/aw/ Goes Dahntahn: Exploring the Social History of Sociolinguistic Indexicality in Pittsburgh[1]

Barbara Johnstone
Carnegie Mellon University

1. Overview

A Pittsburgher who left the city in the mid-1960s and returned after 2000 encountered a very different indexical soundscape than the one she left. Before about 1967, features like /aw/-monophthongization (which makes *downtown* sound like *dahntahn*) indexed social class, for those Pittsburghers for whom this variant had any second-order indexical meaning at all. Growing up in a middle-class suburb, the returned Pittsburgher associated this and other local features with the nearest working-class neighborhood, and many of the relatively socially and geographically immobile residents of that neighborhood didn't associate them with anything. Coming back to Pittsburgh in 2004, the returnee found that people now associated the same features not with class but with place. Features people heard as local were now collectively referred to as "Pittsburghese," a term she'd never heard as a child, and examples of "Pittsburghese" adorned coffee mugs, t-shirts, postcards, and refrigerator magnets, and even got spoken by a talking doll. Newspaper cartoonists and columnists alluded to "Pittsburghese" almost every time they alluded to local identity, and ordinary people talked about local speech with a new sense of pride. Yet you could still hear people speaking with the local accent -- she did so herself, she thought -- and some of these people found it embarrassing. Others seemed oblivious to it.

In this paper, I first briefly trace the developments during the latter half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st that have given rise to these ways of imagining and re-imagining local speech forms in Pittsburgh. I draw on Michael Silverstein's concept of indexical order to trace how variables like monophthongal /aw/ that once just correlated with local birth or residence came to serve as second-order indices of class and correctness

in everyday linguistic practice, and how a subset of these features have come to index place in a highly reflexive, representational, third-order way.

I then return, as I am always drawn to do, to individuals. I focus on how the diachronically layered orders of indexicality that I have described play out synchronically in the sociolinguistic environments of particular Pittsburghers. I am interested in how different people experience local speech: people like the returnee, who experiences both talk in and talk about local speech, as well as people whose sociolinguistic environments are limited mainly to one or the other of these phemonena. To illustrate a small subset of the possibilities, I draw on case studies, touching on how each of three speakers talks, perceives local talk, and talks about local talk.

Finally, I discuss what can be learned by juxtaposing a historical account of language-ideological change focused on the community as a whole with a closer look at the phenomenology of individual linguistic experience. I will suggest that a phenonenological approach to language change, and the language-ideological change that accompanies it, productively complicates a more top-down approach by highlighting the ideological multiplicity (Gal, 1998), complexity, and confusion – in short, the indexical disorder – to which change subjects some speakers.

2. Indexical Layering and the Historical Enregisterment of "Pittsburghese"

To organize a historical account of the changing connections in Pittsburgh between linguistic form and social meaning, I draw on Silverstein's (1995[1976], 2003) concept of "orders of indexicality." This is probably a familiar body of theory to some of you, but Silverstein's writing is sometimes rather opaque, and different people interpret it differently. So, here is my take on Silversteinian indexicality.

Silverstein uses Charles Pierce's term "index" to label "signs where the occurrence of the sign vehicle token bears a connection of understood spatio-temporal contiguity to the occurrence of the entity signaled" (Silverstein 1995 [1976], 199). Indexes can be referential, as in the case of "shifters" like demonstrative and personal pronouns such as *you* or *here*, where the denotation of the term depends on the context of its utterance. I am concerned here, however, with non-referential indexes: linguistic forms that evoke and/or construct (Silverstein uses the terms "presuppose" and "entail") what is sometimes called "social meaning," a concept which encompasses such things as register, stance, and social and personal identity. In this paper I use Silverstein's model as it is usually used, namely to characterize "non-denotational" meaning, although there is a good argument to be made, as Silverstein himself sometimes hints, that denotational meaning is also indexical.

Relationships between linguistic form and social meaning can stabilize at various levels of abstraction or "orders of indexicality." Silverstein claims that the concept of indexical order is necessary for "showing us how to relate the micro-social to the macro-social frames of analysis of any sociolinguistic phenomenon" (193).

I am interested in a particular instantiation of the process by which, in Silverstein's terms, an n-th-order correlation can give rise to $n+1$-th-order social meaning and $n+1$-th-order connections between linguistic forms and social meanings can themselves be invested with meaning, becoming the presupposing n-th-order pattern for a new $n+1$-th-order entailment. In order to identify orders of indexicality that can be historically

observed, I thus assign actual values to Silverstein's variable *n* in sketching the history of the indexical meanings of regional speech forms in Pittsburgh (see Figure 1).

