EDICIONES
COMPLUTENSE

Recent Changes in London English. An Overview of the Main Lexical, Grammar and Discourse Features of Multicultural London English (MLE)

Ignacio M. Palacios Martínez[1]

Abstract. This paper is intended to provide an overview of the main lexical, grammar and discourse features of the so-called Multicultural London English (MLE), a recent multiethnolect that can be regarded as a new development of London popular speech with the addition of traits from a pool of other sociolects and varieties of English, namely Caribbean and Jamaican English, and with a high proportion of young speakers. The data here analysed have been extracted from multiple sources, such as the *London English Corpus* (LOE), the *Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language* (COLT), dictionaries, magazines, films, TV series, song lyrics and social media, mainly Twitter.
Particular attention is paid to those grammar and discourse features which can be considered as the most innovative, such as the quotative *this is* + pronoun, *man* used as a personal pronoun, the overuse of a set of vocatives (*brother*, *mate*, *boy*, *guy(s)*, *bastard*, *dickhead*), the invariant tags *innit* and *you get me*, the adjectives *proper* and *bare* used as intensifiers, a high presence of negative vernacular forms (*ain't*, third person singular *don't*), *never* as negative preterite and a high proportion of negative concord structures. As regards lexis, a wide range of borrowings and loan words from other varieties and languages are recorded together with an excessive amount of general vague nouns and general extenders.
Keywords: Multicultural London English; multiethnolect; language change; language innovation; youth language.

[es] Cambios recientes en el inglés de Londres. Una panorámica de las principales características léxicas, gramaticales y discursivas del Inglés Multicultural de Londres

Resumen. Este artículo pretende dar una panorámica de los principales rasgos léxicos, gramaticales y discursivos de la variedad del inglés conocida como Inglés Multicultural de Londres, un multietnolecto de reciente aparición que se ha creado como resultado de la expresión popular londinense junto a la suma de una serie de rasgos tomados de otros sociolectos y variedades, principalmente de origen jamaicano y del Caribe, y con un gran número de hablantes jóvenes. Los datos que aquí se analizan fueron extraídos de múltiples fuentes como son el corpus de inglés de Londres, el corpus de jóvenes adolescentes londinenses, diccionarios, revistas, películas, series televisivas, letras de canciones y redes sociales, esencialmente Twitter. Se presta una atención especial a aquellas características que se pueden considerar como las más innovadoras, como son el citativo *this is*+ pronombre, *man* utilizado como un pronombre personal, un uso excesivo de ciertos vocativos (*brother*, *mate*, *boy*, *guy(s)*, *bastard*, *dickhead*), las coletillas invariables *innit* y *you get me*, los adjetivos *proper* y *bare* usados como intensificadores, una alta presencia de formas vernáculas negativas (*ain't*, *don't* como tercera persona del singular en el presente), *never* con valor de pretérito y un alto índice de construcciones de negación doble/múltiple. En lo que se refiere al léxico, se identifican una gran variedad de préstamos de otras variedades y lenguas, junto a un número elevado de nombres de referencia vaga y de elementos finales de serie enumerativa.
Palabras clave: inglés multicultural de Londres; multietnolecto; cambio lingüístico; innovación lingüística; lenguaje juvenil

Contents: 1. Introduction. 2. Review of the literature. 3. General purpose and method used. 4. MLE main linguistic features. 4.1. Lexis. 4.1.1. Borrowing and use of words from other sociolects and languages. 4.1.2. Shortenings/Clippings. 4.1.3. Change of meaning of words. 4.1.4. Lexical items form marginal sectors come to the forefront. 4.1.5. Vague language. 4.2. Grammar and discourse. 4.2.1. Quotatives. 4.2.2. Address terms. 4.2.3. *Man* as a new pronoun. 4.2.4. Negation. 4.2.5. Pragmatic markers. 4.2.6. Intensifiers. 5. Final words.

---

[1]   Department of English and German, University of Santiago de Compostela.
        ORCID: 0000-0001-9202-9190
        Email: ignacio.palacios@usc.es

1. Introduction[2]

Over the last decades of the twentieth century, large urban centres in Europe, and in fact all over the world, Asia and Africa included, have gone through a number of changes produced, among other factors, by the arrival of large immigrant populations, this having a direct impact on the linguascape of these big cities with the emergence of a series of multiethnolects (Clyne 2000), which have also been referred to in the literature as *contemporary urban vernaculars* (Ramptom 2015), *urban vernacular* and *urban youth speech style* (Wiese 2009; Nortier and Svendsen 2015; Cheshire, Nortier and Adger 2015). Thus, we find the variety known as *straattaal* 'street language' in the Netherlands (Nortier 2001), *Rinkebysvenska* 'Rinkeby-Swedish' in Sweden (Kotsinas 1988), *københavnsk multiethnolekt* 'Copenhagen multiethnolect' in Denmark (Quist and Svendsen 2010), *Kiezdeutsch* 'neighbourhood language/hood language' in Germany (Wiese 2009), *Verlan* in France (Doran 2004), *Kebabnorsk* in Norway (Cutler and Røyneland 2015), *Bahasa gaul* in Indonesia (Smith-Hefner 2007), and *Sheng* in Kenia (Dorleijn et al. 2015), to mention just a few.

In the particular case of London, this new multiethnolect dating from approximately the 1980s has been known since 2006 by linguists and academics in the field (Cheshire et al. 2011) as *Multicultural London English* (MLE), although in the mass media, TV and daily papers in particular, it has been popularly labelled, often pejoratively, as Jafaican or Jafaikan, that is, a pseudo or fake Jamaican, due to the large number of speakers of Caribbean and African origin living in the area and making use of this variety. However, MLE is much more than that, it can be described as the result of language contact and second language acquisition, agglutinating speakers of English from India and Africa, Caribbean creoles, learner English varieties and even local London dialects such as traditional Cockney (Mott 2012). It is spoken mainly, but not exclusively, in the East End of London covering the districts of Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Islington, Shoreditch, Mile End and Bow, Spitalfields, Whitechapel, Wapping, Limehouse and Millwall, which have received a high proportion of young immigrant populations, and which correspond basically to the area traditionally associated with Cockney, to the extent that this multiethnolect has also received the name of the *new Cockney* (Fox 2015). MLE can then be regarded as a new development of London popular speech with the addition of features from a pool of other sociolects. At present, it is not restricted only to the districts just mentioned since it is also in use in other areas of inner and outer London, such as Havering and Essex, and by groups of speakers with different profiles and origins including here Anglo, non-Anglo, white, black, Asian and mixed-race individuals with a large proportion of teenagers and young adults. We here find then the perfect ingredients for language innovation: language contact, since we have a community of speakers of different language backgrounds; a large proportion of young speakers who are very fond of being creative and playing with the language; and a huge metropolis. All these factors and variables are precisely what makes MLE extremely interesting from a sociolinguistic perspective. Furthermore, because of its multicultural condition, MLE is also associated with new cultural, artistic and musical movements and trends where some rappers and grime musicians, such as Dizzee Rascal, The Dappy, Wiley and Stormzy, are also playing a role by introducing innovative features in the language. In addition to this, it should be borne in mind that there has always been a strong political component associated with London English and this is particularly so in the case of MLE. Several studies on language ideologies and attitudes (Kerswill 2013, 2014; Kircher and Fox 2019a, 2019b) have shown that mass media manifest strong reservation towards this new sociolect since it is regarded as foreign and linked to bad behaviour and social misconduct. In fact, a connection was drawn between this variety and the street riots taking place in London back in 2011 with over 1,400 persons arrested, where apparently, according to some journalists and historians such as David Starkey, "the whites have become black" and this also applies to their way of speaking.[3]

Moreover, considering the importance and tradition of London, not only from a political and economic point of view but also linguistically speaking, this sociolect has diffused in a major or minor degree to other large cities in Britain, such as Manchester and Birmingham, to the extent that some linguists (Drummond 2017, 2018) have recognised the existence of *Multicultural Urban British English* (MUBE), which shares a number of features across British urban centres although each of these varieties has characteristics of their own.

This paper is intended to provide an overview of the main lexical, grammar and discourse features of this variety of English, paying special attention to those traits which are regarded as most innovative.[4] Thus, it will try to fill a gap in the literature where attention has been provided to isolated linguistic characteristics but without presenting in close detail this English vernacular in its full form and from a global perspective on the

[3]　See <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/aug/13/david-starkey-claims-whites-black> for additional information (The Guardian. August 13th, 2011).

[4]　For reasons of space, phonetic and phonological features of MLE are not covered in this paper. See Cheshire et al. (2011) and Fox (2015) for information on this particular area.

basis of materials drawn from different sources such as corpora, websites, song lyrics, literary works and social media.

