–1913) in normalized frequencies per 100,000 words	95
5.3	Diachronic distribution of the seven most frequent maximizers in our Old Bailey Corpus data that are also found in Hessner and Gawlitzek's (2017) study of BNC2014S (normalized frequencies)	98
5.4	The top seven Old Bailey Corpus maximizers and their occurrence in the British National Corpus trials	99
5.5	Proportion of zero form for dual-form maximizers	102
5.6	Semantic input domains of maximizers	104
5.7	Maximizers by target of modification; proportional distribution of target categories	107
5.8	Syntactic distribution of 200 adjectives modified by the top five maximizers	109
5.9	Semantic classes of maximized adjectives (based on Dixon 1977, 2004); proportional distribution	111
5.10	Semantic process types of maximized verbs/verb phrases (based on Halliday and Matthiessen 2004); proportional distribution	113

6.1a	Distribution of the boosters per 100,000 words. Raw frequencies and the proportion of a type among all boosters are listed in the right margin	123
6.1b	Distribution of the infrequent boosters per 100,000 words. Raw frequencies and the proportion of a type among all boosters are listed in the right margin	124
6.2	The top five Old Bailey Corpus boosters and their occurrence in the British National Corpus trials	129
6.3	Proportion of zero form for dual-form boosters	133
6.4	Semantic input domains of boosters	138
6.5	Boosters by target of modification (proportions). This includes approximate proportions for <i>very</i> and <i>so</i> , extrapolated from classified samples of 10 per cent each	144
6.6	Syntactic distribution of adjectives modified by the top five boosters (for each booster except <i>greatly</i> pertaining to a random sample of 200 adjectives)	148
6.7	Semantic classes of boosted adjectives (based on Dixon 1977, 2004); proportional distribution. This includes approximative proportions for <i>very</i> and <i>so</i> , extrapolated from classified samples of 10 per cent each	149
6.8	Semantic process types of boosted verbs/verb phrases (based on Halliday and Matthiessen 2004); proportional distribution	152
7.1	Intensifiers per 100,000 words in the Old Bailey Corpus, by category	169
7.2	Distribution of the downtoners per 100,000 words, shown as bars. Raw frequencies and the proportion of a type among all downtoners are listed in the right margin	170
7.3	Distribution of the five most frequent downtoners across the period studied (1720–1913) in normalized frequencies per 100,000 words	170
7.4	Diachronic distribution of the four downtoners in our Old Bailey Corpus data that are also found in Hessner and Gawlitzek's (2017) study of BNC2014S (normalized frequencies)	172
7.5	The top five Old Bailey Corpus downtoners and their occurrence in the British National Corpus trials	173
7.6	Downtoners by semantic category (normalized frequencies)	176
7.7	Semantic input domains of downtoners	177

7.8	Downtoners by target of modification; proportional distribution of target categories	181
7.9	Semantic process types of downtoned verbs/verb phrases (based on Halliday and Matthiessen 2004); proportional distribution	184
7.10	Syntactic distribution of adjectives modified by the top five downtoners (for <i>a little</i> pertaining to a random sample of 200 adjectives)	185
7.11	Semantic classes of downtoned adjectives (based on Dixon 1977, 2004); proportional distribution	186
8.1	Intensifiers: diachronic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic patterns in their estimated usage rate. Each pane shows for a given predictor model-based rate estimates (per 100,000 words), statistically controlling for the other predictors in the model	201
8.2	Maximizers: diachronic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic patterns in their estimated usage rate. Each pane shows for a given predictor model-based rate estimates (per 100,000 words), statistically controlling for the other predictors in the model	204
8.3	Boosters: diachronic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic patterns in their estimated usage rate. Each pane shows for a given predictor model-based rate estimates (per 100,000 words), statistically controlling for the other predictors in the model	207
8.4	Downtoners: diachronic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic patterns in their estimated usage rate. Each pane shows for a given predictor model-based rate estimates (per 100,000 words), statistically controlling for the other predictors in the model	209
9.1	Scribes' average normalized frequency of intensifiers across their working years (per 100,000 words). The broken line reflects the average of the full inventory of intensifiers for subperiods 1720–59, 1760–99, 1800–39, 1840–79 and 1880–1913 (per 100,000 words)	220
10.1	Model-based estimated rates of intensifiers of different categories (per 100,000 words) by speakers of different roles in the courtroom	235
11.1	Model-based estimated rates of intensifiers of different categories (per 100,000 words) by speakers of different roles in the courtroom	273

II.2	Model-based estimated rates of intensifiers of different categories (per 100,000 words) by speakers of different social classes	282
C1	<i>Very</i> : diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in its estimated usage rate	305
C2	Boosters without <i>very</i> : diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in their estimated usage rate	305
C3	Intensifiers without <i>very</i> : diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in their estimated usage rate	305
D1	<i>A little</i> : diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in its estimated usage rate	306
D2	Downtoners without <i>a little</i> : diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in their estimated usage rate	306
E1	Diminishers: diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in their estimated usage rate	307
E2	Minimizers: diachronic and sociopragmatic patterns in their estimated usage rate	307