(1) Orders of indixicality in Pittsburgh

Silverstein	In Pittsburgh
"*n*-th-order indexical": A feature whose use can be correlated with a socio-demographic identity (e.g. region or class)	The frequency of regional variants can be correlated with being from southwestern PA, working-class, male. But correlations are not noticeable, because "everybody speaks that way."
"*n+1*-th-order indexical": an *n*-th order indexical feature that has been assigned a meaning in terms of native ideology	Speakers start to notice and attribute meaning to regional variants and shift styles in their own speech to project correctness, carefulness.
"For any indexical phenomenon at order *n*, an indexical phenomenon at order *n+1* is always immanent, lurking in the potential of a … native interpretation of the *n*-th-order … variation"	People noticing the existence of second-order stylistic variation in Pittsburghers' speech link the regional variants they are most likely to hear with Pittsburgh identity. These variants are collectively called "Pittsburghese."

"First-order" indexicality is the kind of correlation between a form and a socio-demographic identity or pragmatic function that an outsider could observe. For example, work by Labov, Ash, and Boberg (2005), Johnstone et al. (2002), and Kiesling and Wisnosky (2003) shows that the monophthongization of the diphthong /aw/ (so that *downtown* sounds like "dahntahn" or *house* like "hahs") occurs in the speech of people from a particular part of southwestern Pennsylvania and rarely elsewhere, and it is more likely to occur in the speech of working-class males born in Pittsburgh than in that of other people. Thus monophthongal /aw/ is a first-order index of someone's being from that area, working class, and/or male.

Because the form-social category connection only begins to be meaningful when someone notices it, first-order indexicality is potential indexicality. In the early stages of a sound change, the variant in question is not invested with social meaning, because community members have not noticed the first-order indexical correlation between form and demography, and they thus cannot make use of the correlation to interpret others' speech or project social identity. In the ethnically and religiously homogeneous, tightly-knit, working-class immigrant neighborhoods that characterized early 20th-century Pittsburgh, people did not notice that local speech was different from how people spoke English elsewhere. Nothing called attention to regional or class-linked differences in people's English. For first-generation immigrants, the sorts of social work that would later be done by using a less regional-sounding English form rather than a more regional-sounding one may have been done via degrees of foreign-accentedness.

Second-order indexicality occurs when people begin to use first-order correlations to do social work, either interpretive or performative. For example, because monophthongal /aw/ is distributed the way it is, someone who has noticed this distribution can hear monophthongal /aw/ as suggesting that the speaker is from southwestern Pennsylvania and/or working class and/or masculine. Accordingly, people who can use this feature variably may use it less when they are trying harder to sound educated or cosmopolitan, or more when they are trying harder to sound like working-class men or like other Pittsburghers.

Pittsburghers only started to notice first-order correlations like this when they started to use English in everyday interaction, and when some (thereby) began to be socially, and, in a limited way, geographically mobile. At this point, local versus non-local forms became a resource for style-shifting. Second-order indexical relations link phonetic and lexical form with "social meaning" in several ways: nonstandard forms hearable in Pittsburgh can sound incorrect, working-class, or local, and, as we will see, some Pittsburghers associate them with other, more idiosyncratic identities.

Second-order indexicality involves "1st-order indexical variation that has been swept up into an ideologically-driven metapragmatics" (Silverstein 2003, 219). Since "metapragmatic" activity is not necessarily "metadiscursive," speakers are not necessarily aware of second-order indexicality in such a way as to be able to talk about it. In general, $n+1$-th-order indexicality occurs when n-th-order indexical relations are noticed, consciously or not, and given meaning, becoming pragmatically usable. In Pittsburgh, the (aw) variable acquired *third*-order indexical meaning when it began to be "swept up" into explicit lists of local words and their meanings and reflexive performances of local identities, in the context of circulating discourse about the connection between local identity and local speech. This started to happen in the 1960s. The term "Pittsburghese" appears to date from 1967 (Johnstone, et al., 95). The shift to an explicit linkage of local speech and local identity began to occur in the context of rising class- and place-consciousness on the part of the grandchildren of the industrial immigrants of the 1920s – a development that also accounts for some of the other facets of the startlingly new youth culture of the 1960s. Only a subset of the variable features of regional speech have been taken up into the third order of indexicality, in which using words and pronunciations from a highly codified repertoire is a way for people who may have few of the resources for second-order indexicality to show that they know how Pittsburghers sound.

