Grammaticalisation in social context: The emergence of a new English pronoun[1]

Jenny Cheshire

Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom

The paper documents the early stages of grammaticalisation of a new first person singular pronoun, *man*, used in multi-ethnic adolescent peer groups in inner cities of the U.K. I argue that the pronoun derives from a plural noun *man*, which is used in the peer groups to refer to a group of individuals whose precise composition is defined by the linguistic or situational context. The recruitment of *man* as a pronoun is encouraged by the frequent use of its homonym as a pragmatic marker and address form in the peer groups, and by the locally salient connotations of some uses of the singular noun *man.* The functions of the plural noun and the pragmatic marker are reflected in the two main rhetorical functions of the new pronoun: adolescent speakers use the *man* pronoun to position themselves as members of a contextually defined group and thereby provide authority for their opinions or mitigate a potentially face-threatening act, and they also use it to solicit empathy from their interlocutor or construct solidarity. I suggest that a compositional model of the semantics of pronouns can account for the emergence of the new pronoun.

Cet article analyse les premières étapes de la grammaticalisation d'un pronom nouveau, *man,* chez les adolescents multi-ethniques dans quelques grandes villes de l'Angleterre. Dans ces groupes de pairs, le substantif *man* a développé une forme plurielle, *man*, qui fait référence à un groupe d'individus dont la composition précise s'est définie par le contexte linguistique ou situationel. Je soutiens que le pronom vient de ce substantif et que son apparition est renforcé par l'usage fréquent par les adolescents de *man* en tant que marqueur discursif et terme d'adresse. Les fonctions du substantif pluriel *man* et le marqueur discursif *man* se reflètent dans les deux stratégies rhétoriques principales pour lesquelles les adolescents utilisent le pronom. Un modèle compositionnel de la sémantique des pronoms démontre comment ce pronom nouveau a pu naître. [French]

KEYWORDS: Grammaticalisation, pronouns, linguistic innovation, adolescent language, multiethnolects

Our language is at present most singularly embarrassed for want of this most useful old pronoun. There are probably few English speakers or writers who have not felt the awkwardness resulting from our loss of this most regrettable old pronoun. (Earle 1871: 37, in Visser 1963: 51)

1. INTRODUCTION

Earle, in the quotation above, was referring to the English indefinite pronoun *man*. The pronoun died out during the fifteenth century (Rissanen 1997; Los 2002), but it is now re-emerging in young people's speech in multicultural inner cities in the U.K., albeit with somewhat different values from the earlier form. It can sometimes be interpreted as an indefinite pronoun, as in (1), but usually it could refer equally well to the speaker and mainly it does so unambiguously, as in (2).

1. I don't really mind how . how my girl looks if she looks decent yeah and there's one bit of her face that just looks mashed yeah . I don't care it's her personality **man's** looking at (Alex, Multicultural London English corpus [MLE])[2]

2. before I got arrested **man** paid for my own ticket to go Jamaica you know . but I've never paid to go on no holiday before this time I paid (Dexter, MLE)

I assume that, like its predecessor, the new pronoun has developed from the noun *man*, partly because of its phonetic form but also because it is common cross-linguistically for pronouns to develop from nouns, especially nouns that refer to 'person' or 'people' (Lehmann 2002: 35; Heine and Song 2011). However, it is unusual for first person singular pronouns to develop in this way. Little is known about their origins, but the information that does exist shows them emerging from oppositions in deictic space or social status (Heine and Song 2011: 610). The emergence of *man* as a pronoun with first person reference is therefore an unexpected development, and one of the aims of this paper is to explain how *man* can come to have this value. A second aim is to throw light on the more general issue of how personal pronouns emerge, a further question that has rarely been addressed. Heine and Song (2011: 587) note that this is mainly because of a lack of data. They argue that new pronouns are likely to originate as a rhetorical strategy used by one individual and then adopted by others, but since the individual act is no longer recoverable our ideas about the development of pronouns have to be 'based on hypotheses about how people interacted in the past, rather than on "facts" that are readily accessible to the student of language use' (2011: 626). I will suggest that the two research questions are connected, in that the use of *man* as a first person pronoun by young speakers in inner-city areas is a consequence of the rhetorical strategies for which they find it useful.

Since the pronoun *man* is a new phenomenon in present-day English, it does not occur very frequently, so the analysis presented here still suffers from the problem of insufficient data that was regretted by Heine and Song. Nevertheless, we can document some of the 'facts' and observe the rhetorical acts in which *man* occurs as a pronoun. It is so rare to be able to document the emergence of a new pronoun that it seems worth attempting an

understanding of the processes involved, even though the conclusions will be necessarily tentative.

I begin by discussing the different sources of data that I used for the analysis, and then, based on these data sources, describe the syntax and semantics of the new pronoun. In sections 6 and 7, I discuss two strands of evidence that seem relevant to its emergence. First, I show that in inner-city London and Birmingham (and perhaps elsewhere) the noun *man* has acquired a range of variable plural forms, one of which, significantly, is *man.* As a plural noun, *man* usually refers to a group whose composition is defined by the situational or linguistic context. I argue that it is a short step from using *man* in this way to using the same form as a pronoun. Secondly, I note the high frequency with which *man* is used as a pragmatic marker and address form amongst adolescents in inner-city areas. I suggest that as a pragmatic marker *man* conveys interspeaker solidarity and that this affective meaning, together with the local culturally-salient connotations of some uses of the singular noun *man,* helps explain why young people recruit the form as a pronoun in certain types of rhetorical act. An advantage of a small data set is that it allows scrutiny of the interactional contexts in which a form occurs (Snell 2010; Hundt and Leech 2012). In section 8, I therefore attempt to address Heine and Song's point about our ignorance of the rhetorical acts in which a new pronoun arises by analysing some of the discourse contexts in which speakers use *man* as a pronoun. Finally, I consider the implications of this study for our understanding of the earliest stages of the grammaticalisation of pronouns, especially the grammaticalisation of first person singular pronouns.

2. DATA

2.1 Multicultural London English (MLE)

I used four sources of data for this analysis, but the main focus is on one of these sources: a subset of recordings from two recent projects on present-day working-class London English: the *Linguistic Innovators* project[3] and the *Multicultural London English* project.[4] Only six speakers in these London projects used *man* unambiguously as a pronoun, and it is the recordings of these six speakers that I analyse here. The six speakers were all male, aged between 16 and 19. Apart from one self-recording, they were recorded with two or sometimes three friends by a fieldworker, Sue Fox. The subcorpus, referred to here as the Multicultural London English (MLE) corpus, consists of approximately 27,000 words and contains 11 unambiguous tokens of the *man* pronoun. These tokens are listed in the Appendix, with some context and a gloss.

Table 1 gives the pseudonyms of the six speakers, their self-defined ethnicity, and the number of times each speaker used *man* as a pronoun. The ethnic backgrounds are varied; what the speakers have in common is a wide, multi-

Table 1: Inner-city London speakers using *man* as a pronoun

Speaker	Self-defined ethnicity	No. of *man* pronoun tokens
Alex	Mixed race: White British/German/ Maltese/BlackAfrican	5
Zack	White British	1
Tao	Congolese	1
Dexter	Jamaican	2
Roshan	Mixed race: Mauritian/Jamaican	1
William	White British	1

ethnic friendship group. This is typical of adolescents in our inner-London research sites, which were peopled by many different minority ethnic groups of recent immigrant origin. I will argue later that this multicultural and multilingual setting has given rise to many linguistic innovations, one of which is the new pronoun.