The study will be organised as follows: after the introduction, the next section will be dealing with a review of the main publications on the area; this will be followed by a detailed statement of the objectives and of the methodology pursued. Section 4 will be concerned with the actual description of MLE by referring to its main grammar, discourse and lexical features. Some tables and figures will also be provided as illustration of the main findings. The paper will conclude with some reflections in the in the form of final words.

2. Review of the literature

In spite of its short existence, there is an extensive literature on MLE. In what follows I will summarise those studies which can be regarded as the most important.

As regards grammar, special attention has been paid to the emergence of a new quotative or reporting verb (*this is* + pronoun) (Fox 2012), which is particularly frequent in the expression of teenagers together with *like* and *be like* (Cheshire et al. 2011); these contrast with the so-called traditional adult quotatives such as SAY, ASK, THINK and even GO.

The pronominal system has also been the centre of attention and, most particularly, the emergence of *man* as a pronoun for the first person singular and plural, and even as a generalised *you*. Cheshire (2013) has shown how this noun has gone through a process of grammaticalization, developing first as a vocative and then as a pragmatic marker by finally adopting features and roles typical of the pronominal class.

Palacios Martínez (2018, 2021) has investigated the role and pragmatic function of some address terms which are extremely common in the expression of these speakers; that is the case of *brother* and its variants *(bro, broth, blud, blood)*, *mate* and *boy* together with some taboo or offensive vocatives, such as *bastard* and *dickhead*. These vocatives, apart from functioning as terms of address, often behave as pragmatic markers serving to express both interpersonal (summoning attention, seeking solidarity among the speakers) and discourse-related functions (topic and turn management).

The area of negative polarity has been studied at length because of the high frequency of negatives in the language of MLE teenagers, especially if compared with that of adults, and the elevated proportion of vernacular negative forms; that is the case of *ain't* (Cheshire 1991; Palacios Martínez 2010), which stands out as quite multifunctional since it can be equivalent to negative forms of BE, HAVE and even DO.

Negative concord or double negation constructions (Anderwald 2002; Palacios Martínez 2017) often occur in MLE under various patterns by combining different negatives (*ain't, never, nobody, nothing, no, n't, nowhere*) as first and second negators. These very often serve to intensify or heighten negative statements although they are sometimes equivalent to single negatives.

Third person singular present *don't* (Palacios Martínez 2016) is not as common as third person singular present *doesn't* although the differences in their rate of occurrence are not as high as could be expected since they occur in very similar numbers. Work on negatives has been concerned with the adverb *never* as equivalent to a single negator in the past rather than expressing universal temporal reference (Cheshire 1985; Lucas and Willis 2012), this gradually becoming more and more common and found in similar proportions in the expression of young and adult speakers (Palacios Martínez 2019). Finally, the pragmatic meanings associated with negatives in teen talk are also particularly interesting since young speakers tend to avoid hedges and are extremely direct and straightforward in their exchanges, often using these structures as a kind of game to contradict their interlocutors (Palacios Martínez 2011a).

The distinct levelling pattern for the past tense of BE with the use of the forms *was* and *wasn't* throughout the whole paradigm has been discussed in detail by Cheshire and Fox (2013), although differences in this respect have been reported between inner and outer London.

Intensifiers have received extensive attention (Stenström et al. 2002; Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez 2014; Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo 2014) since differences in their use have been identified when comparing the language of teenagers and adults; thus, while teenagers often opt for *really* and *so*, adults prefer *very*. Moreover, some sporadic uses of *right* and *well* as intensifiers by the youngest speakers have been recorded. In addition to this, Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez (2018) draw attention on *bare* and *proper* as intensifiers typical of MLE, the latter being only found in the expression of teenagers.

Gabrielatos et al. (2010) and Fox (2015) have dealt with the article system in this variety, which stands out by being highly simplified as, for example, no distinction is made with the indefinite article forms between contexts in which it occurs before consonant-initial and vowel-initial words.

Finally, at the discourse level, a series of invariant tags such as *yeah, you know, you get me* and, more particularly, *innit* have raised the interest of scholars such as Torgersen et al. (2011, 2018), Palacios Martínez (2015) and Pichler (2016a, 2016b) because of their multifunctional pragmatic meanings. As regards *you get me*, for example, Torgersen et al. (2018) show how the speakers may make a comment on something said before, expand their speech or offer clarification. With respect to *innit*, Palacios Martínez (2015) has confirmed

that it has gained frequency in the last decades, particularly in teen talk, it is highly flexible in the sentence since it may occur at the beginning, middle or end, and it may perform different interpersonal and discourse functions by being emphatic and discourse organiser.

At the lexical level, the expression used by MLE speakers also denotes a high degree of innovation by introducing a number of new terms and expressions having to do with their geographical and social background (Cheshire et al. 2011; Kerswill 2013; Palacios Martínez 2016). The borrowing and use of lexical items from other sociolects and other varieties of English, namely Caribbean and Jamaican English, is a very common practice together with the high frequency of shortened forms of words, phenomenon that is motivated not only by their intention to being more economic in the use of language but also as their role as identity marker mechanism within their group.

The language of young MLE speakers is characterised as well by the prevalence of vague language in the form of placeholders or nouns with a general meaning (*thingy, stuff, thingybob*) (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo 2015) and general extenders or final tags such as *and stuff*, *or something* (Overstreet 1999; Cheshire 2007; Palacios Martínez 2011b). Although vagueness is at the heart of all these expressions, these may also perform other roles pragmatically since they may help in the organisation of discourse, they are sometimes used as devices to hold or cede the floor, and also function interpersonally by promoting cooperation between the participants in the conversation.

3. General purpose and method used

As mentioned above, the present study aims to provide an overview of the main linguistic features of MLE, with special attention to lexis, grammar and discourse. Thus, within lexis I will refer to the borrowing and use of words from other sociolects, the change in the meaning of some lexical items and particular word-formation processes such as shortening or clippings. Within the area of grammar and discourse, I will focus on the quotative system, pragmatic markers, the expression of vague language, which includes placeholders and general extenders, address terms of frequent use, the expression of negation and *man* as a personal pronoun and intensifiers. Special emphasis will be placed on those elements that can be regarded as most innovative or that may show some kind of evolving change.

I will use several distinct sources for MLE, the first and most important being the *London English Corpus*. More marginally, I will also refer to material extracted from COLT (*The Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language*) (Stenström et al. 2002) when describing the expression of young speakers although this can be regarded as slightly outdated considering that it was compiled at the early 90's. Incidentally, I will also consult data from the London sample of the *British National Corpus* (BNC) and the *Diachronic Corpus of Present-Day Spoken English* (DCPSE) as regards the language of adult speakers as this will allow me, when needed, to make a comparison between the language of these two groups of speakers. In addition, I will draw on a variety of websites and forums, television series and films, and the lyrics from London rappers, since rap music has also exerted a significant influence on the variety; we might note in this respect that many of the most influential rappers currently working in Britain come from East London.

The *London English Corpus* (LEC) was compiled by Cheshire and her team in London between 2004 and 2010 (Cheshire et al. 2011). This corpus includes the *Linguistics Innovators Corpus* (LIC) and the *Multicultural London English Corpus* (MLEC). The data for the former corpus, which contains over a million words from 121 speakers, was collected between 2004 and 2007 and includes the speech of both teenagers and adults. The MLEC was compiled between 2007 and 2010 and contains data not only from young speakers but also from small children as well as from adult speaker groups. It amounts to 621,327 words from a total of 137 speakers. In both cases the material was collected through individual and group interviews in youth centres and schools. The two corpora were accessed using the Sketch Engine interface. Part of the material was also kindly provided by Jennie Cheshire and Sue Fox. As is usually the case, the data retrieved from the corpora had to be filtered out several times so that the analysis could be conducted on valid data.

Regarding websites and forums, much of my data are drawn from the Spoken English Language Teaching Resources, provided by the Department of Linguistics of Queen Mary University of London and containing, among other things, a Databank of Spoken London English and a Research Digest with abstracts of recent academic work on spoken English.[5] Other useful sources include the web-based Urban Dictionary, Green's (2020) and Thorne's (2014) slang dictionaries, and a number of TV series and films which involve speakers of MLE, these including *Phoneshop* (Phil Bouker, director), *Kidulthood* (Mershag Huda, director), *Attack the Block* (Joe Cornish, director), and the series *Chewing gum* (Michaela Coel, director). Finally, for the lyrics of modern London rappers I have consulted those by Wiley, Dizzee Rascal, The Dappy and Stormzy. Information has also been extracted from some literary works such as Wiley's *The Eskiboy* (2018).