Describing the social history of monophthongal /aw/ according to this model suggests that there are three ways in which this variant has figured semiotically in Pittsburgh: first, monophthongal /aw/ was a first-order index that carried no social meaning; then, a second-order index of, mainly, correctness and class, and, finally, a third-order index of locality. This suggests that if we group Pittsburghers by age, the oldest would be the least likely to hear monophthongal /aw/ as indexical, and hence the least likely to be able to distinguish it from the diphthongal variant and the least likely to talk about it. They would also be unlikely to style-shift, since style-shifting is a consequence of second-order indexicality. Middle-aged Pittsburghers would, according to this scheme, be able to hear the difference between the variants and be likely to style-shift in its usage, but not likely to talk about the feature. Younger Pittsburghers would be able to hear the difference and talk about the feature, as well as using it stylistically to project localness.

3. The Phenomenology of /aw/

A closer look at the meanings and uses of monophthongal /aw/ from the perspective of individual speakers suggests that the orders-of-indexicality model oversimplifies the situation in some ways. As the model suggests, multiple indexical meanings are now potentially available for monophthongal /aw/ in Pittsburgh, so that different Pittsburghers experience this sound semiotically in different ways. In some cases, for some speakers, monophthongal /aw/ indeed has no social meaning. For other Pittsburghers,

monophthongal /aw/ has one of a number of second-order indexical meanings. To some of these people, monophthongal /aw/ may sometimes sound uneducated, to others it may sometimes sound local; sometimes, for others, monophthongal /aw/ sounds like people in Brooklyn, New York or has some other fairly idiosyncratic indexical association. For other Pittsburghers, monopthongal /aw/, represented in writing or performed in speech in words like "dahntahn" and phrases like "get aht a here," is the quintessential example of "Pittsburghese." Some people use and orient to this feature, and others, in multiple ways. For some people, the answer to the question "What does monophthongal /aw/ mean?" or the more general question "What is Pittsburghese?" is simple; for others it is much more complicated. To put it another way, some Pittsburghers experience the indexically orderly sociolinguistic world that our historical sketch might lead us to expect, but, for others, indexical disorder is the norm.

To illustrate this, I turn now to case studies of three of over 100 people my colleagues and I have interviewed in the past four years. These three Pittsburghers have three quite different sets of ideas about what monophthongal /aw/ sounds like and means, and they employ this feature differently in everyday interaction.

The first is someone I call Esther R., who was born in 1917 and is thus one of the oldest speakers we interviewed. On a modified matched-guise experimental task that was administered after the sociolinguistic interview, Esther R. listened to the sentence "I bought a house" pronounced with diphthongal and monophthongal variants of /aw/ in the word *house*: "I bought a [haws], I bought a [ha:s]". Esther said she could not hear a difference between the monophthongal and diphthongal variants. Auditory coding of /aw/ tokens, supplemented by acoustic analysis (see Johnstone et al. 2005), shows that Esther R. used the nonstandard monophthongal variant 100% of the time in the interview.

For Esther R., local phonological forms do not function as second-order indexes of social identities. As excerpt (1) from my interview with her shows, she claims never to have heard of "Pittsburghese" and does not think there is a local accent.

(2) FH03 and 04, interview 4[2]

1	BJ	So ((5 sec.)) let me ask you if you ever heard of the term "Pittsburghese." No? ((responding to head gesture)) Um-hm. Do you think people here have an accent that's different from ((4 sec.)) other places?
2	Esther R.	No, I don't think so.
3	BJ	You don't think so? Um-hm.
4	Esther R.	To me, it didn't… you know, it doesn't…
5	BJ	But so, there aren't any =
6	Esther R.	= [Yeah]

---

[2] Transcription conventions: Simultaneous speech is left-aligned and enclosed in square brackets; equals signs indicate a turn that follows without pause on the preceding one; single parentheses enclose material that was unclear on the recording; double parentheses enclose comments about pauses and paralinguistic material, as well as phonetic transcriptions where relevant. Ellipses indicate pauses of under 1 sec., with more dots corresponding to a longer pause. Words pronounced with extra stress and volume are underlined. Interviewees are identified with pseudonyms.

7	BJ	[Particular] words or [expressions]
8	Esther R.	[No]
9	BJ	or anything that people think.. .[people think]
10	Esther R.	No, [I don't think so]
11	BJ	Um-hm. Um-hm. OK.

Later in the interview, Esther does claim to use some local words, like *redd up* (to tidy), and to know people who use *yinz* ('you, pl'., also pronounced and spelled *yunz*). However, she links these forms only to the personal identities of individual speakers. For example, she remembers her sister-in-law using *yinz* a lot. However, she appears never to have thought about local forms in terms of schematizations linking them to localness, standardness, region, gender, or any other social identity category. Esther R. fits nicely into the top row of the orders-of-indexicality chart in Fig. 1 above: her sociolinguistic world, with respect to this sound, is characterized almost completely by stable first-order indexicality.