2.2 Anuvahood

The film *Anuvahood* (Deacon 2011), a 90-minute urban comedy filmed in Hackney, east London, yielded 59 tokens of the *man* pronoun, used by four different actors. *Anuvahood* features local actors playing members of a street gang. In interviews the actors say that the characters they perform are like people they grew up with, if slightly exaggerated, and they claim to be speaking in a way that is authentic and typical of the area. The film is scripted but the writers, Adam Deacon and Michael Vu, grew up in Hackney and their backgrounds seem much like those of the young people in our London projects. Deacon's speech, as heard in interviews about the film, has the phonetic features typical of MLE (Cheshire et al. 2011). Adam Deacon is mixed race, Michael Vu is Vietnamese, and the appearance of the actors indicates that they too are from ethnic minority backgrounds.

2.3 One Mile Away

One Mile Away[5] is a 90-minute Channel 4 TV documentary about street gangs in Birmingham. The documentary provided a further 13 tokens from three young people from ethnic minorities. As far as it is possible to tell, the young people are speaking spontaneously; in fact, some of the tokens occur when they are talking on their phones to their friends. However, many utterances seem to be clips taken from longer stretches of discourse, so it is not possible to examine the full discourse contexts in which the pronouns are used.

2.4 Giggs Biography

A further 11 tokens were gathered from three young Grime artists and fans of Grime music contributing to an 11-minute *YouTube* Biography of the U.K. rapper Giggs.[6] Again, these speakers all appear to be from minority ethnic backgrounds and, again, they seem to be speaking spontaneously. No information is given about their regional backgrounds. Perhaps it is worth noting that Grime music originates in East London and that Giggs himself is a Londoner with Caribbean and West African roots.

3. YOUTH LANGUAGE OR LANGUAGE CHANGE?

It is striking that more tokens of the new pronoun were obtained from the three media sources in a shorter stretch of time than from the sociolinguistic research projects. It may be relevant that the six MLE speakers use *man* as a pronoun in emotionally charged sections of their discourse, when they are talking to each other rather than to the fieldworker. Perhaps, then, the presence of the fieldworker accounts for the low number of tokens in the MLE data set. The pronoun is certainly more widespread in London than this figure suggests. It can be easily overheard on the streets and on public transport, and students at the University of London recognise it.

   The high number of tokens in *Anuvahood* may indicate that the writers and actors recognise the pronoun as indexing a social meaning compatible with the 'street' personae that they are performing. As Bell and Gibson point out (2011), staged linguistic performances build on the foundations of existing social meanings. *Man* also occurs as a pronoun in scripted U.K. television sitcoms set in multicultural areas of London, such as *Phoneshop*[7] and *The Youngers.*[8] Here, too, the pronoun, together with other linguistic features and the dress and ethnicities of the actors, seems to index a social meaning associated with the persona of a 'cool' streetwise male Londoner. The use of *man* in *Anuvahood* and in these mainstream TV performances suggests that it is a socially marked feature, stereotypical of a multi-ethnic urban youth speech style[9] (see Kerswill in press).

   I use only the MLE corpus when considering the rhetorical strategies for which the new pronoun is used. I use the tokens from the *Giggs Biography* clip, *One Mile Away* and *Anuvahood* merely to give additional information on the grammatical role and referential values of the pronoun, on the assumption that these properties are below the level of conscious awareness. I also analyse plural forms of the noun *man* in all four sources of data.

   The six MLE speakers are aged between 16 and 19, as mentioned, and from their appearance all the individuals who use *man* as a pronoun are of roughly this age. At this stage there is no way of telling whether the new pronoun will spread beyond this age group. The low frequencies in the MLE data may indicate that we are witnessing the start of a language change: if so, its use in

mediated performance could lead to a wider take-up in everyday discourse, thus contributing to the spread of the innovation (Bell and Gibson 2011: 559; Coupland and Kristiansen 2011). On the other hand, the *man* pronoun may be a transitory youth-language phenomenon that speakers will drop as they grow older. In any event, the future fate of the pronoun is irrelevant for the topic of this paper since, unlike typical age-graded features such as slang vocabulary or a heightened frequency of non-standard grammatical forms, the *man* pronoun represents an addition to what is usually considered a closed system of the grammar. Whether or not it becomes more established as an English pronoun, analysing the ways in which *man* is currently used can help us understand the processes involved in the early stages of grammaticalisation of a new pronoun.

4. SYNTACTIC ROLES OF THE *MAN* PRONOUN

Table 2 shows that in all four data sets, speakers use the *man* pronoun more often as a grammatical subject. This could be seen as confirming Heine and Song's conclusion that pronouns developing from a noun meaning 'person' or 'people' tend to occur first in subject contexts (Heine and Song 2011: 617). On the other hand, it could merely reflect the higher frequency of subject forms in speech generally. Examples of the subject pronoun are given in (1) and (2), above; (3) shows *man* as an object pronoun and (4) as a possessive pronoun.

3. he used to make us laugh in the way he shouts <putting on a voice> 'I told you not to bring your phone in school' . make **man** laugh like (Tao, MLE)

4. No robbing **man**'s journal man (to a friend about to look in someone's diary; *Anuvahood*)

As a subject pronoun, *man* triggers singular verbal agreement, as shown in (1) above where it is followed by –s, contracted from *is*. Of course, the lack of inflections in English verbal morphology means that often no agreement is shown.

Table 2: Grammatical roles of the *man* pronoun in the four data sets

| Data set | Gramatical role of *man* | | | |
	Subject	Object/ oblique	Possessive	Total
MLE corpus	7	4	0	11
Giggs Biography	9	1	1	11
One Mile Away	11	2	0	13
Anuvahood	46	6	7	59
Total	73	13	8	94

5. SEMANTIC VALUES OF THE *MAN* PRONOUN

A common pathway for the development of pronouns from nouns referring generically to 'person' or 'people' is for the formerly generic noun to begin to be used with specific reference to groups of individuals. From this it comes to be used as a first person plural pronoun referring to a group of individuals that includes the speaker, perhaps after an earlier stage when the pronoun has indefinite reference (Travis and Silveira 2009: 249; King, Martineau and Mougeon 2011). Examples, in addition to the Old English *man* pronoun, include the emergence of French *on* as an indefinite and first person plural pronoun from Latin *home*, 'man' (King, Martineau and Mougeon 2011), and Brazilian Portuguese *a gente*, 'we', from the noun *a gente*, 'the people' (Zilles 2005). The German impersonal *man* pronoun is a further example, developing from the noun *Mann*. In Jamaican Creole, too, the noun *man* can have the generic sense 'people' as in (5) and (6);[10] some of these uses can lead to an interpretation of *man* as an impersonal pronoun, as in (7):[11]

5. man kaan fuul mi, man
    'people can't fool me, man'

6. ai no riili fiil se day ai am set above man
    'I don't really think I'm [set up] above other people'

7. man kyaan bai bred
    'people/one can't buy bread'

In the early stages of their development, new pronouns may have a range of referential values with one predominating. For example, in Old French *on* occurred with several definite values including first and second person singular and plural (King, Martineau and Mougeon (2011): 473); indeed, in present-day French *on* can still have a range of referential values (Peeters 2006).

