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Introduction: What’s New about the New Quotatives?

In 1996, the American punk rock band ‘The Mr. T Experience’ released a song entitled ‘I’m Like Yeah, But She’s All No’. Its refrain, which is reproduced in the snippet below, showcases three innovations that have recently started to be used for the reporting of one’s own or other people’s speech, namely be like, be all and go.

‘I’m Like Yeah, But She’s All No’ (from the album Love Is Dead)
And I’m like ‘yeah’,
but she’s all ‘no’,
and I’m all ‘come on baby, let’s go’,
and she’s like ‘I don’t think so’,
and I’m going ‘...’

Be like, go and be all are the most notorious innovations for reporting speech, thought and activity in the English language. But they are by no means the only novel forms in this linguistic domain which is called quotation. Ever since the 1970s, speakers of English have witnessed a steady stream of innovative forms in this area of the grammar. Table 1.1 lists the wealth of new English quotative variants by date of first mention in the literature.

The list does not end here. Even newer quotative options, such as kinda, sorta and combinations of variants – all like, go totally, etc. – continue to get picked up in the literature (see De Smedt, Brems, and Davidse 2007; Margerie 2010; Vandelanotte 2012).1 Obviously, quotation is an extraordinarily dynamic domain. However, except for be like and go, these quotative newcomers have received very little attention in the literature. This is probably due to two factors: (i) Most innovative variants are much less frequent than these two forms. (ii) Also, whereas be like and go have been reported from English-speaking communities all over the world (see Singler and Woods 2002), other quotative variants are – as of yet – geographically relatively restricted. Quotative be all seems to be heavily localized to California, where it was
Table 1.1  Non-canonical quotative forms by date of attestation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quotative Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>here was I</td>
<td>‘Then I must be hard of hearing or something you rapped the door and I didn’t hear you’ (Milroy and Milroy 1977: 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Here was I</td>
<td>‘Here was I’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>here’s me</td>
<td>‘Have youse took leave of your senses?’ (Milroy and Milroy 1977: 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Here’s me</td>
<td>‘Here’s me’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>‘No I had them bound in front of me’ (Butters 1980: 304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She goes</td>
<td>‘You rapped the door and I didn’t hear you’ (Milroy and Milroy 1977: 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be all</td>
<td>[with hands on hips and falsetto voice] ‘Why don’t you ever do what you’re told!’ (Alford 1982–83: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S/he’s all</td>
<td>‘Then I must be hard of hearing or something you rapped the door and I didn’t hear you’ (Milroy and Milroy 1977: 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m here</td>
<td>[feigned nonchalance] ‘la-de-da-de-da’ (Alford 1982–83: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>I’m sittin’ there</td>
<td>‘Wow, dude! Slap bracelets!’ (Stein 1990: 303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be like</td>
<td>‘Let me say something’ (Butters 1982: 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He was like</td>
<td>‘He was like’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>this is + NP</td>
<td>‘What are you doing?’ (Cheshire and Fox 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is my mum</td>
<td>‘This is my mum’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be git</td>
<td>‘Aye do you know her?’ (Norton 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was git</td>
<td>‘I was git’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be just</td>
<td>‘Did you do anything last night?’ (Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999: 155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela’s just</td>
<td>‘Angela’s just’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be pure</td>
<td>‘You got it wrong’ (Macaulay 2006: 275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She’s pure</td>
<td>‘She’s pure’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range of liberal arts colleges have launched study skills programs aimed towards improving students' rhetorical skills and to effectively stamp out *be like* usage.

The constant incursion of innovative forms into the system of quotation raises a number of questions: Has the domain of speech and thought reporting always been the locus of such abundant creativity? Or is the stream of innovations we observe in Table 1.1 a relatively recent phenomenon? Also, we might want to ask about the outcome of the invasion into the quotative system: Are the newcomers pressing out older, less fashionable forms? Alternatively, the development might be additive, resulting in a richer system that incorporates incoming innovative forms. This would amount to a 'layering of variants' (Hopper 1991: 22) where older and younger forms coexist, a situation that has been argued to have occurred in the system of intensification (Ito and Tagliamonte 2003).