---

5   See <https:/www.linguistics.sllf.qmul.ac.uk> for more information.

4. MLE Main linguistic features

4.1. Lexis

MLE is full of expressions of its own, some shared by other varieties of spoken British English, although a large number are fully autochthonous. Many of these words, expressions and idioms are closely related to the geographical and social background of its speakers. This explains the existence of a high number of loan words from other varieties of English and languages (Section 4.1.1). MLE speakers also use a wide range of shortened forms in their everyday communication, which mainly derive from their colloquial nature (4.1.2), and they are also very fond of introducing changes in the meaning of common words and expressions so that some lexical items which generally denote something positive here acquire negative values and vice versa (4.1.3). In their mode of expression, we also find groups of words associated to marginal social domains or speakers and to activities which do not conform to what is generally regarded as the norm or mainstream (4.1.4).

4.1.1. Borrowing and use of words from other sociolects and languages

It is quite common to find lexical items and expressions from Jamaican and Afro-Caribbean English, given that in some of the districts of central London, such as Hackney, there is a large community of immigrants from these areas.[6] Some of the most frequent lexical items which have their origin in Jamaican or are commonly used by the speakers of this variety are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Common words in MLE of Jamaican origin

Term	Meaning	Example
ackee	national Jamaican fruit	they've got like erm *ackee* and saltfish which I think that's the national dish down there. (LEC) [7]
alie	exclamation of agreement with a previous point.	Jack: That new ting in cinema is sik. Mark: *Alie*! (UD)
badman	antisocial youth	A: ya see dat man deh him shot 5 five police.B: him ah real *badman* (LEC)
bashment	reggae dancehall music	I didn't go, man was into *bashment*. (Wiley 2018: 65)
ba(t)ty/ ba(t)tie	from bottom, vulgar, general insult: homosexual	he started shouting *batty* boy and stuff like that. (LEC)
bludclart/ bloodchart	a Jamaican swear word to express emphasis.	so instead of what the "Hell" is this? you could say what the "bludclart" is this? (UD)
bumbaclat	exclamation of surprise, marvel or disgust.	*Bumbaclat*! Look 'pon dis fine gyal ere'so! (UD)
chav	white working-class person with a stereotypically "low-class" lifestyle and way of dressing.	*chav* like rude boy sort of thing dresses like black man all baggy clothes and crap do you know how they wear all their hats and (LEC)
cotch	to relax at home or with close friends	they've got nothing. *cotch* on the stairs and smoke cannabis shit. (LEC)
creps	trainers	I went and look at and I wanted to go and buy a pair of *creps* for fifty pound. (LEC)
deya(h)	here, I am here	*Deyah* (TW)
duppy	to beat somebody up	the boys knows "oh shit they're gonna they're gonna *duppy* me". (LEC)
dutty	ugly, dirty	Jacob is a *dutty* beast and this was no "gaffe" this kind of rhetoric/ ideology is rife and intentional. (TW)
frass(ed)	extremely high or drunk	if you're frass yeah that means you're this . </s><s> feeling lively "I'm just *frassed* " (LEC)

---

[6]   According to the census figures provided by the Hackney Council for 2019, 25.1% of the whole population in this London district have Caribbean origin. More information at: <https://hackney.gov.uk/population>

[7]   Each example is followed by a code indicating the corpus or the source from which it was extracted. Thus, LEC, COB, DCPSE, BNC, UD, TW stand for *London English Corpus*, *Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language*, *Diachronic Corpus of Present-Day Spoken English*, *British National Corpus*, *Urban Dictionary* and Twitter, respectively.

pickney	child/children	it's my fucking *pickney* don't tell me what to do with my child. (LEC)
safe	hi, see you later, term of approval used in different situations (Green 2020)	if you say "safe" "safe" is] what "safe" basically means like . </s><s> "see you" like "see you later" yeah "safe" ... (LEC)
skeen	OK	on my sixteenth birthday my mum goes . erm "I know you want cigarette so go out in the garden and have one" I was like "oh *skeen* bye". (LEC)
sket/ sketel	loose woman and short for Caribbean sketel meaning 'slut'	oh I heard you called my mum a slag. I heard you called me a *sket* and I was like "this is pathetic this is like junior school stuff". (LEC)
wah gwam/ wahgwam	Greeting: How are you doing? What's up?	*wah gwaam* man? (UD) *What's gwaning*, Nan? Y'aright? (Wiley 2018: 30)
woyless	careless	I'm not a *woyless* father. (Wiley 2018: 157)
yardie	Jamaican or Jamaican descents that live abroad, typically in the UK. It may also refer to a gang.	my mum is a tough *yardie*. (LEC)
yute/yout	youth, kid(s)	Because he's a dark *yout*. (Wiley 2018: 110)

The adjective *bare* is also commonly used as a quantifier (1) and even as an intensifier of adjectives as will be discussed below in the Section on intensifiers (4.2.6). This also seems to be fairly common in Jamaican English according to Drummond (2017: 645).

> (1)   I ain't got a lot of cousins boy *bare* people have got *bare* cousins I've only got about three. (LEC)

The plural suffix-*dem* attached mainly to animate nouns, as in *boydem, mandem, peopledem, galdem* also has its origin in this variety (Cheshire et al. 2011, Kerswill 2013). By *boydem*, London teenagers mean policemen or members of a gang. Witness the following:

> (2)   It's baffling the *boydem boydem* not knowing where they're going. (LEC)

We also find words from Arabic such as *akh*, a short form for "brother", from African-American English e.g. *bling* "flashy ostentatious and elaborate jewellery", *brap(p)* "exclamation of approval", *crib* meaning 'home', *du-rag* "a silk-like material worn around the head of black mates" Also from Spanish the following items are recorded: *tapas bar, amigo, adió*s, *loco, sombrero, zapatos, ponce* from *príncipe* 'prince', *hasta la vista, guapo, pina colada, Tía María*, etc. There are also some words from French, such as *café, chic, coup, mousse, pom-pom*; from Italian, e.g. *bravo, studio, lido, mafia*, and even from Yiddish, namely *schmuck*, meaning stupid or foolish. It is true that most of these words are currently present in almost any variety of English nowadays but in MLE, due to the presence of speakers from many different backgrounds and of its multiculturality nature, the volume of these lexical items is much higher. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that young speakers, broadly speaking, are very receptive to words from other languages and jargons since they easily incorporate them in their everyday expression (Drange 2009). Here are some examples of the use of some of these items:

> (3)   Funny trip home last night with dappy on the plane laughing at my huge fuck off *sombrero* (TW)
> (4)   he's not chatting about having holes in his *zapatos*. (Wiley 2018: 80)
> (5)   yeps he go through # starts clapping # *bravo* for her. (LEC)
> (6)   she's a dodgy girl innit is that a see see innit? </s><s> yeah is German *chic*. (TW)

4.1.2. Shortenings/Clippings

In colloquial spoken English it is very common to find shortened or clipped versions of full words. This is particularly so in the language of MLE teenagers, and is not only motivated by the constraints of economy of language but also as a strategy to strengthen the group. Some of the original words from which they derive sound very long so this may explain the need for their reduction. In addition, these clippings or reduced forms generally correspond to lexical items which are very frequently used and widely known for the speakers. This familiarity is precisely what makes these individuals refer to these terms in this way and, as before, this is one of the strategies to reinforce their identity as a group, that is, to support the feeling that they all share the same code that binds them together.

Table 2: Common clippings in MLE

Clipped term	Full term	Example
aggro	aggressive	It just sounds well *aggro*. (LEC)
alkie	alcoholic	You *alkie* man. (LEC)
astro	astro turf, artificial turf	a new *astro* they've got got a new one there? (LEC)
cuz	cousin, good friend	What ends are you from *cuz*? (LEC)
diff	different	ours was *diff*. (LEC)
div	divider	I think you just look like a *div* no one is impressed by it. (LEC)
fam	family(ies) (used also as an address term, especially in social networks such as Twitter)	*Fam*, I've never lived in England whilst @Dizzee Rascal has been touring (TW)
garms	garments	They are all wearing their *garms*. (LEC)
Hack	Hackney	My family lives in *Hack*. (LEC)
marvy	marvellous	I'm worth two dubbs none of the *marvy*. (Wiley 2018: 129)
ped	moped, small motorbike	I had a stolen *ped*. (LEC)
peo	people	I don't know what attracts *peo*. (LEC)
perf	perfect	A: I'll come at 8 for the party. B: *Perf* (UD)
po(s)	police	I don't know if the *PO POS* are after me or something like that. (LEC)
prob(s).	probably	you know had to leave school *prob*. (LEC)
ques	question	cos you're like doing all the rides and the *ques* is we could… (LEC)
regs	regular basis	I was getting robbed on a *regs*. (LEC)
sis	sister	I live with my *sis*. (LEC)
totes	totally	That guy is *totes* a hottie. (UD)

4.1.3. Change of meaning of words

This semantic change is particularly common with adjectives, and involves a word which usually denotes something positive being turned into something negative, or vice versa. This is generally done by young speakers to subvert reality and react against the establishment. Thus, we find *wicked, sweet, rude, heavy* and *sick* with the meaning of great or good, *mould* meaning stage or period, *crew* referring to a group of friends or gang, and *beef* meaning trouble or fight. Some examples follow:

(7)   Oh it's lovely… it's *wicked*. (LEC)
(8)   But they also had a piano, guitars, speakers. They were *sick* musicians. (Wiley 2018: 10)
(9)   I might start *beef* with you you get me? (LEC)

Also, for some meanings a large number of different terms are found, as if they are in competition to convey the same idea, as with *drugged, frassed, mashed, pissed, stoned, zoned,* all meaning to be high on drugs or heavily drunk.