Table 3 shows the semantic values of the *man* pronoun in the four data sets. Like Old French *on*, it has a range of semantic values but overall, and

Table 3: Referential values of *man* pronoun

Data set	1 sing.	2 sing.	3 sing.	1 plu.	indefinite	Total
			Referential value			
MLE corpus	9	0	0	1	1	11
Giggs Biography	4	0	0	3	4	11
One Mile Away	2	1	0	8	2	13
Anuvahood	51	3	3	1	1	59
Total	66	4	3	13	8	94

unexpectedly, it is first person singular reference that predominates, especially in the MLE subsample and *Anuvahood*. Examples (1) and (2) above illustrate impersonal and first person values; (3) above illustrates first person plural reference; and (8) and (9) below illustrate, respectively, second person singular and third person singular reference.

8. **man**'s trying to take me for some kind of idiot (female addressing her errant boyfriend; *Anuvahood*)

9. **man**'s only known you for about five minutes and even he's onto you (*Anuvahood*)

Numbers are low, but the fact that *man* has the expected distribution in the Birmingham *One Mile Away* documentary may indicate that it emerged later as a pronoun in Birmingham than in London: in other words, the distributions in *Anuvahood* and the MLE corpus could reveal that *man* first appeared in London with the expected indefinite and first person plural values, as in Birmingham, and only later became used to refer mainly to the speaker. Alternatively, *man* may have followed different developmental pathways in the two cities. In any case, in order to better understand its emergence it is necessary to analyse the use of the source noun in the four data sets, and it is to this that I turn next.

6. THE NOUN *MAN*

Zilles (2005: 25) suggests that the shift towards pronominal usage of the noun *a gente* began with a decline in the use of the generic noun *homen* or *ome*, 'man' and a parallel rise in the use of *a gente* with indeterminate reference. For a time both forms competed: so, as Zilles points out, 'there was variation before change or as change was getting underway'. In the data I examine here, there is also variation in the form of the source noun, in this case an apparent decline in the use of the plural form *men* in favour of a range of other plural forms: *mens* (occurring once only), *mandem, mans* and *man*. The most frequent

Table 4: Percentage (N) of plural forms of noun *man* in each data set

Data set	% of plural forms of noun *man* (N)					Total
	men	*mens*	*man*	*mans*	*mandem*	
MLE corpus	21.2 (7)	3.3 (1)	39.4 (13)	27.3 (9)	9.1 (3)	100 (33)
Giggs Biography	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	100.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	100 (3)
One Mile Away	6.4 (2)	0.0 (0)	74.2 (23)	9.7 (3)	9.7 (3)	100 (31)
Anuvahood	4.8 (1)	0.0 (0)	90.5 (19)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)	100 (21)
Total	11.4 (10)	1.1 (1)	65.9 (58)	13.6 (12)	8.0 (7)	100 (88)

plural form is *man*, as Table 4 shows (admittedly with very low numbers for the *Giggs Biography*). Examples of the different plural forms are given in (10) to (15).

10. she's been out with white **men** but she's never had a kid with a white man (Alex, MLE)

11. most Congolese **mens** in this country yeah they look funny cos like they got expensive clothes they wear all these Versace clothes D and G all that (Tau, MLE)

12. I wanna be with the **mandem** innit your friends who you grew up with (*One Mile Away*)

13. if you put all the **mans** together make them fight a cause together (*One Mile Away*)

14. some of my boys they were kicking **man** in the canal like from their bikes . people just driving past on their bikes . they're like out at ten o'clock kicking **man** in the canal and that (Alex, MLE)

15. I'm about to show you **man** how to get a woman (*Anuvahood*)

There are only three tokens in the data with generic or indeterminate reference: *man* in (16), meaning 'people', and *men* in (17) and (18).

16. but yeah when you're trying to do good **man** don't wanna see that though (Zack, MLE)

17. you think **men** don't cry when they break up (William, MLE)

18. this programme . how **men** and women cheat on each other and all that (Tau, MLE)

Men more often has specific reference, defined by a premodifier such as *white* (19) or *four* (20).

19. she's been out with white **men** (Alex, MLE)

20. I think it was four **men** (Dexter)

Both *mandem* and *mans* occur only with specific reference. *Mandem* always refers to the speaker's friends. *Mans* can also have this meaning, as in (13), but it also refers to young men in a different gang from the speaker, or to older drug runners. Other than the single exception mentioned above (example 16), the plural noun *man* also has specific reference, but the reference is to a group of individuals whose identity is made clear by the context. In *Anuvahood* both the linguistic and the non-linguistic context are relevant. In 16 of the 19 tokens from *Anuvahood*, plural *man* co-occurs with *you* (as in 21), *them* (22) or *us* (23), referring deictically to individuals who are present.

21. you **man** are all batty boys though

22. them **man** will kill me

23. all of **us** man got robbed because of you

Elsewhere, it is the linguistic context that specifies the composition of the relevant group. In (14) above, for example, *man* refers to people cycling along the canal towpath, as the following context with *their* makes clear (*people just driving past on their bikes*). In (24) *man* refers to the group of rival gang members that Alex has just been talking about.

24. what am I doing with over thirty-six **man** chasing me blud (Alex, MLE)

As a subject, the plural noun *man* triggers plural verbal agreement, unlike the pronoun (note, for example, the verb form *are* in (21) above). When there is no overt verbal agreement, plurality is often indicated by other forms in the Noun Phrase, such as a number in (24), *bare*, 'many' in (25) or *the majority* in (26); in both (25) and (26) the previous discourse makes it clear that the speakers are referring to their friends.

25. and I ended up hanging around with bare bare **man** (Roshan, MLE)

26. if it's like a big rave the majority of the **man** go together (Zack, MLE)

The fact that the reference of the plural noun *man* is determined by the situational or linguistic context is important in explaining the emergence of the pronoun, since pronouns by definition have a deictic or anaphoric meaning that is also contextually defined.

6.1 Ambiguous cases

Hopper and Traugott (1993: 41) argue that ambiguity encourages reanalysis since it allows a structure to continue to be analysed as before, while simultaneously allowing a new analysis. It is relevant, then, that the data includes seven tokens of *man* that could be analysed both as plural nouns and as pronouns. One such example is (27): here the preceding noun *people* suggests that *man* is a plural noun with the same meaning, but it could also be a pronoun referring deictically to 'us' or anaphorically to 'the people'.

27. he's rapping for the people he's rapping for **man** (*Giggs Biography*)

In (28), similarly, *man* refers to people who take the drug Ecstasy. The reference to a group of people is clear from the third person plural pronouns in the following linguistic context (*their death bed* and *gets them cold*), but again *man* could be analysed both as a noun meaning 'people' and as a third person plural pronoun coreferential with the previous and following *they* pronouns:

28. even if it's someone younger than me I don't mind shotting them weed yeah let them get a little buzz cos all they can do is feel sick and <makes pretend vomiting noises> vomit then go home and sleep but ecstasy you got **man** shaking up on their death bed like and it's all. they. gets them cold (Alex, MLE)

There are no indications in the discourse that ambiguity was an issue for any of the seven tokens.