The rapid expansion of quotative variants also makes us wonder how exactly these innovations edge their way into the system of speech and thought reporting. Do innovative variants perform any specific linguistic functions that differentiate them from older forms? Or do they intrude into the same functional niches and thereby stand in direct competition with more conservative variants?

Moreover, the attitudes and ideologies attached to these newcomer quotatives are of crucial importance for our understanding of the emergence and promotion of innovative forms. Given that the press and other media outlets voice predominantly hostile attitudes towards these variants (consider Chapter 5), it seems surprising that they have been and continue to be embraced by some speakers. We need to find out more about these innovators, the primary users of emerging quotative forms: What is the social profile of the speakers who first adopted *be like, go* and other novel forms? Are these the same speakers in different localities? And why is it that people start using these innovative quotative variants? Do they want to tap into positive associations these forms might bear? If yes, what are these associations? And what about the non-users of *be like* and *go*, those speakers who choose not to adopt the innovative quotatives in spite of the fact that they hear them being used all around them. Do these people reject the novel quotative variants because of ideological considerations? More generally, we need to ask whether speakers' attitudes towards innovative quotatives are constant across time and space.

Finally, we must not forget to investigate the typological considerations that are evoked by the recent large-scale fluctuations in the quotative system. Why have these new forms of quotatives arisen in several languages simultaneously? Are there any cross-linguistic tendencies at work? One obvious hypothesis is that the innovations are due to repeated borrowing from one language into another. An alternative hypothesis is that the innovative forms of reporting might have arisen due to parallel but autonomous developments in different languages and speech communities. We need to examine innovative quotatives in typologically related and unrelated languages in order to establish whether the process that led to the creation of these quotative forms is the same on a global scale or whether we witness locally independent developments.

This book seeks to provide answers to the above questions. Chapter 1 sets the scene by tracing the recorded history of *be like* and *go* – the only two quotative variants about which we have consolidated diachronic knowledge. I will go on
to investigate the question to what extent the recent emergence of innovative quotative forms in the English language is an isolated phenomenon or whether the development we witness in English is part of a larger, cross-linguistic trend. Chapter 2 provides a thorough definition of quotation as a phenomenon, drawing on research in a range of linguistic subdisciplines (see also below). In Chapter 3, I examine the global attestation of innovative quotative forms, followed by an investigation of the longitudinal repercussions of their spread in Chapter 4. Attitudes and ideologies attached to newcomer quotatives are discussed in Chapter 5. Finally, Chapter 6 revisits the main findings of this book and puts them into a broader perspective.

Note that the main methodological framework I rely on throughout this book for the analysis of the quotative system is variationist (aka quantitative) sociolinguistics. But the argument will also draw on a range of other approaches, notably on linguistic typology, construction grammar, grammaticalization, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis and methods used in social psychology, such as social identity theory. This synthetic approach stems not from a ‘lack of conviction in any method or theoretical framework, but rather out of strong conviction that the full picture … requires explanations that eschew existing orthodoxies and assumptions of excessive modularity in the grammar’ (Meyerhoff 2002: 356).

Furthermore, whereas the focus of the research presented here is on different varieties of English, I will also take into account typological, cross-linguistic considerations, especially in Chapters 1 and 6. Finally, while this book considers a range of innovative quotatives, it predominantly focuses on the two globally available forms *be like* and *go*. These two variants are unique in that they have developed into major players in the quotative domain, resulting in a large-scale reorganization of the system. They have also become part of the public consciousness, triggering extensive, often negative evaluative commentary. However, throughout this volume, I will examine these two prolific innovations within the system in which they occur, focusing on the continued interaction and competition between alternative forms within the pool of quotative variants as a whole.

**The History of Innovative Quotatives**

A widespread hypothesis in the literature on quotation is that the variants in Table 1.1 are recent additions to the quotative pool. The reasoning behind this assumption – apart from the fact that they have only recently been mentioned in the literature – is relatively straightforward: since the main users of these forms are adolescents, the group who tends to be the first to pick up and advance (linguistic) innovations, these quotative variants must be new. However, as we will see below, this hypothesis is only partially accurate. Let us now investigate the history of non-canonical quotative variants.