(10)   You're just getting *mashed* with your friends. (LEC)

At times MLE speakers, teenagers in particular, alter the meaning of words by creating a metaphor or a metonymical image; this is the case with words such as *bits*, *ends*, *manor*, *turf* and *yard*, used to refer to a speaker's own area or district.

(11)   my *ends* are East Ham and Manor Park. (LEC)

4.1.4. Lexical items from marginal sectors come to the forefront

When analysing the expression of many MLE young speakers, we notice the presence of new items that are closely connected with the topics of their daily conversations and with their own hobbies and interests (music, sports, fashion, sex, technology, videogames, etc.). Thus, we find a series of words referring to music e.g. *bars*

(lyrics), *spit bars* meaning "to rap", *jam* "favourite song", *stem* "multitracks of songs", r and b "rythms and blues", *drum and bass*, *mc-ing* "performing as a Master of Ceremonies in rapping", *wavey* "transmission of positive vibes", etc.

> (12)   they're representing Hackney and other areas as well and stuff and they're just *spitting* the lyrics as well made really good beats. (LEC)

The same applies to clothing, namely *c/kreps* "trainers", *bally* "a rag that covers a person's face", *low batties* "trousers than hang low on the waist'", *durag (du-rag)* similar in meaning to *bally*.

> (13)   I'm not being funny yeah but a *low batties* I swear it's a bad thing with *low batties*. (LEC)

In addition, there are also other items that refer in different ways to money, such as *pea*, *sterling*, *doe*, *dosh*, *dough* and *bill* (note).

> (14)   they don't realise they all think it's so easy money work like they get so much *dough* and that but. (LEC)

The domains of drugs and weapons are also clearly present in their exchanges. Terms such as *benner(s)* "ten pounds worth of marijuana", *bun* "smoke marijuana", *cats* "people who buy drugs", *draw* and *ganja* meaning both "cannabis", *cokehead*, *grit* "joint" would belong to the former while *leng* and *stick* "gun", *corn* "ammunition", *shank* "knife" or "stab somebody with a knife" and *lick off* "shoot a gun" would be classified within the latter.

> (15)   pretending that they was *cats* cos they got their number and phoned the man said "yeah we want something "and then they come and then they took all their crack and then... (LEC)
> (16)   they started beating them and *shanking* them. (LEC)

These speakers in their interactions are also very fond of using pejorative and offensive language when referring to persons they do not particularly like. These may have to do with their physical appearance, such as *butters*, *clapped*, *grim*, social condition, for example, *wasteman*, *roadman*, *badman*, *dutty*, *rotter,* or sexual orientation or behaviour, such as *battie* meaning homosexual and *sket* and *bizzle* referring to a prostitute.

> (17)   he's a *wasteman* tell him I'm gonna bang him up (LEC)

4.1.5. Vague language

The expression of MLE speakers shows the prevalence of vague words and expressions (Channell 1994), in particular, placeholders (*thingy*, *stuff*, *thingybob*) (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo 2015) and general extenders (*and things*, *and stuff*, *or something*, *and everything*) (Cheshire 2007; Palacios Martínez 2011b).

Placeholders, vague reference or dummy nouns, are lexical words that are almost empty semantically, multipurpose in communication, and without a referential meaning, since this has to be inferred by the listener (Jucker et al. 2003: 1749). They can stand for nouns or names of people, and have to be interpreted pragmatically. The category of placeholders includes terms such as *thing(s)*, *thingy/thingie*, *stuff*, *thingummy(bob)*, *thingybob*, *whatsit*, *whosit*, *whatnot* and *whatitsname*. Contrary to what was expected, adults in MLE tend to use them more often than teenagers, although the latter group have in fact a larger repertoire of them. A total of 14 placeholders were identified, with *thing*(*s*), *stuff*, *thingy* and *so and so* being the most common in both groups of speakers.

Table 3: General frequency of placeholders in the language of MLE teenagers and adults

Placeholder	COLT (young, 431,528 words)		LIC (young, 1,223,000 words)		DCPSE (adult, 425,519 words)		BNC (adult, 2,801,159 words)	
	N	*freq. per 100,000 words*	*N*	*freq. per 100,000 words*	*N*	*freq. per 100,000 words*	*N*	*freq. per 100,000 words*
thing(s)	126	29.1	355	29	229	53.81	568	22.41
thingy/thingie	39	9.03	65	5.3	6	1.41	59	2.10
stuff	7	1.6	64	5.2	40	9.4	100	3.5
so and so	3	0.69	10	0.81	11	2.58	56	1.99

whatsit	4	0.92	-	-	-	-	21	0.74
thingamajig	7	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
thingummy (bob)	1	0.23	-	-	1	0.23	2	0.07
thingybob	1	0.23	1	0.08	-	-	6	0.21
thingythang			2	0.16	-	-	-	-
whatshisname	1	0.23	-	-	-	-	-	-
whatsername	-	-	1	0.08	-	-	19	0.67
dooberry (wallah)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.03
gizmo	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.03
gubbins	-	-	4	0.32	1	0.23	1	0.03
TOTAL	189	43.63	502	40.95	288	67.66	834	31.78

Here are some examples of their use:

(18)   for three year I went to a *thingy* innit … well… to a boarding school in in... (LEC)
(19)   Some acid *stuff* I thought it was water. (LEC)

They can serve a variety of communicative purposes (lack of precision or difficulty to come up with the right term, avoiding pomposity or pretentiousness, euphemistic, derogatory intention, insult, etc.) and they may also play a social function, particularly in the language of teenagers where they act as an in-group identity marker adopting the role of a pragmatic particle.

General extenders (Overstreet 1999), set marking tags (Winter and Norrby 2000) or final coordination tags (Biber et al. 1999) usually take the form of a conjunction (*and, or*) plus a noun phrase, such as *and stuff*, *or something*. A distinction can be drawn in terms of their frequency between *primary* general extenders (*and everything, and stuff, and things, and so on, and all that/this stuff, or something, or so, or anything or whateve*r) and *secondary* general extenders (*and so on, and so on and so forth, and what not, and crap, and shit, and this and that, and blah blah blah, and what have you, or somewhere, or wherever, or somebody, or whoever, or anybody*). In the LIC corpus they are, on the whole, more common in teenage language than in adults although some of them occur more frequently in the expression of the latter; that is the case of *and things, or so* and *or anything like that*. However, *and that, and everything, and stuff* and *or something* are more typical of teenagers.

(20)   The band used to go to Tunbridge Wells and practise *and stuff*. (Wiley 2018: 10)
(21)   I had a ball *or something* like that. (LEC)

Table 4: General frequency of general extenders in the language of MLE teenagers and adults (LIC corpus)

General extender	**LIC (young, 1,223,000 words)**		**LIC (adult, 261,695 words)**	
	N	*freq. per 100,000 words*	*N*	*freq. per 100,000 words*
and that	964	788,22	100	382
and everything (like) that) (else)	438	358,13	30	114,63
and stuff (like) that)	394	322,15	4	15,28
and things (like) that)	84	68,68	49	187,24
and all that (sort)	340	278	37	141,38
or something (like) that)	498	407,19	48	183,4
or so	11	8,99	3	11.46
or anything (of) (like) that)	78	63,77	31	118
or whatever	109	89,12	8	30,56
TOTAL	2916	2384,25	310	1184,58

All these forms occupy clause final position and they generally signal turn exchange. They should not simply be regarded as simple tokens of vague, sloppy language or hedges, since they may serve to convey interpersonal relationships by expressing the speaker's attitude towards the message being conveyed as well as to the participants in the conversation. In addition to this, they may also have a textual function by marking the end of a section of reported speech.

4.2. Grammar and discourse

4.2.1. Quotatives

As in other varieties of English, we find the prevalence of certain quotatives or verbs/expressions to introduce reported speech in spoken discourse, these not always corresponding to the traditional reporting verbs: SAY, TELL, ASK, SHOUT, TALK and THINK. Thus, in the language of MLE teenagers, in particular, the two most common are GO and (BE) *like*, as in the following:

(22)   "I'll be back by one o' clock", he *went*. (LEC)
(23)   He *was like* "Come on". (LEC)

However, in addition to this we find in MLE a new quotative, the expression *this is* + speaker, which is restricted to the language of teenagers. A total of 205 tokens are recorded in the LEC corpus, being *this is me* the highest in frequency (77 examples). Moreover, while the speakers of the age groups 12-13 years and 16-19 years use it exclusively to introduce reported direct speech, children who are 8-9 years old resort to it to introduce both direct speech (24) and non-lexicalised words or sounds and gesture (25) (Fox 2012; Palacios Martínez 2013). Consider the following:

(24)   *this is me* "no I'm laughing out loud man". (Laura, 19 years old, LEC)
(25)   *this is him* "blah". (Howard, 8 years old, LEC)

Differences are also perceived regarding the grammatical person, aspect and tense in the quotative frame. The third person singular is, in global terms, the most frequent in the case of the quotatives GO, SAY and BE *like,* followed by the first person singular.