I do not include these potentially ambiguous cases in the analyses, but simply note their potential relevance as critical contexts (in the sense of Diewald 2002) for the emergence of *man* as a pronoun.

6.2 Sources of variation

Why do the different plural forms exist? They are not typical of non-standard English dialects and in our two London projects they do not occur in the speech of indigenous Londoners aged 70 and above. They seem, then, to be recent innovations.

In fact, the pronoun is one of many innovations that are found in multi-ethnic inner-city areas in the U.K. – and, indeed, in similar areas elsewhere in Europe (see, for example, Wiese 2009; Quist and Svendsen 2010). In Hackney, where the MLE speakers grew up, indigenous white British families now account for less than half of the population, with the remainder made up of a wide range of different minority ethnic groups (for details, see Cheshire, Adger and Fox 2013). More than 30 different languages are spoken there (Baker and Eversley 2000) – and the linguistic diversity is greater than this figure suggests, since it does not include Caribbean and African Creole varieties or postcolonial varieties of English such as Nigerian or Indian English. The situation is similar in Birmingham and other cities with dense multi-ethnic areas. In these inner-city settings many young children do not acquire English until they go to nursery school, so from a very young age the peer group is an important influence on their acquisition of English. Since the peer group consists mainly of children like themselves, they encounter a great deal of linguistic variation arising from the mix of different varieties of English and learner varieties influenced to varying degrees by the many different languages spoken in their homes. Speech norms are highly diffuse, and there is plenty of scope for linguistic innovation. In previous work we have argued that individual speakers select variants from a 'feature pool' (Mufwene 2001) for specific moment-to-moment communicative purposes. We have used the term 'Multicultural London English' to describe the English spoken by young people in multi-ethnic London areas of this kind, defining the term as a variable repertoire of distinctive language forms that reflect the effect, both direct and indirect, of multiple language contact (Cheshire et al. 2011).[12]

The different plural forms for the noun *man*, then, probably reflect the unguided second language acquisition that occurs in multi-ethnic peer groups. The plural morpheme is known to be difficult to acquire for learners of English (Bialystock and Miller 1999; Jia, Aaronson and Wu 2002). The –*s* on *mans* and on the single token of *mens* suggests generalisation of the regular plural noun inflection. The uninflected plural form *man* may be modelled on those English nouns that do not have an overt plural inflection. *Police* and *people* are among the 20 most frequent nouns in the MLE subsample (the other frequent nouns, such as *house*, *brother*, *friend* and *girl*, have regular plural forms with [s] or [ɪz]). In the full corpus from the two London projects, *mans*, *mens* and plural *man* all occur in the speech of young children aged 4 and 8; and *mans* is used by some parents who are beginning to learn English as a second language. *Mandem* seems to derive straightforwardly from Jamaican Creole English.[13] All these variant plural forms, then, can be considered to be in the feature pool from which young people draw.

We saw earlier that, by the time they have reached adolescence, young people seem to have begun to attribute different meanings to some of the variant plural forms, with *man* conventionally referring to a group whose makeup is defined by the context. I argued that this paves the way for the form to emerge as a pronoun whose reference is defined in an identical way.

7. CONNOTATIONS OF *MAN*

A further question to consider is the rhetorical function of *man* as a pronoun. Recall that in the early stages of its development a new pronoun is likely to occur as a rhetorical strategy in face-to-face interaction (Heine and Song 2011: 626). Why, though, should young people choose to use this particular form as a rhetorical strategy?

One possible relevant factor is the frequency with which young people in inner-city areas use *man* as an address term and pragmatic marker. Kerswill (in press) finds *man* used almost four times as often by adolescents in multi-ethnic inner-city Hackney than in a mainly monolingual borough in outer London (1288.3 per million words in inner London, compared to only 761.4 per million words in outer London; an estimated 75% of these figures represent the pragmatic marker and address form).

Like other pragmatic markers, *man* is multifunctional. Sometimes it expresses surprise or other emotions, either alone or with other markers of emotion, as in (29).

29. aah **man** that's long that's kind of long (Roshan, MLE)

On other occasions it seems to add emphasis to what has just been uttered, though it can be difficult to separate out this function from that of an address term, as (30) shows. Perhaps the intertwined function of address term and pragmatic marker helps construct solidarity in discourse.

30. I got raped in the toilet once . seriously **man** no yeah I got raped three
     times there **man** (Tao, MLE)

Sometimes *man* occurs so frequently in a stretch of discourse that it appears
to function as a punctor (Macaulay 1985; Vincent and Sankoff 1992: 206),
breaking up the discourse much as a comma does in writing, while
simultaneously constructing mutual solidarity between the interlocutors:
(31) is an example.

31. he's going 'oh man I just done some dumb shit' like 'look at my arm'
     like his bone's all coming out he's like 'look at my arm **man** look at
     my arm bruv look' I'm like 'urgh **man** allow that **man** cover that
     shit up bruv' you get me **man** there's bones all hanging out his arm
     I'm like 'cover that shit **man**' I don't want to know about that (Alex,
     MLE)

The sheer frequency of the pragmatic marker *man*, then, may enable its
connotations of mutual solidarity and friendship to bleed into its homonyms
(see also De Smet 2010).

Certain uses of the singular noun *man* in the MLE data suggest that this, too,
may have acquired local cultural connotations for adolescent speakers.
Younger gang members refer to the older male for whom they work (for
example, by selling on drugs that the older male supplies) as *my man*:

32. police station bruv my **man**'s outside on a stolen bike revving it up
     <makes revving sound> (Alex, MLE)

These older males are prestigious in the local community, commanding respect
and fear from the adolescents. *Man* also occurs in frequent collocations
referring to culturally relevant types of individual, such as:

- *yardie man* 'black man' or, more often, 'Jamaican man';
- *big man* 'someone who feels superior for no good reason';
- *batty man* 'homosexual';
- *waste man* 'someone who does nothing with their life'.

These collocations are typical of Jamaican Creole English, as is the frequent use
of *man* as a pragmatic particle. Mair and Lacoste (2012: 105–106) argue that
Jamaican Creole features are used in metropolises around the English-speaking
world to index 'particular kinds of urban pop-cultural street credibility'. We
saw in section 3 that the *man* pronoun also seems to index a streetwise urban
persona.

Perhaps, then, the frequent use of the pragmatic marker *man* with its
connotations of mutual solidarity and friendship, reinforced by the culturally
salient connotations of the noun *man* and its collocations, provides an impetus
for speakers to use *man* as an innovative pronoun to accomplish specific
rhetorical functions.

8. THE *MAN* PRONOUN AS A RHETORICAL STRATEGY

Close analysis of the discourse context surrounding the 11 tokens of the *man* pronoun in the London recordings suggests that the pronoun has two main rhetorical functions which are sometimes intertwined: it allows speakers to present themselves as a member of a contextually defined group; and it adds to the communicative force of what they are saying.

8.1 First person man as a membership category

Speakers sometimes use *man* when expressing a personal opinion or point of view, as in (1), repeated below as (33).

