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The French are funny about their language, as everyone knows. But then, so are the Germans, the Italians, the Belgians, the Canadians, the Turks, the Slovaks, the Russians, and the Sri Lankans. And so are we in the United States, for that matter, although we tend to make only an intermittent public fuss about it. In many other nations, “the language question” is a persistent topic for newspaper editorials, television talk shows, and parliamentary debates, and occasionally the source of major political crises. In the USA, discussions of language tend to rumble along in Sunday-supplement features and the usage screeds arrayed in the language shelves at the back of the bookstore.

Every so often, though, controversies over the language erupt into a wider national discussion in America. That has happened perhaps half-a-dozen times in the last half century. In the early 1960s, there was a furor over the publication of the Merriam-Webster’s *Third New International Dictionary*, which took what critics regarded as an excessively permissive attitude toward usage – it refused to condemn the use of *ain’t* for “am not,” and it included the “incorrect” use of *like* as a conjunction, as in “Winston tastes good like a cigarette should.” The dictionary’s derelictions were front-page news for months – *The New York Times* condemned it as a “bolshevik” document, and the *Chicago Daily News* took it as the symptom of “a general decay in values.”

Other recent American language controversies have followed more or less the same pattern – they flare into wide discussion for a relatively brief period, and then, when the point is made, they subside again into the back pages of the national consciousness. From the 1960s onward, for example, there has been a series of debates sparked by efforts to reform the English vocabulary in the interest of social justice, some of them involving the feminist program of eliminating sexist usage, and some involving the introduction of new terms to describe groups defined by race, ethnicity, physical condition, sexual orientation, and the like.

Then there was the English-Only movement, which received a huge amount of national attention from the mid-1980s onward, as several groups tried to have English declared the official language of the country and eliminate bilingual programs and services. The campaign resulted in the adoption of English-Only measures by a number of states, and continues today in the form of state initiatives aimed at ending bilingual education.

In December of 1996, the great “Ebonics” controversy was set off when a local school board in Oakland, California announced it would be adopting a new
approach to helping inner-city African American students to master standard English. The program was widely but inaccurately reported as recognizing African American English – or “Ebonics,” the term used by the school board – as a legitimate language of instruction, and as rejecting the need for students to master the standard language. The resulting controversy raged for months, as virtually every major newspaper editorialized against the Oakland program, and cartoonists and Internet wags had a field day with Ebonics jokes.

Those affairs remind us that while we Americans like to think of ourselves as easy-going about language, our feelings about it actually run very deep, and it can take only the slightest pretext to arouse our national passions – the appearance of a new dictionary, the adoption of a speech code at a university, or the action of a local school board. In fact, a certain forgetfulness about the importance of language is one of the abiding characteristics of American language attitudes – every language controversy seems unprecedented.

There are historical reasons for this. The United States hasn’t had a continuously tumultuous linguistic history in the way many other nations have. We have always had a single dominant language – and a relatively homogeneous one, without the major divisions of dialects that most European nations have had to deal with in the course of their nation-building. American English may have notable regional and class differences, but they are nowhere near as broad as the differences that have separated the regional varieties of nations like France, Germany, or Italy. And while there are some varieties that depart substantially from the standard English pattern, they have been spoken by marginal or disempowered groups, so haven’t been deemed worthy of serious consideration by the mainstream media until recently.

True, America has never been without large communities of speakers of languages other than English – indigenous peoples, the language groups absorbed in the course of colonial expansion, like the French-speakers of Louisiana and the Hispanics of the Southwest, and the great flows of immigrants in the period between 1880 and 1920 and over the past thirty years or so. And from the eighteenth century onward there have been energetic efforts to discourage or suppress the use of other languages. But these episodes have generally been local or regional rather than national affairs, and interest in them has generally waned as language minorities became anglicized or as waves of immigration decreased.