When considering the effects of tense on the choice of the quotative, we find a sheer contrast between GO and SAY; thus, while GO is selected when the speaker wants to render the story more vivid and realistic by resorting to the use of the conversational historical present, which generally has this communicative function and which is particularly common in narratives and stories (Biber et al. 1999: 454-455), SAY is preferred when simply referring to events in the past without any particular emotional overtone. Witness the following extracts where this contrast can be clearly seen.

(26)   n Romford like all mixture depends where you're from cos my cousin grew up in Ilford and now she lives in Chadwell Heath .. and .. she don't she she don't like hanging about with English people I dunno why .. but . </s><s> she *goes* she she *goes* "ah they're really bitchy and like they'll turn they'll turn on you". (LEC)
(27)   my judge *said* "oh doug stay on" i *said* "no" the wife says "look you done fifty one years of work that's enough" so I said "oh alright" and i retired. (LEC)

As regards verbal aspect, the progressive is more typical with GO than with SAY, which might be related to the far more common use of the present historical form with the former than with the latter. Finally, SAY and GO serve mainly to report speech but both can also introduce non-lexicalised words, although this is more common with the latter. Witness the following:

(28)   he *goes* dah dah dah dah dah dah (LEC).

4.2.2. Address terms

MLE is also well-known because of the speakers' overuse of address terms (Braun 1988; Biber et al. 1999; McCarthy and O' Keefe 2003), particularly familiarisers, that is, those denoting a close relationship between the participants in the conversation (Biber et al. 1999). Thus, *man*, *brother* and its variants *bro* (*blud*, *blad*, *blood*, *bruv*), *mate* and *boy* are the most common in the language of teenagers while *man*, *brother*, *baby* and *guy* are more recurrent in adult speech. Here are some examples of their use in everyday communication:

(29)   now the teacher's violent *blud* boy she ben in the school like for twelve years of teaching. (LEC)
(30)   what was you *guys* talking about? (LEC)

As can be easily gathered from Table 5 below, younger speakers are clearly more fond of these items than adults to the extent that the differences in use between the members of the two groups are statistically significant (Palacios Martínez 2018).

Table 5: Most frequent familiarisers in MLE (LEC corpus)

	LEC young (2004-2010) 1,208,909 words	*Freq. per 100,000 words*	**LEC adults (2004-2010) 460,022 words**	*Freq. per 100,000 words*
man	1108	91.65	75	16.30
brother	507	41.93	57	12.39
mate	131	10.83	1	0.21
boy	43	3.55	1	0.21
guy	14	1.15	4	0.86
baby	7	0.57	6	1.30

As regards their position in the clause, they may occur in initial, medial or final position although the latter is by far the most frequent. The position in the clause is relevant in terms of the speaker's communicative intention or purpose. Thus, initial position is more closely connected with attention-getting (31) while final is more closely related to interpersonal and the reinforcement of social bonds (32). Consider the following:

(31)   *bruv* trust me. (LEC)
(32)   my kid's coming out posh *bruv*. (LEC)

Apart from the familiarisers just discussed, taboo or offensive address terms are also quite pervasive in MLE teen talk. A total of 59 terms of this kind were found in the material analysed with an overall frequency of 32,70 per 100,000 words, the most common being in this order *bastard, dick/cock(head), cunt, stupid, fool* and *idiot*. In the expression of adults, no tokens of this kind were recorded. The majority of these taboo vocatives are nouns and denote some kind of sexual reference (*dick, cockhead, chopper, arsehole, prick, cunt, tit, wanker, tosser, batty*), an abnormal or strange human condition or behaviour (*idiot, stupid, freak, fool, twat, muppet, mug, moron, dumb, git, goon, nutter, prat*), racism (*black, nigger, paki*) or a pejorative animal-related reference (*chicken, pig(head), cow, bitch*). These cannot be regarded only as insults since often they also serve to reinforce the bonds between young speakers and may even carry affectionate connotations as in the following.

(33)   like four years he's probably butters now anyway . people do change over time….he is gorgeous I'm telling you. first time I see him I just fell in love with him I was like "you're fucking gorgeous *you bastard*".. he is nice ain't he? (LEC)

4.2.3. *Man* as a new pronoun

Cheshire (2013) has shown how the noun *man*, which, as mentioned above, is very frequently used in MLE as a vocative, has become, through a process of grammaticalisation a pragmatic marker by losing its reference to a male individual, and subsequently adopting the function of a new personal pronoun. This change in word class can be explained by the loss of the male feature, its condition to refer to both a singular or plural male or to even a female addressee, and, ultimately, by the grammaticalisation process. As a pronoun, *man* may represent first person singular (34) or plural (35), second person plural (36), third person singular (37) or even a generalised *you* or people in general (38).

(34)   The mandem started going to the Colosseum, West End, those kind of places. Raving to that type of vibe. . I didn't go, *man* (<u>I</u>) was into bashment. (Wiley 2018: 65)
(35(he used to make us laugh and that <putting on a voice> 'I told you not to bring your phone in school' make *man* (<u>us</u>) laugh like. (LEC)
(36)   You lot go like *man* (<u>you</u>) go like "don't do it". (LEC)
(37)   We were in this room, about fifty people, no space. , music loud. I was standing next to Dizzee. I spit, then give the mic to Tich.. Tich in the middle on a mad ting. *Man* was sweating, you get me. (Wiley 2018: 83).
(38)   They don't jump up for *man*, they weren't gassed about anything. (Wiley 2018:41)

This use by the speakers corresponds, according to Cheshire (2013), to two main rhetorical functions: to provide authority in their statements by positioning themselves in front of their peers, and to request empathy from their interlocutors.

In the last few years, this pronominal use of *man* has continued being the focus of attention in other studies. Thus, Denis (2016), for example, refers to a similar behaviour of another form closely related to this, *mans,* in the multiethnic adolescent Toronto speech community although in this case it never appears as a plural noun

or pronoun. According to Denis (2016), these two uses of *man(s)* in London and Toronto may have their origin in the Caribbean English creoles. Adams (2018) has also studied address terms in grime music and also refers to the multifunctionality of *man*. In this study he shows how it can be used not only negatively or in a hostile manner, as was the case in Cheshire (2013), but also positively. Hall (2020) maintains that *man* as a pronoun "seems to be somewhere in between a personal and impersonal pronoun" and moreover "its ability to have such a broad range of interpretations comes from its lack of feature specification, and the obligatory projection of D" (2020: 148).

4.2.4. Negation

MLE shows very interesting features in the system of negative polarity. A brief account follows.

- *ain't*

In MLE, and in other varieties from the southeast of Britain (Anderwald 2002; Kortmann and Lunkenheimer 2013: features 155, 156, 157), this negative is very commonly used as a present negative form of BE and HAVE, with all subjects in positive and negative statements (39), and even in question tags (40). More marginally it can be equivalent to *didn't* and *don't*.

> (39)   I've done alright since I've been here. I *ain't* had no trouble or nothing. (LEC)
> (40)   There's about seventy cases I expect *ain't it*? (LEC)

Broadly speaking, *ain't* occurs more often as the negative of HAVE, followed by BE as copula and BE as auxiliary (Cheshire 1991; Palacios Martínez 2010).

- *never* as past tense negator or as a negative preterite

Contrary to the case in standard English, in MLE it is quite common to find this negative adverb negating a single occasion in the past rather than as a universal negator. This special use of *never*, which is also reported as pervasive in 24 varieties of English such as East Anglian English, Irish English, and Hong-Kong English (Kortmann and Lunkenheimer 2013: feature 139), is also known as punctual *never* and it is then equivalent to *didn't*.

> (41)   I had a knife in my pocket and I picked it out and I put it to her throat . but I *never* done nothing. (LEC)

Palacios Martínez (2019) shows how this use of *never* as a negative preterite is far from being anecdotical since it amounts to a frequency of 16.5% of total uses, and appears to be constrained by the nature of the main verb and by the type of the following complementation. Most of these verbs are transitive and they may express different types of verbal aspect. Furthermore, they tend to be followed by simple and non-tensed complements.