> **33.** I don't really mind how . how my girl looks if she looks decent yeah and there's one bit of her face that just looks mashed yeah I don't care it's her personality **man's** looking at (Alex, MLE)

If, with Sacks (1972) and Schegloff (2007), we see pronoun choice as an aspect of membership categorisation, we can interpret the use of *man* here as lending authority to the speaker's opinion. As we have seen, in Multicultural English the plural noun *man* refers to a group of people whose membership is defined contextually. Perhaps, then, by recruiting *man* as a pronoun Alex can position himself as a member of a group, in this case the specific group of people who have this opinion. The immediately preceding *I* pronouns ensure that the focus is clearly on the speaker, but the use of *man* adds emphasis and authority by implying that there are others who share the speaker's opinion. In addition, the connotations of solidarity that may spill over from the pragmatic marker *man* can solicit agreement from the addressee: both the addressee and the speaker are positioned as belonging to the same group of like-minded people.

In (34), Alex tells his friend and the fieldworker what he said to his girlfriend, who had annoyed him by bringing along her friends when he had arranged to meet her.

> **34.** didn't I tell you **man** wanna come see you I don't date your friends I date you not your friends (Alex, MLE)

Again, by using *man* to refer to himself Alex portrays himself as a member of a group of people who would feel the same way, thereby presenting his reaction as perfectly reasonable, because it is likely to be shared. We saw earlier that the pronoun triggers third singular agreement on the verb, so formally it is a third person singular pronoun. Using the third person form *man* rather than *I* distances the speaker from what he is saying, making the remark less confrontational and face threatening for his girlfriend. Again, the connotations of solidarity and friendship that carry over from the pragmatic marker *man* could contribute to its function as a politeness form (in Brown and Levinson's 1975 sense).

Example (35) illustrates a similar strategy.

35. can you try and help **man** out yeah give me a get me a knife or
something yeah (Alex, MLE)

Here Alex is telling a story about a time when he was buying fried chicken and
was threatened by a gang of boys outside the shop. By referring to himself as
man when he asks the shopkeeper to help him, he can suggest that the
shopkeeper might be willing to help anyone who happened to find themselves
in that predicament, and he thereby makes his request more persuasive. Again,
by referring to himself as *man* he distances himself from what he says, making
the request negatively polite and non-confrontational.[14] The tone is reinforced
by the choice of words – *try and help* rather than the more direct *help* and the
intentionally vague *or something*. Once more, the connotations of the
pragmatic marker and address term *man* are relevant.

It is not unusual for pronouns that allow speakers to position themselves as
a member of a group to be used for a range of rhetorical functions. Stirling and
Manderson (2011), for example, show how a woman recounting her
experience of treatment for breast cancer shifts from *I* to generalised *you* and
in so doing displays her authority as a member of the group of women who
have undergone this treatment, enhancing her credibility:

36. **I** asked him to close the door (0.7) and you know, to lock it (1.0) and **I**
took- off my shirt (0.7) and my- the bra that **I** had on and, and the (0.6)
tsk- the prosthesis that they give **you** [R: yeah] so **I** took that off
(adapted from Stirling and Manderson 2011: 1587)

In other passages from the same data Stirling and Mandersen show how a
shift from *I* to generalised *you* can recruit the interlocutors' empathy,
engagement or assent (2011: 1597). Bolinger (1979), similarly, argues that
using generalised *you* instead of *I* invites the addressee to share the speaker's
own viewpoint. And King, Martineau and Mougeon (2011) note that French
on was stylistically marked in Middle French, and became frequently used by
the higher social classes during the 17th century as a negative politeness
strategy, to avoid direct confrontation. These discourse functions are paralleled
in examples (33) to (35) above. The adolescents also use generalised *you* with
these functions, but using *man*, I suggest, emphasises the force of the
communicative act, partly because of the connotations of its homonyms and
partly simply because it is a new and therefore striking form.

8.2 Man *as a strategy for adding emphasis*

The second way that the adolescents use *man* seems to particularly exploit
these properties. In (2), for example, reproduced below in expanded form as
(37), Dexter tells his friends how he was unable to use the plane ticket he had
bought because he had been arrested by the police. He uses *you know* to involve
the addressees, emphasises the fact that he had paid for the ticket himself with

paid for my own ticket (rather than simply *I'd bought a ticket*) and reinforces the personal drama of being unable to use the ticket by stressing that he had never paid for his own ticket before. He also highlights the amount of money involved (*a **big** three hundred and fifty pounds*) and explicitly mentions that he was *so upset*. Here, then, using *man* is just one of a number of forms that Dexter uses to emphasise the experience. Aimee's final question suggests that he succeeds in gaining the sympathy of his addressee.

37. Dexter: before I got arrested **man** paid for my own ticket to go
  Jamaica you know . but I've never paid to go on no holiday
  before this time I paid
  Aimee: and you got arrested
  Dexter: a big three hundred and fifty pound . I got arrested so I'm
  thinking 'ah I got arrested I'm gonna tell them that I've got
  a holiday to go to so they gonna let me out' . nah they
  didn't let me .. I was so upset ..
  Aimee: can't you get a refund?

In (38), similarly, the speaker uses *man* alongside other forms that emphasise the drama of his experience. Zack is talking about an occasion when one of the older members of another gang fired at him just to let him know that this older person was there, watching. He repeats *he let man know* with an emphatic *did*, replacing *man* with *me*.

38. boy just popped shots at me and he let **man** know . he did let me know

In examples such as (37) and (38) speakers do not seem to be implicating a specific group of people when they refer to themselves as *man*. Instead, they appear to choose a new form when relating events that for them are emotionally heightened, to make their speech vivid and to involve their addressees by talking 'in such a way that you are noticed' (Haspelmath 1999: 1055). The examples support Hopper and Traugott's claim (1993: 65) that speakers opt for new and innovative ways of saying things in order to enhance expressivity.

Again, these types of strategies may be typical of early uses of a new pronoun: once a pronoun becomes more frequent and more established in the language it is less useful as a rhetorical strategy. Heyd (2010) argues, for example, that *you guys* as a second person plural pronoun evolved first in emotive contexts. The fact that as a pronoun *man* appears to index a streetwise persona may also contribute to its suitability as a rhetorical strategy. Like the second person plural *allyuh* in Trinidad English, which is said to symbolise Trinidadian identity (Mühleisen 2011), *man* may symbolise for young people in urban areas an identity as a member of a multi-ethnic youth culture.

Of course, it is not unusual for speakers to shift the referential value of an existing pronoun to accomplish different pragmatic functions. Kitigura and Lehrer (1990), for example, discuss impersonal uses of personal pronouns; De

Cock (2011) and Wales (1996: 67–68) discuss the use of *we* to refer to the addressee. I have already mentioned Stirling and Manderson's (2011) work on variation between *I* and generalised *you*. It is rarer, though, to add a new form to the pronoun system to accomplish rhetorical functions.

9. GRAMMATICALISATION

Both Lehmann (2002) and Heine and Song (2011) consider the development of pronouns as an example of grammaticalisation, seen as the process whereby lexical forms, in certain contexts, gradually develop grammatical functions (Hopper and Traugott 1993: xv). The process involves a series of inter-related language changes, usually thought to include phonetic reduction, decategorialisation, semantic change and pragmatic shift (see, for example, Bybee 2003). Heine and Song (2011: 592) point out that these changes tend to occur in a diachronic sequence. Extension (equivalent to pragmatic shift) comes first. Extension triggers desemanticisation or semantic bleaching, followed by decategorialisation. Erosion (phonetic reduction) is usually the last process to apply, and does not always occur.