To the extent that we can trace their diachronic development, most forms in Table 1.1 seem to be relatively recent arrivals in the quotative system. *Be all* was first mentioned in *The Newsletter of Transpersonal Linguistics* edited at the University of California at Berkeley (Alford 1982–83), and diachronic research has revealed
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that it is indeed an innovative variant originating in California (Buchstaller and Traugott 2007; Waksler 2001). This is me seems not to have been around before London adolescents started using it in the early 2000s (Cheshire and Fox 2007). Other low frequency quotative forms have only been attested once or twice (such as here was I or I’m sittin’ there, see Table 1.1), which makes it impossible to trace their historical development. The history of go, however, is completely dissimilar, starting a great deal earlier and taking a different, much broader, geographical route. I will turn to the case of quotative go below. But let us first dig into the linguistic history of be like, which, due to its vigorous global spread, has become the poster child for rapid language change phenomena (Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2009; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999).

The earliest attestation of be like in quotative function is Butters (1982: 149), who reports that American speakers use ‘to be (usually followed by like) where what is quoted is an unuttered thought, as in And he was like “Let me say something” or I thought I was going to drown and I was (like) “Let me live, Lord’” (see also Schourup 1982a/b). In an article published shortly after (Tannen 1986), be like amounts to 4 per cent in American English, but we are not told when the data was collected or where the speakers are from. Hence, in all evidence, quotative be like seems to have arisen at some point in the early 1980s in the US. What further corroborates this hypothesis – apart from the fact that the form has not been mentioned in the literature prior to Butters (1982) – is that most authoritative dictionaries have only recently picked up on the quotative use of the lexeme like. For example, the first edition of the Random House Webster does not mention like in this function. But the second edition, which appeared in 1999, incorporates the new use as ‘informal (used esp. after forms of “to be” to introduce reported speech or thought) (3) She’s like “I don’t believe it,” and I’m like “No, it’s true” ’ (1999: 768). Also the OED was slow to pick up on the quotative innovation. Before the newest set of additions were added in 2010, the only entry for like in connection with quotation is classified as a ‘less analysable construction’ and one of the examples features like in a collocate construction with another quotative verb, think.

N. Amer. colloq. Followed by an adj.: in the manner of one who is _______. Cf. like crazy (…), like mad (…). Also in less analysable constructions. (…) 1970

Time 31 Aug. 19 Afterward, a girl came up to me and said, ‘You kinda look interested in this; did you know there are civil rights for women?’ And I thought like wow, this is for me. (OED online, emphasis mine).

The OED entry is correct in pointing out that in quote introductory function, the lexeme like can co-occur with verbs of quotations (such as think like in the citation above). Most frequently, however, like collocates with the verb to be. Thus, in this volume, I will refer to the quotative variant as be like, bearing in mind that this is not the only form in which it can be used (the same also holds for quotative be all).

The OED draft addition of June 2010 finally adds an entry that recognizes the quotative use of like. This definition gives examples dating back to 1982 (see 1a–c).

colloq. (orig. U.S.). to be like: used to report direct speech (often paraphrased, interpreted, or imagined speech expressing a reaction, attitude, emotion, etc.); to
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say, utter; (also) to say to oneself. Also with all. Freq. in the historic present (…).
Sometimes also used to introduce a gesture or facial expression evocative of the speaker’s feelings.