- negative concord (NC)

As in many other varieties of English (Kortmann and Lunkenheimer 2013: feature 154), a high number of negative concord or double negative structures are recorded in MLE, especially among young speakers (43.8%) as compared to adults (14.4%) (Palacios Martínez 2017).

> (42)   I do*n't* want *nothing* to do with you *no more*. (LEC)

Moreover, the repertoire of NC structures in teen language is wider than that of adults. The teenage data yielded 6 possible negatives as first negators (*n't*, *ain't*, *never*, *nobody*/*no one*, *nothing* and *hardly*), while only 3 (*n't*/*ain't*/ and *never)* were found in adult speech.

Table 6: Distribution and frequency of NC in LIC-young (1,223,230 words)

1st element / 2nd element	*n't/not/ dunno*	*ain't*	*never*	*nobody/no one*	*nothing*	*hardly*	**TOTAL**
nothing	351	38	21	4	-	-	**414**
no/n't	101	71	4	1	1	-	**178**
no more	129	13	-	3	3	1	**149**

nobody/no one	59	10	6	-	-	2	**77**
none	31	6	1	-	-	-	**38**
never	5	3	-	1	-	-	**9**
nowhere	15	11	-	-	-	-	**26**
neither	5	2	1	-	-	-	**8**
hardly	-	1	-	-	-	-	**1**
TOTAL	**696**	**155**	**33**	**9**	**4**	**3**	**900/73***

* Normalised frequency per 100,000 words

Table 7: Distribution and frequency of NC in LIC-elderly (261,695 words)

2nd element \ 1st element	*n't/not/ dunno*	*ain't*	*Never*	**TOTAL**
nothing	18	1	2	21
no	9	-	-	9
no more	7	1	1	9
none	-	1	-	1
nobody	1	-	-	1
nowhere	1	-	-	1
neither	1	-	-	1
TOTAL	**37**	**3**	**3**	**43/16***

* Normalised frequency per 100,000 words

NC tends to be associated with the presence of other non-standard negatives, such as *ain't* and third person singular present *don't*. Moreover, negative concord structures tend to occur with first person singular subjects followed by third- and second-person plural subjects, although these tendencies were not different when the distribution of standard negatives with compounds with *any* was considered.

Pragmatically speaking, NC structures are in most cases equivalent to single negatives, and as such they can express denials and refusals, although they can also be used to intensify a negative statement and to make the speaker's account more credible and realistic.

- third person singular *don't*

A previous study (Palacios Martínez 2016) showed that in the youth sample of LIC third person singular *don't* prevails over the standard form *doesn't,* 51.2% versus 48.8%.

> (43)   She *don't* want to be the one always stuck at home looking after the kids. (Wiley 2018: 157)

However, this is not the case in the adult data, where *doesn't* clearly prevails over *don't* with a general percentage of 71.6% versus 28.4%.

Table 8: General frequency of third person *doesn't* and *don't* in adults (BNC and LIC)

	BNC (adults; 348,510 words)			LIC (adults; 261,695 words)			TOTAL	
	N	%	*Frequency per 10,000 words*	N	%	*Frequency per 10,000 words*	N	%
doesn't	203	71.9	5.82	37	69.8	1.41	240	71.6
don't	79	28.1	2.26	16	30.2	0.61	95	28.4
TOTAL	282	100	8.08	53	100	2.02	335	100

The subject of the clause seems to constrain the presence of third person *don't* to a considerable extent, since in all cases personal pronouns (*he* and *she*) are more common than impersonal *it*, and full noun phrases as subjects of these negative forms are recorded only in small numbers.

Table 9. General distribution of third person *doesn't* and *don't* according to the subject of the clause in LIC (young)

it doesn't		*she doesn't*		*he doesn't*		full NP		TOTAL	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
63	20.3	87	28.06	116	37.41	44	14.19	310	100
it don't		*she don't*		*he don't*		full NP		TOTAL	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
72	22.15	115	35.38	115	35.38	23	7.07	325	100

The presence of another non-standard negative in the clause also seems to condition the occurrence of third negative *don't*, since negative concord structures are clearly much more common with third person singular negative *don't* than with *doesn't*.

Furthermore, the speaker's gender and ethnic origin seem to constrain the presence of third person singular negative *don't* in a different way. Both male and female speakers use this feature at a similar rate. However, teenagers of Anglo and non-Anglo ethnic origin use this negative form differently, with Anglo speakers tending to use third person singular *don't* more often than those of non-Anglo origin.

4.2.5. Pragmatic markers

MLE in general, and the language of MLE teenagers in particular, includes a great many invariant tags such as *eh*, *okay*, *right*, *yeah, huh, you get me, you know* and *you know what I mean*, which really function as pragmatic markers. *Innit* is particularly distinctive and common here, its frequency having increased significantly over the last few years (Palacios Martínez 2015; Pichler 2016a).

Innit may represent not only the verb BE but also DO, HAVE (as either an auxiliary or lexical verb) and most of the modal verbs. Furthermore, it does not always observe the polarity reversal rule typical of question tags, and is characterised by its flexibility, occurring in initial, medial or final position according to the pragmatic meanings associated with it. Here are some examples:

(44)   This is terrible difficult *innit*. (LEC)
(45)   He stripped the geezer *innit*. (LEC)
(46)   I don't like watching it my sister watch Hollyaks *innit*. (LEC)
(47   You might as well stand a good side of the fence *innit*? (LEC)

Thus, *innit* should not be regarded as a simple non-canonical question and follow-up tag, in that it has come to perform more (and new) textual functions characteristic of typical pragmatic markers (Krug 1998; Palacios Martínez 2015). These functions contribute to the propositional value of the sentence by expressing the speaker's attitude to the content of the utterance expressing emphasis (48) or incredulity and surprise (49).

(48)   A: I hate it <unclear> you stand there and you not doing nothing <unclear>
       B: *innit*? And they're just looking at you. (COB13207)
(49)   A: but yeah when you're trying to do good man don't wanna see that though
       B. *Innit*?
       A: No-one wants to see /you do good like.
       B: No-one wants to see you/do good. (LEC)

It may also reflect aspects related to the relationship between the participants in the interaction such as aggressiveness (50) or even functioning as a mitigator (51), and even sometimes as text organiser equivalent to *like*, *you know*, *so you know what I mean* (52).

(50)   I'm more mature than you get lost and she wouldn't shut up – and I was like … <kisses teeth> "get lost *innit*". (LEC)
(51)   leave them *innit*. (COB135207)
(52)   A: you have to help round the house do you? [B: mm] what sort of things do you do?
       B: hoover and that *innit*. Like clean up my room and that. But my room's always tidy I just. It's just an excuse *innit*.. to do something. (LEC)

Torgersen et al. (2011) have also shown that some pragmatic markers in MLE (*you get me*, (*do*) (*you*) *know what I mean* and (*do*) *you know what I'm saying*) are increasing in use over time, more particularly from the

1990's to the first decade of the twentieth century, while certain others (*OK*, *right*, *yeah*, *you know*) are in decline; in the case of *innit* very few differences are reported when its evolution over time is considered.

4.2.6. Intensifiers

As regards adjective and adverb intensifiers in MLE, previous results (Paradis 2000; Stenström et al. 2002; Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo 2014) that showed the higher use of intensifiers by adults over young speakers are not here clearly confirmed (See Table 10). However, differences between these two groups of speakers are observed regarding the patterns of use of these intensifiers. While teenagers resort mainly to *so*, *really, pretty* and taboo words (*bloody*, *fucking*) with *very* being quite secondary, adults prefer *very, so* and *really*, although to a lesser extent in the case of the latter three. Moreover, adult speakers also opt more often than young speakers for some *-ly* adverbs such as *absolutely and totally*.

Table 10: Most frequent intensifiers in MLE (LEC corpus)8

	LEC young (13-19) 1,105.937	Freq. per 100,000 words	LEC adults (20-25, 40-50, 70+) 460,022 words	Freq. per 100,000 words
very	362	32.73	566	123.03
really	1037	93.76	227	49.34
so	1103	99.73	278	60.43
pretty	90	8.13	24	5.21
bare	82	7.41	-	-
proper	104	9.40	-	-
absolutely	10	0.90	6	1.30
completely	6	0.54	4	0.86
extremely	3	0.27	-	-
totally	18	1.62	20	4.34
dead	3	0.27	7	1.52
well	78	7.05	10	2.17
right	10	0.90	3	0.65
fucking	419	37.88	6	1.30
bloody	90	8.13	4	0.86
Total	3,415	308.77	1,155	251.07

The high number of examples of *well* as intensifier also stands out in the data, particularly in the case of the younger speakers. Thus, it may collocate with adjectives of both positive (*easy, nice, fit, good*) and negative (*confusing, dumb, scary, weird, upset, rough, pissed, naughty)* semantic prosody.