The emergence of *man* as a pronoun confirms the beginning and end points of this route. Erosion has not occurred. Pragmatic extension is clearly evident: the source noun, plural *man*, has been extended to new contexts requiring addressees to reinterpret the lexical item as having a deictic meaning.

Desemanticisation could be said to have occurred to some extent if we assume that the meaning of the plural noun *man* is 'group of human male individuals'. I include 'male' as a semantic feature since, as far as it is possible to tell from the contexts, the groups are usually composed of male individuals. Examples such as (39) confirm that the plural noun *man* retains the meaning 'male': here, Roshan decomposes the preceding hyponym *people* into the plural forms *girls* and *man,* apparently referring separately first to females and then to males.

> **39.** there's just bare people that we know innit bare girls bare man and there's some youths (Roshan, MLE)

As a pronoun the most frequent referential value for *man* is singular, and mainly it is first person singular (as we saw in Table 2). Clearly, then, *man* has lost the literal sense of 'group' or plurality. Like the source noun, though, it seems to have retained the sense of 'male': with only two exceptions the *man* pronouns in all four sources of data were uttered by male speakers (the two exceptions were extracted from *Anuvahood,* uttered by the same female speaker and addressed on each occasion to her boyfriend). Laitinen's (2008) analysis of the development of *he, they* and *those* as indeterminate pronouns in Early and Late Modern English found that women strongly disfavoured the use of masculine *he* as an indeterminate pronoun, presumably, he suggests, because

they were avoiding a form that for them indexed masculine gender. Similar gendered patterns are found in studies focussing on the loss of –*man* in indefinite pronouns. Nevailainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003) point out that gender is the only social factor that correlates with the reorganisation of the indefinites in Early Modern English; and Laitinen's (forthcoming) study of individuals who lag behind and polarise language change shows that male writers continue using the –*man* indefinites several generations after female writers. The female speakers in our data, then, seem to be behaving in a similar way to females in earlier generations.

The incomplete desemanticisation of the pronoun *man* is in sharp contrast to the pragmatic marker *man*, which developed separately, and much earlier, from the noun *man* and is now fully grammaticalised. In our data both male and female speakers use *man* as a pragmatic marker, and as an address term it is used both by and to females as well as males.

When *man* is used as a pronoun it has necessarily undergone decategorialisation, to the extent that it cannot occur with modifiers. The fact that it triggers singular verbal agreement also indicates decategorialisation from the plural noun. Unlike desemanticisation, then, decategorialisation cannot really be considered to lag behind the other types of change. Instead, it is co-extensive with pragmatic shift, occurring alongside and perhaps even before semantic change, not after it. The analysis presented here, therefore, suggests that the order of the changes associated with grammaticalisation is not necessarily that suggested by Heine and Song.

9.1 Triggers of grammaticalisation

Although the linguistic changes involved in grammaticalisation are well understood, the factors that trigger the process are less often discussed, mainly because we do not usually have access to the earliest stages of grammaticalisation. The data analysed here, then, offer an opportunity to consider possible triggering factors. There are two that seem relevant. One consists of sociolinguistic triggers, while the other is linguistic – in this case not exactly a trigger, but a relevant characteristic of pronouns.

Sociolinguistic triggers. The sociolinguistic triggers are twofold, and have already been mentioned. First, there is the process of group second language acquisition through which children in multicultural urban areas acquire English. The process encourages extensive variation and linguistic flexibility (see earlier; and see Cheshire et al. 2011; Cheshire, Adger and Fox 2013 for further details). The *man* pronoun, I suggest, would not have emerged if there had not been extensive variation in the plural forms of the source noun, one of which was itself *man*. For speakers already attuned to the functional flexibility of the form *man* (which for them is a singular noun, a plural noun, a pragmatic marker and address form) it may be relatively easy

to add a further grammatical function, perhaps especially since the grammatical function of a pronoun has much in common with that of a noun.

A further relevant sociolinguistic factor is the frequent use of the pragmatic marker and address term *man* in the peer groups. This may also be a partial consequence of the group second language acquisition setting. In the inner-city London recordings speakers as young as 8 use *man* as a pragmatic marker and address term with a high frequency, perhaps because it is an easy way for children not yet fully proficient in English to construct solidarity and show group affiliation in the fast pace of speech of their friendship groups (Kerswill et al. 2013). Subjective shades of meaning are well known to be present in the early stages of grammaticalisation (Traugott 2010), but the analysis presented here suggests that they may even be one of the driving forces.

9.2 Characteristics of pronouns

Pronouns, by definition, are contextually defined. I have stressed the significance of the reference of the plural noun *man* to a group defined by the discourse or situational context. A decompositional model of the semantics of pronouns is helpful here. Nunberg (1993), for example, proposes that the semantic value of an indexical is determined by the interaction of three components. The first is a *deictic* component, which picks out an index that is contextually salient. The pronoun *man* triggers third person singular verbal agreement, so formally it can be considered a third person form. It therefore has no index (since it does not refer to either the speaker or the hearer). The second component is *relational*, constraining the relation between the index and the interpretation. This relationship is defined by the context; it makes it possible, for example, for *you* to have generalised reference in some contexts, plural reference to the addressee and others at other times, and reference to a single addressee on yet other occasions. Unlike *I* and *you*, though, which have a basic index of first or second person reference, *man* has no predetermined index, so its interpretation is *always* contextually defined. We have seen that as a pronoun it can have a range of values, though the predominant one in London is first person singular. Finally, there is a *classificatory* component, which adds further information, including *Φ*-features, about other semantic features relevant to the interpretation: in the case of *man*, the interpretation is usually [+animate], [+male] and [+singular]. If the pronoun becomes further grammaticalised it would presumably lose the [+male] feature, as has the pragmatic marker *man*.

It is the relational component, then, and ultimately the contexts in which the pronoun is used, that determine whether a pronoun originating in a noun meaning 'people' has predominantly first person singular

reference, as in London English, or first person plural reference, as in Brazilian Portuguese or modern French. Since the interpretation is contextually defined, it is the speech acts for which speakers find it useful to use a new form that determine its referential value. The nature of these speech acts depends on the local sociocultural setting and, ultimately, the social lives of the speakers. I mentioned in the Introduction that the available information about the emergence of first person singular forms shows them tending to emerge from nouns referring to social relationships. For example, in earlier Thai culture speakers found it useful to refer to themselves as *khâá*, 'servant' when speaking to their social inferiors (Heine and Song 2011: 611). In multicultural peer groups in London, speakers seem to find it more useful to refer to themselves as members of a group, using a form that for them has connotations of group solidarity. In the emergence of new pronouns then, the linguistic and the sociolinguistic factors are intertwined.

10. CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to fill a gap in our understanding of how first person pronouns emerge, and to increase our understanding of the early stages of the grammaticalisation of a pronoun, though the low numbers mean that the conclusions have to be seen as tentative. I have suggested that subjectivity is an important driving force, as is variation in the source noun. The sociolinguistic setting is all-important, in this case providing the linguistic and normative flexibility that allows innovative forms to develop and survive, as well as the kinds of rhetorical acts for which speakers find it useful to use *man* as a first person pronoun.