(1) a 1982 F. Zappa & M. U. Zappa Valley Girl (song) in F. Zappa Ship Arriving Too Late to Save a Drowning Witch (CD lyrics booklet) (1995) 435/2 She’s like Oh my God.
b 1986 N. Y. Mag. 14 July 37, I was like, ‘She’s got a new dress?’ (…) c 1992 San Francisco Chron. (Nexis) 17 Nov. (Final ed.) a9 ‘It makes me so mad to see him like that,’ one girl says. ‘I’m all like, God, what happened to him?’
d 1998 T. R. Tangherlini Talking Trauma vi. 146 And Darryl’s like, ‘Who’s this fellow?’ She goes, ‘That’s my husband.’ He’s like, ‘Do you have a cat?’.. The guy says, ‘Well, I don’t got any gas.’ (…) e 2008 Daily Tel. (Sydney, Austral.) (Nexis) (State ed.) 7 June (Sport section) 88 When it came to the contract he cut it back a quarter, so I’m like, whatever, it’s still more than what I was asking for.

The OED thus supports Butters’ (1982) and Macaulay’s (2001) hypothesis that the quotative use of like first appeared in the early 1980s in California: Example (1a) is taken from Frank and Moon Unit Zappa’s 1982 song ‘Valley Girl’, a satire of young Californian girls’ way of speaking which, apart from be like, features a number of iconic Californian linguistic features such as for sure, totally as well as Oh my God. The OED also illustrates be like in a combined form with all (see 1c) as well as in alternation with quotative go (1d). Note also that the OED captures the global spread of the form since the 2008 citation (1e) stems from an Australian source, hence outside of its American epicentre.

As regards the chronology of the global use of the form, Miller and Weinert (1995) report no quotative be like in Scottish English prior to 1980 and Tagliamonte and Hudson (1999) state that the form is unattested in Britain until the early 1990s. But we know that by 1993, be like has found its way into the use of London teenagers because Andersen (1996) is the first to note its occurrence in the Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT). Buchstaller (2004) reports the use of be like in Derby and Newcastle in 1994. Tagliamonte and Hudson (1999) attest be like for their 1995–96 data in York and in Canada and Macaulay (2001) writes that Glasgow Scots speakers use be like in 1997. D’Arcy (2010, 2012) discusses its usage in New Zealand and Winter (2002) in Australia, both with data from the 1990s. In the years to follow, quotative be like was spotted in a multitude of varieties of English world wide (including Singapore, India and South Africa; see Chapter 3; D’Arcy 2013; Singler and Woods 2002). Crucially, the novel form not only extends its remit geographically – it also increases dramatically in frequency. Countless studies have reported the rampant expansion of quotative be like in global varieties of English (see for example Buchstaller 2011; Cukor-Avila 2011; D’Arcy 2012, 2013; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2009). Chapter 4 further investigates the diachronic development of be like as well as its impact on the quotative system in the North of England in the past 40 years.
The literature on innovative quotative variants contains an – at times quite fervent – discussion as regards the types of quotes be like tends to introduce. The general consensus seems to be that the variant has entered the system framing reported thought, attitudes or stance. Consider, for example, Butters’ (1982: 149; highlighting mine) claim that ‘to be (usually followed by like) where what is quoted is an unuttered thought, as in And he was like “Let me say something”’. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that the earliest reported examples of the form (see 1a and 1c above from the OED) tend to frame reported inner monologue, thoughts, attitudes and point of view (see Haddican et al. 2012; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999). By the early to mid-1990s, however, we find be like introducing speech as well as thought re-enactments. This means that the newcomer must have expanded its functional niche to encode outwardly occurring speech relatively quickly. The examples in (2) and (3) illustrate these two types of speech act. In (2), the speaker expresses his thoughts in a situation in which he felt trapped. He conveys his feelings or attitude towards this situation by uttering a non-linguistic sound effect, ahhh, which he frames with be like.

(2) Reported Thought (UK English 1994, Buchstaller 2008: 24)
I mean I was like trapped,
rather like being a rabbit in the headlight you know,
it was like ‘ahhhh’.

Given that the quote contains no linguistic content and with no one present to whom ahhh could have been addressed, I would suggest that this quote very likely expresses the speaker’s mental state, attitude and opinion rather than an outwardly realized speech act (see also Fox and Robles 2010; Vincent and Dubois 1996; Vincent and Perris 1999). Example (3), on the other hand, demonstrates quotative be like with reported speech. The snippet contains two quotes, one framed by be like and one without a lexical quote-introducer (depicted by the symbol Ø). Both introduce outwardly occurring speech acts.