The case of *bare* and *proper* also deserve attention as they can be regarded as typical of this variety of English although they are recorded only in the expression of the younger speakers (Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez 2018). As regards *proper*, we observe that as an adjective it may occur in attributive, predicative or postpositive position while it also shows gradation. Attributive (53) is the most common followed by the predicative (54).

> (53)   My brother is a slang person he don't talk to you in *proper* English. (LEC)
> (54)   I was really *proper* nervous. (LEC)

As intensifier it may occur with adjectives of both positive (*confident, good*) and negative semantic prosody (*rude, pissed, upset*) although the adjectives of negative prosody prevail. No significant differences are fond as regards gender and ethnic group being used in similar numbers and way by the speakers of those groups.

Bare as an adjective is always found attributively; however, it is by far most frequently attested in the corpus as quantifier expressing a high number (*bare friends, bare people, bare noise*). As intensifier it collocates with adjectives of both positive (*good, nice*) and negative (*dangerous, scary*) semantic prosody, especially with the latter.

---

8   Field-workers data have been excluded from the count.

(55)   That game is *bare heavy* </s><s> it's *bare addictive*. (LEC)

As was the case with *proper*, no significant differences are recorded according to gender and ethnic groups despite being usually identified with speakers of Jamaican origin (Drummond 2017).

5. Final words

This paper has sought to provide a descriptive account of the main features of a new English variety emerging in London, generally known as *Multicultural London English*. This sociolect is very interesting from a linguistic perspective since our data clearly confirm that various innovations are being introduced into the language system in different areas, from lexis and grammar to discourse. There are several factors which seem to be responsible for this: language contact with communities of speakers from different social backgrounds and origin, the prevalence of teenagers and the existence of a metropolis.

From a methodological point of view, this study has also shown that in order to study a multicultural variety such as MLE, corpora and even sociolinguistic instruments such as questionnaires and interviews are not really enough to conduct a thorough analysis. Social media such as Twitter and YouTube, song lyrics, TV series and films, and mass media may also provide us with very interesting data and information for our analysis.

Our description has also shown that there is still room for further research. It would be interesting to investigate the extent to which some of these changes in the language are restricted to teen talk, or if they are retained by the same individuals when they become adults. The factors which may be responsible for these changes and innovation would also be worthy of attention together with the circumstances that justify the speakers' changes in their mode of expression.

Drummond's proposal of the existence of a broader British Multicultural English that would go beyond the area of London and would spread to other big British cities such as Manchester or Birmingham, for example, clearly merits further consideration and study. Finally, as noted at the beginning of this paper, the multiethnolect created in London is by no means unique in the European linguascape, particularly in large capital cities. In this respect, it would also be interesting to look at whether something similar is currently happening in a city such as Madrid, and hence whether we might also speak of the existence of a Multicultural Madrid or Urban Spanish. There are some hints that may point in that direction: the high proportion of speakers from Latin American countries, Ecuador, Colombia, Argentina and Peru in particular, who are also introducing innovations in the daily use of Spanish, particularly at the lexical level, and the coexistence of speakers from numerous and diverse backgrounds. Previous studies on these issues (Cestero et al. 2015) also anticipate relevant findings although there is still much room for further investigation.

Corpora, dictionaries and other primary sources used

BNC: *British National Corpus*. Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. URL: http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/ (accessed 24 February 2020).
COLT: *The Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language*. 1993. Department of English. University of Bergen. Anna-Brita Stenström, Gisle Andersen and Ingrid Kristine Hasund. URL: http://www.hd.uib.no/i/Engelsk/COLT/index.html (accessed 24 February 2020).
DCPSE: *The Diachronic Corpus of Present-Day Spoken English*. 1990-1993. Survey of English Usage. University College London. URL: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ projects/dcpse/ (accessed 24 February 2020).
LIC: *Linguistic Innovators Corpus: The English of Adolescents in London*. 2004. Jenny Cheshire, Paul Kerswill, Sue Fox and Eivind Torgersen.
MLEC: *Multicultural London English Corpus*. 2007. Jenny Cheshire, Sue Fox, Arfaan Khan, Paul Kerswill and Eivind Torgersen.

Dictionaries

Green, Jonathon (2020). *Green's Dictionary of Slang*, online edition. URL: https://greensdictofslang.com/ (accessed 24 February 2020).
OED: *Oxford English Dictionary* online edition, 1989. URL: http://www.oed.com/public/online/about-oed-online#ViewingSecondEdition (accessed 24 February 2020).
Urban Dictionary. URL: https://www.urbandictionary.com/ (accessed 24 February 2020).
Thorne, Tony. 2014. *Dictionary of Contemporary Slang*. London: Bloomsbury.

Social networks: Twitter

Dizzee Rascal Twitter account: https://twitter.com/DizzeeRascal
Stormzy Twitter account: https://twitter.com/stormzy
The Dappy Twitter account: https://twitter.com/TheDappy
Wiley Twitter account: https://twitter.com/WileyUpdates

Literary works

Wiley (Richard Kylea Cowie) (2018). *The Eskiboy*. London: Penguin Books.

References

Adams, Zoe (2018). *I Don't Know why Man's Calling Me family All of a Sudden*: Address and Reference Terms in Grime Music. *Language and Communication* 60: 11–27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2018.01.004

Anderwald, Lieselotte (2002). *Negation in Non-standard British English. Gaps, Regularizations and Asymmetries*. London and New York: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203167502

Androutsopoulos, Jannis, ed. (2014). *Mediatization and Sociolinguistic Change*. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346831

Auer, Peter, Martin Hilpert, Anja Stukenbrock and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi, eds. (2013). *Space in Language and Linguistics: Geographical, Interactional, and Cognitive Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110312027

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan (1999). *Longman Grammar of Written and Spoken English*. London: Longman.

Braun, Friederike (1988). *Terms of Address. Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848113

Buchstaller, Isabelle and Ingrid Van Alphen, eds. (2012). *Quotatives*: *Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.15

Cestero Mancera, Ana María, Isabel Molina Martos and Florentino Paredes García, eds. (2015). *Patrones sociolingüísticos de Madrid*. Bern: Peter Lang. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0351-0815-6

Channell, Joan (1994). *Vague language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cheshire, Jenny (1985). English *Never* and the Problem of where Grammars Stop. *Polyglot* 6 (fiche 1), A3-A18.

Cheshire, Jenny (1991). Variation in the Use of *Ain't* in an Urban British English Dialect. In Trudgill, Peter and J. K. Chambers, eds., 54-73.

Cheshire, Jenny (2007). Discourse Variation, Grammaticalisation and "Stuff like That". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11,2: 155-193. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00317.x

Cheshire, Jenny (2013). Grammaticalisation in Social Context: The Emergence of a New English Pronoun. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17,5: 608-633. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12053

Cheshire, Jenny, Paul Kerswill, Susan Fox and Eivind Torgersen (2011). Contact, the Feature Pool and the Speech Community: The Emergence of Multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15,2: 151-196. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00478.x

Cheshire, Jenny and Susan Fox (2013). *Was*/*Were* Variation. A Perspective from London. *Language Variation and Change* 21: 1-38. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394509000015

Cheshire, Jenny, Jacomine Nortier and David Adger (2015). Emerging Multiethnolects in Europe. *QMUL Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 33. URL: https://www.qmul.ac.uk/sllf/media/sllf-new/department-of-linguistics/33-QMOPAL-Cheshire-Nortier-Adger-.

Clyne, Michael (2000). Lingua Franca and Ethnolects in Europe and Beyond. *Sociolinguistica* 14: 83-89. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110245196.83

Cutler, Cecilia and Unn Røyneland (2015). *Where the Fuck Am I from*?: Hip-hop Youth and the (Re)negotiation of Language and identity in Norway and the US. In Nortier, Jacomine and Bente A. Svendsen, eds., 139-161. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139061896.010

Denis, Derek (2016). A Note on *Mans* in Toronto. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* (TWPL) 37: 1-13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33137/twpl.v37i0.26973

Doran, Meredith (2004). Negotiating between *Bourge* and *Rancaille*: Verlan as Youth Identity Practice in Suburban Paris. In Pavlenko, Anita and A. Blackledge, eds., 93-124.