A very different way of interpreting local-sounding speech is that of Jason E. Jason was born in 1987 and is one of the youngest speakers in the sample. His speech sounds supra-local in most respects; his score for /aw/ monophthongization 57.00%, but most of the glide-reduction in his speech can be attributed to its speed. In the perception task, he identified the guise with [ha:s] as the one that sounds more like the way a Pittsburgher would say it. Although he is a native Pittsburgher, Jason claims not to speak the local dialect. Nevertheless, he is able to discuss and perform both what he calls "the actual accent of the Pittsburgher" and "the words that we use and no one else uses." Jason E. also shows that he associates monophthongal /aw/ with local identity in the interview, where this is the first feature he uses to exemplify "Pittsburghese" as an accent. When he performs "Pittsburghese" toward the end of excerpt 2, he relies on words that include monophthongal /aw/ to make his point about both accent and usage.

(3) FH21, dahntahn

1	BJ:	Have you ever heard of Pittsburghese?
2	Jason E.:	Oh yeah..
3	BJ:	[What]
4	Jason E.:	[I don't] speak it.
5	BJ:	You <u>don't</u> speak it.
6	Jason E.:	No.
7	BJ:	What is it?
8	Jason E.:	It's a- I wouldn't say it's a language, it's a- like a- what's the word- um, a . dialect . unique . to . this . area. ((as if reciting a dictionary definition))
9	BJ:	And what is-, what are some things, what are some examples of it?
10	Jason E.:	Uh well, you have- I think there's two- two things that make it up. There's uh, the actual accent of the Pittsburgher, and then there's, the words, that we use and no one else uses. And you know the accent would be like, instead of saying *down* you'd say *dahn* (([dæ:n])), or you know- Uh, also the way

you, the way you use words, which I guess fits into the second category. You know, *dahn* (([dæ:n])), Welcome to, Max- like Knox's Pierogie House (([nɔksəz pər⁀ogi hæ:s])).You know, that, that kind of thing. Or instead of saying "I"m going to this place" they say "I'm goin' dahn (([dæ:n])) blah blah blah."

11	BJ:	"Dahn (([da:n])) street." *Dahn* (([da:n])), yeah.
12	Jason E.:	"I'm goin' dahn (([da:n])) the street. I'm going dahn (([da:n])) a John's (([janz])) hahs (([ha:s]))."
13	BJ:	"Dahn John (([da:n jɔnz])) – dahn a John's hahs" (([da:n ə jɔnz ha:s])) .
14	Jason E.:	"Dahn John's hahs" (([da:n jɔnz ha:s])). Yeah.
15	BJ	Mm hmm
16	Jason E.:	Yeah. I (hate)- It's a really ugly accent (I think.)

The first actual example Jason E. gives is the local pronunciation of *down* represented in the respelling <DAHN>. After repeating the pronunciation of this single word, he offers a sentence that includes a very local-sounding restaurant name: "Welcome to Knox's Pierogie House." He performs several features of local speech in this sentence: he rounds the low back vowel in *Knox*, fronts the /o/ in *pierogie*, and monophthongizes the /aw/ in *house*. As his illustration of "Pittsburghese" continues, Jason E. continues to utilize this feature, working it repeatedly into the performance in *down* and *house* and supplementing it with other phonological features. Interestingly, he does not always get it right: the first four times he uses the /aw/ variable in his performance, he pronounces it [daen], and it is not until after I model the "correct" nonstandard pronunciation that he switches to [da:n].

Jason E.'s phenomenal world, when it comes to /aw/, is a good fit for the hypothetical indexically orderly world I sketched in the first part of this paper. His experience is characterized quite nicely by the third row of the chart in Fig. 1. For him, monophthongal /aw/ has reflexive, third-order indexical meaning; as a result, he can talk about it and perform it. He uses monopthongal /aw/ as a resource for styling, in Rampton's (1995) and Coupland's (2001) sense -- that is, to index an identity associated with someone else -- but he does not use it as a second-order index of his own social identity, and although it is variable in his speech, its variability is not related to style in the Labovian sense.