(3) Reported Speech (US English 1988–92, Buchstaller 2008: 24)
My daughter’s like ‘Mommy can I help you with the laundry?’
Ø ‘Of course you can’

Is there any evidence that the quotes in example (3) frame outwardly realized speech rather than unuttered thought or inner monologue? The sequential structure of the mother–daughter conversation gives important clues for our interpretation of the verbal interaction: the two quotes are realized as a question and answer sequence: Question: Can I help you with the laundry? Answer: Of course you can. A key structural characteristic of question and answer combinations is that they are paired action sequences. This means that the second pair part – the answer – is structurally contingent on the occurrence of the first pair part – the question (for the concept of the ‘adjacency pairs’ and the ‘next turn proof procedure’ used in conversation analysis, see Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998 inter alia). What does this mean for the quotes in example (3)? Well, the sequential structure of the interaction
supports my claim that the quote framed by *be like* is reported speech rather than merely inwardly occurring thought: the mother’s answer *Of course you can* *I help you with the laundry?*. This leads me to conclude that the quote framed by *be like* – namely the daughter’s question – must have been an outwardly realized speech act. Note that in example (2), by contrast, no such contingency relationship exists. The exclamatory nature and the lack of an interlocutor to whom *ahhhh* could have been directed suggest that this quote depicts inner thought rather than outwardly realized speech.

Hence, the available evidence suggests that *be like*, when it first emerged, predominantly framed thoughts, stances and inner monologues within the English quotative system. But it quickly broadened its remit to introduce quotations of both speech and thought reports. In present-day usage, *be like* is ambiguous as regards the outward occurrence of the quote. This indeterminacy can be exploited by speakers in real occurring conversations: prefacing a quote with *be like*, we do not commit ourselves as to whether or not the quoted utterance was actually spoken out aloud or whether what is reported is only a mental commentary on the situation, an inner thought or an expression of stance (see Buchstaller 2011; Jones and Schieffelin 2009). The usefulness of its non-committal nature is illustrated in example (4), which was uttered by a college-age American woman in the mid-1990s reporting on her experience in high school.

(4) (US English, Buchstaller 1997: 13)

| He’s [= the teacher] ah he’s like ‘I’ve lived in Chinatown and I know the Chinese’. ha ha And I’m like, like, like ‘You do? Ah sure’ |

The narrator’s *You do? Ah sure* amounts to a confrontational retort that undermines the teacher’s authority. If it had been uttered audibly, we would expect some form of reaction from the teacher, such as a response that puts the student in her place, a witty reply or – alternatively – a comment by the student that the teacher was brushing over her unacceptable behaviour. Given the absence of any reportable reaction to the student’s remark, I have previously suggested that what the speaker in (4) is actually doing is presenting her opinion as if it could have been a real speech act ‘in order to verbalise what was in her mind and in order to make the teacher look (….) ridiculous’ (Buchstaller 1997: 13). Hence, while her speech act could have been outwardly realized, the narrative context suggests that it was probably rather inward, ‘a verbalisation of what she thought’ (ibid.).

By leaving open the possibility that she might have in fact confronted the teacher, the speaker portrays herself as audacious and cheeky. However, note that by using *be like* the speaker does not commit herself as to the outward realization of the speech act at any point. The epistemic stance of the quoted material is left completely unspecified. In doing so, the speaker is hedging her bet, forestalling potential objections such as *you didn’t say that!* (see also Jones and Schieffelin 2009). Surprisingly, maybe, speakers are very seldomly confronted as to whether they actually uttered a quote aloud or not.5 But by framing an utterance with *be like*, we can
avoid committing ourselves as to whether or not a quote was actually uttered aloud. Indeed, I have argued elsewhere that it is exactly because of this ‘wild card’ status that be like has enjoyed such a rapid growth in the quotative system (Buchstaller 2004, 2008). I will further elaborate on this discussion in Chapters 3 and 4.

