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Many languages have a word which expresses totality or universality over sums, across (i) sums of atoms, (ii) sums of mass, (iii) atoms reconceptualized as sums. In Icelandic, for example, the stem all-combines with definite plural terms, as in (1), definite mass terms, as in (2), or definite singular count terms, as in (3).
(1) Hvað myndi breytast ef allir jöklarnir á Íslandi hyrfu? what would happen if all glaciers.Def on Iceland vanished 'What would happen if all the glaciers on Iceland disappeared?'
(2) Til að bræða allan ísinn byrfti að hlýna verulega á jörðinni... To to melt all ice.DEF needed to warm significantly on earth.DEF 'For all the ice to melt, the Earth would have to warm significantly ...'
(3) Pess vegna finnst mér að ganga eigi alla leið og friða allan jökulinn. that cause finds me to go not all way and peace all glacier.def 'Therefore we shouldn't go all the way and protect the whole glacier.'

Other Germanic languages, such as MSc, belong to the relatively few languages that make lexical distinctions among these three cases.

Although English whole as in '(3)' has been described, by Moltmann (2005, 628), as inducing a distribution "over all the actual parts of an object", it has also been argued, by Morzycki (2002), to be very different from all. So part one is devoted to showing that whole and all are after all essentially synonymous, and that the distinction drawn in English and some other languages is a superficial one.
Then, in part two, existing accounts of the English determiner all are reviewed, with difficulties coming to light along the way. In fact, it appears that theorists have been unduly focused on the plural count case, at the cost of the mass case. Even the recent proposals by Champollion (2017) and by Križ and Spector (2021) face hurdles. In response I outline an analysis where all just means the factor 1.