Tables

1.1	Intensifier ranks in different studies (from Wagner 2017: 65)	<i>page 3</i>
3.1	Three scale-based intensifier classifications	40
4.1a–c	Overview of the (a) maximizers, (b) boosters, and (c) downtoners from the Old Bailey Corpus included in the investigation; raw frequencies and frequencies normalized per 100,000 words	74
4.2	Word counts of the Old Bailey Corpus	84
5.1	The fourteen most common maximizers and one rare maximizer in our Old Bailey Corpus data, and their frequency in BNC2014S as documented by Hessner and Gawlitzek (2017); frequencies per 100,000 words	97
5.2	Maximizers attested in the British National Corpus trials (normalized frequencies per 100,000 words)	99
5.3	Suffixed versus suffixless maximizer forms (raw frequencies)	102
5.4	Maximizers by semantic input domain (raw frequencies)	105
5.5	Distribution of maximizers by semantic input domain (normalized frequencies)	106
5.6	Targets modified by individual maximizers (raw frequencies)	108
5.7	Syntactic distribution of 200 adjectives modified by the top five maximizers (raw frequencies and percentages)	110
5.8	Semantic classification of maximized adjectives (cf. Dixon 1977, 2004)	112
5.9	Targets of modification and suffixed versus suffixless forms of maximizers	114
5.10	Adjectives modified by zero-form maximizers (raw frequencies), examples	115
5.11	Most frequent target lexemes of the top seven maximizers	116

6.1	Boosters searched for in the Old Bailey Corpus	122
6.2	The twenty-two most common boosters and one rare booster in our Old Bailey Corpus data, and their frequency in BNC2014S as documented by Hessner and Gawlitzek (2017); frequencies per 100,000 words	127
6.3	Boosters attested in the British National Corpus trials	128
6.4	Suffixed versus suffixless booster forms (raw frequencies)	136
6.5	Boosters by semantic input domain (raw frequencies)	141
6.6	Distribution of boosters by semantic input domain (normalized frequencies)	142
6.7	Targets modified by individual boosters (frequencies of <i>very</i> and <i>so</i> extrapolated from 10 per cent samples)	146
6.8	Syntactic distribution of adjectives modified by the top five boosters (for each booster except <i>greatly</i> pertaining to a random sample of 200 adjectives; raw frequencies and percentages)	148
6.9a	Semantic classification of adjectives boosted by <i>very</i> (cf. Dixon 1977, 2004); raw frequencies pertaining to 10 per cent sample	150
6.9b	Semantic classification of adjectives boosted by <i>so</i> (cf. Dixon 1977, 2004); raw frequencies pertaining to 10 per cent sample	150
6.9c	Semantic classification of adjectives boosted by boosters other than <i>very</i> or <i>so</i> (cf. Dixon 1977, 2004)	151
6.10	Targets of modification and suffixed versus suffixless forms of boosters	153
6.11	Adjectives modified by zero-form boosters (raw frequencies), examples	153
6.12	Most frequent target lexemes of the top seven boosters; raw frequencies (frequencies for <i>very</i> and <i>so</i> pertain to 10 per cent samples)	157
6.13	Intensification of boosters	160
7.1	Downtoners searched for in the Old Bailey Corpus	168
7.2	The twelve most common downtoners in our Old Bailey Corpus data and the frequency in BNC2014S of those documented by Hessner and Gawlitzek (2017); frequencies per 100,000 words	171
7.3	Downtoners attested in the British National Corpus trials (normalized frequencies per 100,000 words)	172

7.4	Suffixed versus suffixless downtoner forms (raw frequencies and percentages of the suffixless forms)	174
7.5	Downtoner subcategories (raw frequencies)	175
7.6	Downtoners by semantic category (normalized frequencies per 100,000 words)	176
7.7	Downtoners by semantic input domain (raw frequencies)	178
7.8	Distribution of downtoners by semantic input domain (normalized frequencies)	178
7.9	Targets modified by individual downtoners (raw frequencies)	181
7.10	Syntactic distribution of adjectives modified by the top five downtoners	185
7.11	Semantic classification of downtoned adjectives (cf. Dixon 1977, 2004)	187
7.12	Targets of modification and suffixed versus suffixless forms of downtoners	188
7.13	Adjectives modified by zero-form downtoners (raw frequencies)	189
7.14	Most frequent target lexemes of the top seven downtoners	190
7.15	Most frequent target lexemes of downtoners, by downtoner category	192
8.1	Rate ratios (highest vs. lowest estimated rates) of the four predictors for intensifiers overall and for the three intensifier categories	201
9.1	Scribes in the Old Bailey Corpus and their average normalized frequency of intensifiers	219
9.2	Interaction effects of time on the sociopragmatic variables (role, gender, and class)	225
11.1	Occupational groups in the two-class system (cf. van Leeuwen and Maas 2011: 57)	272
11.2	Intensifiers used exclusively by female and male speakers, respectively, per subperiod (no rank order)	277
11.3	Top six boosters per subperiod in rank order by gender, with frequencies per 100,000 words (raw frequencies in parentheses)	279
11.4	Top six maximizers per subperiod in rank order by gender, with frequencies per 100,000 words (raw frequencies in parentheses)	280
11.5	Intensifiers used exclusively by higher and lower-class speakers, respectively, per subperiod (no rank order)	286

B1	Estimated rates per 100,000 words and 95 per cent CI ranges of intensifiers overall, maximizers, boosters, and downtoners	302
B2	Estimated rates per 100,000 words and 95 per cent CI ranges of intensifier subcategories	303
B3	Estimated rates per 100,000 words and 95 per cent CI ranges of downtoner subcategories	304