It isn’t surprising, then, that assimilated English-speaking Americans are apt to take the dominance of standard English for granted – and, often, to become irritated when linguistic diversity obtrudes itself. “This is America – speak English,” people complain, with the implication that the identification of English with American national identity was always unproblematic and natural before recent times, and that earlier generations of immigrants eagerly abandoned their native languages for English in the interest of becoming “true Americans.” That has become a central element of American linguistic mythology, and it helps to explain why English-speaking Americans tend to think of the mastery of a foreign language not just as a difficult accomplishment, but as a suspicious one. Teaching students
a foreign language, the Nebraska Supreme Court opined eighty years ago, must
“naturally inculcate in them the ideas and sentiments foreign to the best interests
of their country.” While few people today would put that point so baldly, a great
many people still have the sense that a loyal American can’t serve two linguistic
masters.

That attitude contributes to many Americans’ readiness to support English-
only measures and to believe claims that America is faced with a “dangerous drift
toward bilingualism.” By the same token, Americans become indignant when they
believe that a school board is maintaining that a nonstandard variety is “just as
good” as the standard language, when everyone has been taught since the seventh
grade that features like the “double negative” are illogical forms of speech.

In fact these are just two signs of a chronic American blindness to the complex-
ities of our sociolinguistic history and of the contemporary linguistic situation.
As the anthropological linguist Dell Hymes observed more than twenty years ago
in his foreword to the 1981 *Language in the USA*, “The United States is a country
rich in many things, but poor in knowledge of itself with regard to language.”

Since then, to be sure, there has been an enormous amount of scholarship and
research that has illuminated the variety and richness of the American linguistic
scene, much of which is summarized and explained in the chapters of this book.
These questions aren’t restricted to the role of languages other than English and
the status of the minority language varieties like African American English or the
ongoing efforts to preserve Native American languages. They also extend to the
particular problems faced by the users of American Sign Language, to the efforts
of groups to forge linguistic identities for themselves, and to the challenges faced
by anyone who speaks English with an accent that happens to be stigmatized.

These questions have become far more urgent over the past twenty years.
Courts, legislatures, government agencies, corporations, public officials, college
administrators – there’s scarcely a sector of American life that hasn’t found itself
having to make complex decisions about language policies and programs, as the
United States tries to come to terms with the challenges of diversity. Too often,
people respond to these issues by appealing to “common sense” ideas about
language, which usually amount to no more than myths and folklore. Indeed,
to linguists who have studied these questions, most of these “everyday common
sense” ideas about language sound very much the way an appeal to “everyday
common sense” ideas about inflation would sound to an economist – they’re
hardly the grounds that you would want to rely on for making policy.

But an understanding of language diversity is important for other reasons, as
well. As the chapters in this *Language in the USA* make clear, there is virtually
no important social issue or cultural development in American life that isn’t
somehow signaled in language. The changing consciousness of gender roles, the
emergence of hip hop culture, the development of new communications media
like the Internet, the sociology of adolescence – all of these phenomena have a
linguistic side that isn’t significant just for its own sake, but sheds a particular
light on the social phenomenon it’s connected to.
In the end, that’s the greatest cost of the conventional ideas and attitudes that people tend to bring to language. If you come to language with the ready-made categories that society prepares for you – “good” and “bad,” “correct” and “incorrect,” and the like – you will almost certainly be deaf to its complexities and subtleties.

Take the various uses of the word *like* that have become popular among adolescents and, increasingly, among other speakers as well: “I was like standing there and she like came up to me,” or “So I was like, Hello?” To listen to a lot of columnists and critics, *like* is no more than a meaningless noise or the sign of an alarming decline in communication skills among adolescents. But charges like that are always self-deceptive – do those critics really mean to claim that they spoke in polished, slang-free sentences when they were teenagers? Worse still, they miss the point. As shown in a chapter of this book, *like* is actually doing a subtle kind of conversational work in adolescents’ speech, one you can attend to only if you are willing to set your linguistic preconceptions aside.

*Language in the USA* will unquestionably be an important resource for policy-makers and decision-makers, and it should make us all better citizens, attuned to the sociolinguistic complexities of the contemporary American scene. But perhaps my greatest hope for the book is that it will help to make us all better listeners, as well – both to the diverse voices around us and to our own.