Dorleijn, Margreet, Maarten Mous and Jacomine Nortier (2015). Urban Youth Speech Styles in Kenya and the Netherlands. In Jacomine Nortier and Bente A. Svendsen, eds., 270-289. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139061896.019

Drange, Elie. M. (2009). *Anglicismos en el lenguaje juvenil chileno y noruego. Un análisis comparativo*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bergen. URL: https://hdl.handle.net/1956/3630

Drummond, Rob (2017). (Mis)interpreting Urban Youth Language: White Kids Sounding Black? *Journal of Youth Studies* 20,5: 640-660. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2016.1260692

Drummond, Rob (2018). *Researching Urban Youth Language and Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73462-0

Fox, Susan (2012). Performed Narrative: The Pragmatic Function of *This Is* + Speaker and Other Quotatives in London Adolescent Speech. In Buchstaller, Isabelle and Ingrid Van Alphen, eds*.,* 231-258. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.15.14fox

Fox, Susan (2015). *The New Cockney. New Ethnicities and Adolescent Speech in the Traditional East End of London*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137318251

Friginal, Eric, ed. (2018). *Studies in Corpus-Based Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315527819

Gabrielatos, Costa, Eivind Torgersen, Sebastian Hoffmann and Susan Fox (2010). A Corpus-based Sociolinguistic Study of Indefinite Article Forms in London English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 38: 297-334. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0075424209352729

Hall, David (2020). The Impersonal Gets Personal: A New Pronoun in Multicultural London English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 38: 117-150. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-019-09447-w

Henderson, John, ed. (2000). *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*. URL: http://www.als.asn.au

Jucker, Andreas, Sara Smith and Tanjia Lüdge (2003). Interactive Aspects of Vagueness in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1737-1769. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00188-1

Kerswill, Paul (2013). Identity, Ethnicity and Place: The Construction of Youth Language in London. In Auer, Peter, Martin Hilpert, Anja Stukenbrock and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi, eds., 128-164. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110312027.128

Kerswill, Paul (2014). The Objectification of "Jafaican": The Discoursal Embedding of Multicultural London English in the British Media. In Androutsopoulos, Jannis, ed., 428–455. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346831.427

Kircher, Ruth and Sue Fox (2019a). Attitudes towards Multicultural London English: Implications for Attitude Theory and Language Planning. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 40, 10: 847-864. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1577869

Kircher, Ruth and Sue Fox (2019b). Multicultural London English and its Speakers: A Corpus-informed Discourse Study of Standard Ideology and Social Stereotypes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1666856

Kirk, John, ed. (2000). *Corpora Galore: Analyses and Techniques in Describing English*. Amsterdam: Rodopi

Kortmann, Bernd and Kerstin Lunkenheimer, eds. (2013). *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English* [eWAVE]. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. URL: http://www.ewave-atlas.org/ (accessed 23 July 2021).

Kotsinas, Ulla-Britt (1988). Immigrant Children's Swedish. A New Variety? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9, 1-2: 129-140. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1988.9994324

Krug, Manfred (1998). British English Is Developing a New Pragmatic Marker, *Innit*? A Study in Lexicalisation Based on Social, Regional and Stylistic Variation. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 23: 145-197. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/43025573

Leistna, Pepi and Charles Meyer, eds. (2003). *Corpus Analysis: Language Structure and Language Use*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004334410

Lucas, Christopher and David Willis (2012). *Never Again*: The Multiple Grammaticalization of *Never* as a Marker of Negation in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 16, 3: 459-485. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674312000196

McCarthy, Michael and Anne O'Keefe (2003). *What's in a Name*? Vocatives in Casual Conversation and Radio Phone-in Calls. In Leistna, Pepi and Charles Meyer, eds., 153-185. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004334410_010

Mott, Brian (2012). Traditional Cockney and Popular London Speech. *Dialectologia* 9: 62-94. URL: http://www.edicions.ub.edu/revistes/ejecuta_descarga.asp?codigo=745

Nortier, Jacomine (2001). Street Language in the Netherlands. In Stenström, Anna-Britta, Ulla-Brit Kotsinas and Elie Drange, eds., 29-141.

Nortier, Jacomine and Bente A. Svendsen, eds (2015). *Language, Youth and Identity in the 21st Century. Linguistic Practices across Urban Spaces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139061896

Núñez Pertejo, Paloma and Ignacio Palacios Martínez. (2014). *That's absolutely crap, totally rubbish.* The Use of the Intensifiers *absolutely* and *totally* in the Spoken Language of British Adults and Teenagers. *Functions of Language* 21, 2. 210-237. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.21.2.03pal

Núñez Pertejo, Paloma and Ignacio Palacios Martínez. (2018). Intensifiers in MLE: New Trends and Developments. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 17, 2: 116-155. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.436.

Overstreet, Maryann (1999). *Whales, Candlelight, and* "Stuff like That"*: General Extenders in English Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2010). *It ain't nothing to do with my school*. Variation and Pragmatic Uses of *ain't* in the Language of British English Teenagers. *English Studies* 91, 5: 548-566. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.2010.488841

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2011a). The Expression of Negation in British Teenagers' Language. A Preliminary Study. *Journal of English Linguistics* 39, 1: 4-35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0075424210366905

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2011b). *I might, I might go I mean it depends on money things and stuff*. A Preliminary Analysis of General Extenders in British Teenagers' Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 9: 2452-2470. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.011

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2013). Zero Quoting in the Speech of British and Spanish Teenagers: A Contrastive Corpus-Based Study. *Discourse Studies* 15, 4: 439-462. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461445613482431

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2015). Variation, Development and Pragmatic Uses of *innit* in the Language of British Adults and Teenagers. *English Language and Linguistics* 19, 3: 383-405. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000288

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2016). *He don't like football, does he*? A Corpus-based Study of Third Person Singular *don't* in the Language of British Teenagers. In Seoane, Elena and Cristina Suárez-Gómez, eds., 61–84. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/veaw.g57.04pal

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2017). Negative Concord in the Language of British Teenagers. *English World-Wide. A Journal of Varieties of English* 38, 2: 153-181. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.38.2.02pal

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2018). Lexical Innovation in the Language of Teenagers. A Cross-linguistic Perspective. In Ziegler, Arne, ed., 363-390. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110472226-017

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2019). *Vernon never called for me yesterday*. A Study of *never* as a Marker of Negation in the English of London Adults and Teenagers. *English Text Construction* 12, 2: 291-319. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.00030.pal

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio. (2021). Taboo Vocatives in the Language of London Teenagers. *Pragmatics* 31,2: 250-277. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19028.pal

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio and Paloma Núñez Pertejo. (2014). Strategies Used by English and Spanish Teenagers to Intensify Language: A Contrastive Corpus-based Study. *Spanish in Context* 11, 2: 175-201. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.11.2.02pal

Palacios Martínez, Ignacio and Núñez Pertejo, Paloma. (2015). *Go up to Miss thingy. He's probably like a whatsit or something*. Placeholders in Focus. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association* 25, 3: 425-451. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.25.3.05pal

Paradis, Carita (2000). *It's well weird*. Degree Modifiers of Adjectives Revisited: The Nineties. In Kirk, John, ed., 147-160.

Pavlenko, Anita and A. Blackledge, eds. (2004). *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596483

Pichler, Heike, ed. (2016a). *Discourse-pragmatic Variation and Change in English. New Methods and Insights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107295476

Pichler, Heike (2016b). Uncovering Discourse Pragmatic Innovations: *Innit* in Multicultural London English. In Pichler, Heike, ed., 58-81. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107295476.004

Quist, Pia and Bente A. Svendsen (2010). *Multilingual Urban Scandinavia. New Linguistic Practices*. Bristol; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847693143

Rampton, Ben (2015). Contemporary Urban Vernaculars. In Nortier, Jacomine and Bente A. Svendsen, eds., 24-44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139061896.003

Seoane, Elena and Cristina Suárez-Gómez, eds. (2016). *World Englishes. New Theoretical and Methodological Considerations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/veaw.g57

Smith-Hefner, Nancy J. (2007). Youth Language, *Gaul* Sociability, and the New Indonesian Middle Class. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17, 2: 184-203. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2007.17.2.184

Stenström, Anna-Britta, Ulla-Brit Kotsinas and Elie Drange, eds. (2001). *Ungdommers språkmøter*. Copenhagen: Nordisk Ministerråd.

Stenström, Anna-Brita, Gisle Andersen and Ingrid Kristine Hasund (2002). *Trends in Teenage Talk: Corpus Compilation, Analysis and Findings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.8

Torgersen, Eivind, Costas Gabrielatos, Sebastian Hoffmann and Susan Fox (2011). A Corpus-based Study of Pragmatic Markers in London English. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 7, 1: 93-118. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt.2011.005

Torgersen, Eivind, Costas Gabrielatos and Sebastian Hoffmann (2018). Corpus-based Analysis of the Pragmatic Marker, *You Get Me*. In Friginal, Eric, ed., 176-196. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315527819-7

Trudgill, Peter and J. K. Chambers, eds. (1991). *Dialects of English*. London and New York: Longman. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315505459

Wiese, Heike (2009). Grammatical Innovation in Multiethnic Urban Europe: New Linguistic Practices among Adolescents. *Lingua* 119: 782-806. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.002

Winter, Joanne and Catrin Norrby (2000). Set Marking Tags "and Stuff". In Henderson, John, ed., 1-12. URL: http://www.als.asn.au

Ziegler, Arne, ed. (2018). *Jugendsprachen: Aktuelle Perspektiven internationaler Forschung /Youth Languages: Current Perspectives of International Research*. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110472226