Let us now turn our attention to quotative go, which tends to be referred to in the literature as the slightly older but equally innovative fellow of be like. Historical evidence, however, suggests that quotative go has been around a while, if largely unnoticed. Looking up go in the OED yields a number of borderline cases, where the construction is ambiguous between a quotative introducer and its older use as a story introducer (as in this is the way the story goes [STORY]). With clearly quotative-introductory function the form is attested from 1791 onwards (see examples 5a–c).

1791 COWPER Retired Cat 79 His noble heart went pit-a-pat. (OED)
1891 Daily News 24 Oct. 5/3 A tyre ... that will [not] go pop all of a sudden. (OED)

The fact that go has been used in quotative function since at least the eighteenth century means that the variant cannot be described as an innovation per se. Crucially, however, as Butters (1980) points out, the form was initially restricted to mimetic quotes, which refers to the re-enactment of previous events based on voice, sound or gesture (Goffman 1981; Wierzbicka 1974). This hypothesis is corroborated by the OED entry ‘with imitative interjections or verb-stems used adverbially, e.g. to go bang, clatter, cluck, crack, crash, patter, smash, snap, tang, whirr’.

1973: 412 Parrot went “Molly wants a cracker”’. Partee points out that, for her, go can only frame mimetic re-enactments, even if they are well-formed sentences, such as parrots mimicking speech or tape-recordings. She also suggests that go can frame ‘otherwise normal speech that mimics deviant intonation’ (ibid.). Hence, it seems that Partee’s examples capture the link between the reporting of mimetic quotes and the introduction of speech. In a study published in 1981, Schiffrin reports 10 per cent go within the pool of quotative verbs for her American speakers but we do not know how many of these tokens occur with voice or sound effects and how many with linguistic quotes, a problem that is endemic to all early studies that mention the variant.

The 1993–97 addition series to the OED acknowledges the extension of go to non-expressive quotes. The entry now reads as follows: ‘to utter (the noise indicated); with direct speech: to say, utter in speech. Now often in the historic
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present. *colloq*. Contrary to the older examples, the quotes in the new entry are now produced by human speakers (see 6a–c). Note, however, that the only example with a non-sound quote the OED provides is from 1988, hence after Butters’ mention of its functional expansion (see 6c).

(6) a 1836 DICKENS *Pickwick*. (1837) ix. 85 He was roused by a loud shouting of the post-boy on the leader. ‘Yo-yo-yo-yo-yoe,’ went the first boy. ‘Yo-yo-yo-yo-yoe!’ went the second. (OED 1993)

b 1975 in C. Allen *Plain Tales from Raj* xix. 201 ‘What’s the trouble? Why did you hit him?’ ‘Oh,’ he says, ‘I was walking down the platform and he twirled his little moustache and went, “Hmm, hmm!”’ (OED 1993)


The available evidence thus suggests that *go* has only started to occur with non-mimetic quotes in the twentieth century, in all probability in the latter half (see also D’Arcy 2012 for the expansion of *go* from sound to speech). Hence while *go* as a quotative variant is not an innovation per se, its use with speech representation is. The snippet in (7), illustrates a more recent example of *go* in this use. Here, the variant introduces linguistic material, such as *‘do you want to dance’, ‘what’* and *‘no, no’*, again in question and answer sequences, attributing these quotes to two human agents.

A: the other day I went into a bar, and this guy asked me to dance. all he saw was my hair, and he goes *‘do you want to dance’*? I turn around and *go* ‘*what’*? he *go* *‘do you want to dance’*? I *go* ‘*no no’*. he *go* ‘*oh oh I’m sorry’*, I *go* ‘*yeah, you better be’*. I *go* ‘*[you better be’*. B: [that’s hilarious,

Crucially, *go* has not lost its ability to encode mimetic reports. In contemporary data, the variant continues to frame quotes containing non-linguistic material, which for many is considered its more prototypical use (see also D’Arcy 2012; Macaulay 2001; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999). This function is exemplified in (8–9) below, where *go* encodes sound effects.

B: my kid didn’t care, A: I know, B: He picks up a stick and *goes* ‘*bang’*,