It remains to be seen whether grammaticalisation of the new pronoun will continue, with *man* losing the sense of 'male' and becoming more widely used. In any event, Earle would have been intrigued and perhaps pleased to learn that *man* has reappeared as a pronoun in English, even if it is not quite the same pronoun as it was in Old and Middle English.

NOTES

National Dictionary Facebook page for examples and information about Jamaican English and Jamaican Creole English. Finally, I thank colleagues and graduate students at Queen Mary for their encouragement and interest at the LingLunch where I first tentatively presented these ideas.

2. Names of speakers are pseudonyms. The Multicultural London English corpus (MLE) used for the analysis presented here consists of recordings of six speakers who use the *man* pronoun and their friends. The corpus is described more fully in the following section. In the examples, a full stop indicates a short pause.

3. *Linguistic innovators: The English of adolescents in London*, 2004–7, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council; Principal Investigator Paul Kerswill, Coinvestigator Jenny Cheshire, Research Associates Susan Fox and Eivind Torgersen (ref. RES 000-23-0680).

4. *Multicultural London English: The emergence, acquisition and diffusion of a new variety*, 2007–10, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council; Principal Investigator Paul Kerswill, Co-investigator Jenny Cheshire, Research Associates Susan Fox, Arfaan Khan and Eivind Torgersen (ref. RES-062-23-0814).

5. http://www.channel4.com/programmes/one-mile-away/4od, accessed 1 May 2013.

6. The *Giggs Biography* is at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=px3Q8zbu79s, accessed 1 May 2013.

7. http://www.channel4.com/programmes/phoneshop/4od, accessed 1 May 2013.

8. http://www.e4.com/youngers/, accessed 1 May 2013.

9. This is confirmed by another *YouTube* video (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NtB1W8zkY5A&feature=plcp, accessed 1 May 2013) where a young white British speaker shows off his ability to don 30 different English accents: the second accent is identifiably MLE, contains seven tokens of the *man* pronoun in the 25-second discourse sequence, and is labelled 'UK – Southern/London – Street/Mandem/Rudeboy (Jamaican Slang Dialect)'.

10. Thanks to Peter Patrick for these examples and for many helpful comments and information on Jamaican Creole English.

11. Many thanks to Hubert Devonish for this example and this point.

12. Innovations in Multicultural London English include near-monophthongal realisations of diphthongs in the FACE and PRICE vowels (Kerswill, Torgersen and Fox 2008), a more syllable-timed speech rhythm (Torgersen and Szakay 2012), neutralisation of the *a/an* distinction (Cheshire et al. 2011), a new quotative expression *this is* +speaker (Cheshire et al. 2011; Fox 2012), use of *who* as a topicaliser (Cheshire, Adger and Fox 2013) and vocabulary items typical of Jamaican English such as *bredren* 'friend', *ends* 'district' (Kerswill in press).

13. Some scholars have suggested to me that the use of *man* as a pronoun with first person singular reference is directly influenced by Rasta Talk (or Dread Talk). Here, the first person singular pronoun is *ai-man* or, sometimes *dis man*; *di man* has second and third person singular reference, and *di ai dem* is the second and third person plural form. The pronoun *man* could be a shortening of some or all of these forms, and in fact there are lines in Bob Marley's *Rastaman Chant* where *man* does seem to be used as a first person singular pronoun. However, the young people we recorded in London did not show any particular interest in Rasta so it seems unlikely that the new pronoun could originate as a borrowing from Rasta Talk.

14. In Jamaican English, *man* may have been used in a somewhat similar way in the past. Cassidy and Le Page's *Dictionary of Jamaican English* (1980: 290) notes that 'the informal generic' *man* is 'sometimes used to avoid direct reference to oneself or another person', citing lines from a folktale taken down in 1924: *so when Cow go long, pass him, Cow say, 'Chuh*! *Man fool*! *Man kyan' work groun' 'pon rockstone*!' Cassidy glosses this as 'Cow is calling Anansi a fool without actually naming him'. However, subscribers to the Jamaican National Dictionary Facebook page say that they are not familiar with the use of *man* as a pronoun in present-day Jamaican English; and a generation later the same story was recorded by David Decamp with *man* in the quote clearly a singular noun: '*boy wat a foolish man*!'; '*Dat man kyan wok op an blak raktap like that*' (http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~patrickp/Anansi.html, accessed 24 July 2012). Many thanks to Peter Patrick for this information.

REFERENCES

Baker, Philip and John Eversley (eds.). 2000. *Multilingual Capital: The Languages of London's Schoolchildren and their Relevance to Economic, Social and Educational Policies*. London: Battlebridge.

Bell, Allan and Andy Gibson. 2011. Staging language: An introduction to the sociolinguistics of performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15: 555–572.

Bialystock, Ellen and Barry Miller. 1999. The problem of age in second language acquisition: Influences from language, task and structure. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 2: 127–145.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1979. To catch a metaphor: *You* as norm. *American Speech* 53: 194–209.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1975. *Politeness*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticization: The role of frequency. In Brian Joseph and Richard Janda (eds.) *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers. 602–623.

Cassidy, Frederic Gomes and Robert Brock Le Page (eds.). 1980. *Dictionary of Jamaican English*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Cheshire, Jenny, David Adger and Sue Fox. 2013. Relative *who* and the actuation problem. *Lingua* 126: 51–77.

Cheshire, Jenny and Sue Fox. 2009. *Was/were* variation: A perspective from London. *Language Variation and Change* 21: 1–38.

Cheshire, Jenny, Paul Kerswill, Sue Fox and Eivind Torgersen. 2011. Contact, the feature pool and the speech community: The emergence of Multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15: 151–198.

Coupland, Nikolas and Tore Kristiansen (eds.). 2011. *Language Standardisation in Europe*. Oslo, Norway: Novus.

Deacon, Adam. 2011. *Anuvahood*. Revolver Films.

De Cock, Barbara. 2011. Why *we* can be *you*: The use of 1st person plural forms with hearer reference in English and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 2762–2775.

De Smet, Hendrik. 2010. Grammatical interference: Subject marker *for* and the phrasal verb particles *out* and *forth*. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Graeme Trousdale (eds.) *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins. 75–104.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2002. A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization. In Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald (eds.) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins. 103–120.

Earle, John. 1871. *The Philology of the English Tongue*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press.

Fox, Sue. 2012. Performed narrative: The pragmatic function of *this is* + speaker and other quotatives in London adolescent speech. In Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid Van Alphen (eds.) *Quotatives: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins. 231–258.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics* 37: 1043–1068.

Heine, Bernd and Kyung-An Song. 2011. On the grammaticalization of personal pronouns. *Journal of Linguistics* 47: 587–630.

Heyd, Theresa. 2010. How you guys doin'? Staged orality and emerging plural address in the television series *Friends*. *American Speech* 85: 33–66.

Hopper, Paul and Eizabeth C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Hundt, Marianne and Geoffrey Leech. 2012. 'Small is beautiful': On the value of standard reference corpora for observing recent grammatical change. In Terttu Nevalainen and Elizabeth Traugott (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press. 175–188.