Geoffrey Nunberg
Preface

It is almost a quarter of a century since Cambridge University Press published *Language in the USA*, edited by Charles A. Ferguson and Shirley Brice Heath. In his foreword to the 1981 volume, Dell Hymes noted that it was “the first book to address the situation of language in the United States as something to be known comprehensively and constantly to be better known.” Since then, *Language in the USA* has come to be widely used and appreciated as a resource for students of language, for teachers, and for a general public seeking a comprehensive, accessible introduction to the linguistic richness and variability of the United States.

While deeply inspired and influenced by *Language in the USA*, the present volume is not intended as a revised edition of the original, and even less as a replacement for it. Several chapters in the original have become classics in their own right. Others are timeless. Even those that seem less relevant now are of historical interest. We plan to draw on both volumes in our classes, and we believe other readers will also want to retain the resources of both. Only four of the original *Language in the USA* authors (Fishman, Nichols, Wolfram, and Zentella) recur in this book, and in each case they do so with new chapters.

The purpose of this new volume is to take a similarly comprehensive, but necessarily selective, look at language in the USA, but through the lenses of today’s issues and contemporary developments – ones that characterize the beginning of the twenty-first century. Since 1981, there have been significant changes in the sociolinguistic and political situation in the USA, and we have gained greater understanding about language and language variation in American society. We are certainly more conscious today of multilingualism and dialect variation and their educational and sociopolitical implications, as witnessed by recent public controversies, political campaigns, and state ballot initiatives centered on these issues. And while our nation is an older nation now, it is infused with extraordinary linguistic vitality from the everyday talk of adolescents and the words and music of hip hop artists.

Some of our chapter titles are brand new simply because their subject matter was completely or virtually non-existent a quarter of a century ago, as with the chapters treating the language of cyberspace, rap and hip hop, the Oakland Ebonics controversy, the English-Only movement, and the *Dictionary of American Regional English*. Other phenomena discussed in the present volume but not the 1981 volume did exist earlier (as with American Sign Language, Asian American
voices, adolescent language, and the relationships among language and gender and sexuality), but they were not then as salient, not then as well studied, and not then recognized as of such theoretical or social significance as they are today. Still others (such as issues having to do with language and education, especially bilingual education) are discussed in both volumes, but dramatic new developments like the passage of Proposition 227 in California (in 1998) and Proposition 203 in Arizona (in 2000) have become focal points for significant educational, political, and legal debate and warrant the additional focus on them here.

Other changes include the fact that we now treat Spanish in two chapters (instead of one) and that Spanish is highlighted in other chapters, in recognition of its increased prominence throughout the United States. Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century also has three general chapters on English dialects instead of one, with separate chapters on regional and social variation, and a chapter dealing exclusively with the Dictionary of American Regional English. Contrary to the possible perceptions or hopes of some, dialect variation is not disappearing in the USA.

The chapters in this book are grouped into three broad sections: Part 1, dealing with varieties of American English; Part 2, exploring other language varieties in the USA (including creole and Native American varieties, and Spanish on the East Coast and the West); and Part 3, focusing on the sociolinguistic situation (including language ideology, language attitudes, slang, the language of doctors and patients, the representation of ethnic identity in literature). Our introductions appear at the head of each chapter, and it is our hope that this placement will invite more student readers than might be drawn to introductions grouped together at the beginning of the volume or preceding each section.

Language in USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century is a shorter book than the 1981 volume, despite its having a few more chapters. The marketing constraint on its length meant omitting certain topics we would otherwise have included. Inevitably, some readers will miss topics that were treated in the earlier volume but not here. We hope that all readers will find favorite chapters in the current volume and that its perspectives will launch inquiries into topics of interest among student readers, policy makers, and the educated public. In his foreword, Dell Hymes described the 1981 volume as “a resource to citizens, as a spur to scholars, a challenge to those who shape policy and public life.” We believe that description has turned out to be accurate, and we believe the content of the current volume is much enriched by the spur the original volume provided.

John R. Rickford Edward Finegan