Jia, Gisela, Doris Aaronson and Yanhong Wu. 2002. Long-term attainment of bilingual immigrants: Predictive variables and language group differences. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 23: 599–621.

Kerswill, Paul. In press. Identity, ethnicity and place: The construction of youth language in London. In Peter Auer (ed.) *Space in Language and Linguistics*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kerswill, Paul, Jenny Cheshire, Susan Fox and Eivind Torgersen. 2013. English as a contact language: The role of children and adolescents. In Marianne Hundt and Daniel Schreier (eds.) *English as a Contact Language*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 258–282.

Kerswill, Paul, Eivind Torgersen and Susan Fox. 2008. Reversing 'drift': Innovation and diffusion in the London diphthong system. *Language Variation and Change* 20: 451–491.

King, Ruth, France Martineau and Raymond Mougeon. 2011. The interplay of internal and external factors in grammatical change: First-person plural pronouns in French. *Language* 87: 470–509.

Kitigura, Chisato and Adrienne Lehrer. 1990. Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 739–759.

Laitinen, Mikko. 2008. Sociolinguistic patterns in grammaticalization: *He*, *they* and *those* in human indefinite reference. *Language Variation and Change* 20: 155–185.

Laitinen, Mikko. Forthcoming. Indefinite pronouns with singular human reference in the long 18th century. In Minna Palander-Collin and Terttu Nevalainen (eds.) *Linguistic Change in its Social Contexts in Eighteenth-Century English*.

Lehmann, Christian. 2002. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization* (revised 2nd ed.). Erfurt, Germany: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Los, Bettelou. 2002. The loss of the indefinite pronoun *man*: Syntactic change and information structure. In Teresa Fanego, Maria José Lopez-Couso and Javier Perez-Guerra (eds.) *English Historical Syntax and Morphology*. Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compestela, 7–11 September 2000. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins. 181–202.

Macaulay, Ronald. 1985. The narrative skills of a Scottish coal miner. In Manfred Görlach (ed.) *Focus on Scotland*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.101–124.

Mair, Christian and Véronique Lacoste. 2012. A vernacular on the move: Towards a sociolinguistics of mobility for Jamaican Creole. *Cahiers de Linguistique* 38: 87–110.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Mühleisen, Susanne. 2011. Forms of address and ambiguity in Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles: Strategic interactions in a postcolonial language setting. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 1460–1471.

Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman.

Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1993. Indexicality and deixis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3: 1–43.

Peeters, Bert. 2006. Nous on vous tu(e): la guerre (pacifique) des pronoms personnels. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 122: 201–220.

Quist, Pia and Bente Ailin Svendsen (eds.). 2010. *Multilingual Urban Scandinavia: New Linguistic Practices*. Bristol, U.K.: Multilingual Matters. 111–126.

Rissanen, Matti. 1997. Whatever happened to the Middle English indefinite pronouns? In Jacek Fisiak (ed.) *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter. 513–529.

Sacks, Harvey. 1972. *Lectures on Conversation*, vols. I and II (Gail Jeffersen, ed.). Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

Schegloff, Emmanuel. 2007. A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 462–482.

Snell, Julia. 2010. From sociolinguistic variation to socially strategic stylisation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14: 618–644.

Stirling, Lesley and Lenore Manderson. 2011. About *you*: Empathy, objectivity and authority. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 1581–1602.

Torgersen, Eivind and Anita Szakay. 2012. An investigation of speech rhythm in London English. *Lingua* 122: 822–840.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.) *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter. 29–71.

Travis, Catherine E. and Agripino S. Silveira. 2009. The role of frequency in first-person plural variation in Brazilian Portuguese: *Nós* vs. *a gente*. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 2: 347–376.

Vincent, Diane and David Sankoff. 1992. Punctors: A pragmatic variable. *Language Variation and Change* 4: 205–216.

Visser, Fredericus Theodorus. 1963. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language* (4th edition). Leiden, Germany: E.J. Brill.

Wales, Katie. 1996. *Personal Pronouns in Present-Day English*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Wiese, Heike. 2009. Grammatical innovation in multi-ethnic urban Europe: New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119: 782–806.

Zilles, Ana M. S. 2005. The development of a new pronoun: The linguistic and social embedding of *a gente* in Brazilian Portuguese. *Language Variation and Change* 17: 19–53.

APPENDIX: *Man* pronouns in the *MLE* subcorpus

Examples are given in italics, with my attempted gloss beneath in regular type. The examples are sorted, tentatively, into two groups. Those in group 1 seem to solicit empathy, agreement or engagement from the interlocutor; those in group 2, I suggest, show speakers positioning themselves as members of a group of people who would feel or behave the same way as the speaker.

Group 1

a. *Man* = 1st person singular (speakers referring to themselves)

1. *Before I got arrested* **man** *paid for my own ticket you know* (Dexter)
   'Before I got arrested I paid for my own ticket you know'

2. *Boy just popped shots at me and he let* **man** *know he did let me know* (Alex)
   'The guy just fired some shots at me and he let me know. He did let me know.'

3. William: *I used to have bare drama with girls*
                   'I used to have a lot of drama lessons with girls'
   Sue: *with girls?*
   William: *bare drama . proper*
                   'a lot of drama . really'
   Sue: were you popular then?
   William: *course yeah* **man** *is well known*
                   'of course yes I'm well known'

4. *girls can chat to* **man** *. like they're like . got a lot of girls that call me their best friend because they can chat to me I'm just easy to chat to* (Dexter)
   'girls can chat to me'

b. *Man* = 1st person plural (speakers referring to themselves and others)

5. *he used to make us laugh the way he shouts and that <putting on a voice> 'I told you not to bring your phone in school' make* **man** *laugh like* (Tau)
   'he used to make us laugh the way he shouts and that 'I told you not to bring your phone into school'. Makes us laugh'

6. *No they're not us no they're not on what **man**'s on* (Roshan)
   'no they're not us no they're not like us'

c. *Man* = 2nd person plural (speakers referring to addressees)

7. *You lot go like **man** go like 'don't do it'* (Aimee)
   'You lot go like you go like "don't do it"'

Group 2

a. *Man* = 1st person singular (speakers referring to themselves)

8. *cos **man** ain't taking the coach . it's bait they search your bags and everything* (Alex)
   'cos I'm not going by coach. It's obvious, they search your bags and everything'

9. *can you try and help **man** out yeah give me get me a knife or something* (Alex)
   'can you try to help me out? Give me a knife or something?'

10. *I don't really mind how. how my girl looks if she looks decent yeah and there's one bit of her face that just looks mashed yeah . I don't care it's her personality **man's** looking at* (Alex)
    'I don't really mind how my girl looks as long as she looks decent. If there's one bit of her face that just looks worn out I don't care it's her personality I'm looking at'

b. *Man* = generalised 'you'

11. ***man**'s got to jump up to hit him he could just go bang bang and pushing fist start hitting youse and that's it* (Zack)
    'you've got to jump up to hit him. He could just go 'bang bang' and push his fist start hitting you and that's it'

Address correspondence to:

Jenny Cheshire
Department of Linguistics
Queen Mary University of London
Mile End Road
London E1 4NS
United Kingdom

J.L.Cheshire@qmul.ac.uk