Dennis C., born in 1951, is a member of the generation between Esther R's and Jason E's. As we have seen, Esther R. and Jason E. have fairly straightforward ideas about local speech (Esther doesn't think there is a local accent, and uses the regional form of the variable /aw/ all the time; Jason does think there is a local accent and can perform it but doesn't speak it). Dennis C. has experienced local speech in many more ways, and has multiple, sometimes conflicting ways of using, perceiving, and talking about it. For Dennis, monophthongal /aw/ has second-order indexical meaning, at least when he hears it in others' speech. In his own speech, Dennis uses the two variants of /aw/ in fairly consistent proportion across modules meant to elicit different levels of self-consciousness, which suggests that he may not be using this feature to do indexical work himself. However, in the experimental task, Dennis chose the more *standard, diphthongal* variant as the one most likely to be the way a Pittsburgher would say the word *house*. In

interview speech, only 38.0% of Dennis's own tokens of (aw) were diphthongal, 62.0% monophthongal.

Unlike Esther R, Dennis C. does hear regional forms as having second-order indexical meaning. However, unlike Jason E., and perhaps because of his more positive attitude about how Pittsburghers talk (cf. Niedzielski 1999), Dennis hears the more standard form as local, despite his own predominant use of the nonstandard form. During the experimental task, Dennis C. eventually says that he hears the local form as rural. Notice what a struggle it is for him to decide how to hear this form, though.

(4) LV07, sentence versions.

1	BJ	Alright, just a [couple more here].
2	recorded voice	[Sentence 8.] a. We bought a house (([haws])). We bought a house (([haws])). b. We bought a house (([ha:s])). We bought a house (([ha:s])).
3	BJ	All right. Which, is one of those, well you know what the questions are now [wh-]
4	Dennis C.	[Well] hau- (([ha])) well the second one sounds (([sa:ndz])) horrible.
5	BJ	Uh-huh.
6	Dennis C.	House (([haws])). But then again now I don't know maybe that's is is is is see I'm not always aware of of my own
7	BJ	um-hm=
8	Dennis C.	=Pittsburgh accent. House (([haws])), house (([ha:s])), that, I don't, that doesn't sound (([sa:nd])), that sounds (([sa:ndz])) terrible [(not Pittsburgh)]
9	BJ	[does] does it, it doesn't sound local to you=
10	Dennis C.	=It doesn't sound (([sa:nd])) local to <u>me</u>,
11	BJ	Um-hm ((breath intake))
12	Dennis C.	That almost sounds (([sawndz])) like some'n I'd, I, I'd almost associate it with like some hillbillies, or somewhere out, out (([a:t], [a:t])) in the hills somewhere talkin' like that, uh
13	BJ	mm-hmm=
14	Dennis C.	=uh, it's almost like some of the strange words that my dad sometimes would slip back into some, some strange thing from Ligonier, where, uh, and even my uncles up 'ere, they weren't well educated, but there were certain pronunciations (([prəna:nsiešʌnz])) certain words I think that are, ((breath)) [common to the]
15	BJ	[um-hm]
16	Dennis C.	coun- to country folk for some [odd reason]
17	BJ	[um-hmm]
18	Dennis C.	'N 'at almost sounds (([sa:ndz])) like one of, one of those=
19	BJ	=that's interesting. Yeah, uh-huh, that's interesting.

In line 4, Dennis C. claims that the monophthongal version of *house* "sounds horrible," in the process monophthongizing the /aw/ in *sounds*. He then starts to admit

that the "horrible" variant might in fact be the Pittsburgh one, the one he uses himself: "I'm not always aware of my Pittsburgh accent." But after repeating the monophthongal variant twice, he asserts that it "sounds terrible, not Pittsburgh." As he repeats the monophthongal prompt, he actually produces it diphthongally first and then monophthongally. This suggests that he does not himself have productive control over this variant. When the fieldworker probes further, he claims that he thinks it sounds like "some hillbillies … somewhere out in the hills somewhere … some strange thing from Ligonier (the mountain town where his father worked for a time) … certain pronunciations common to the country folk for some odd reason."

Dennis was unaware of having an accent while he was growing up, and still has trouble acknowledging that others hear him as having one. As we saw in the previous excerpt, he is "not always aware of [his] own Pittsburgh accent," and suspects that he may actually do some of the things that "sound horrible" to him. But if he does "slur" some words, as he says, doing so has never hurt him. On the other hand, Dennis also recalled an employment workshop for Vietnam veterans at which he was told that people with local accents, like people with beards, should not bother applying for corporate jobs, and indeed he doesn't have such a job. Excerpt 5 provides a sense of some of the inconsistencies there have been in Dennis's environment with respect to what local accents mean and how they are evaluated.

(5) LV07, interview 5

1	Dennis G.	… when I was going to a veterans, uh, Vietnam veterans council, they had us- ((Intake of breath)) You could go Wednesday afternoons, they had, uh- It was for professional veterans that were out of work, and you, it was sort of like a networking, they'd have speakers come in, and they had a speaker come in talking about…Pittsburghese. ((1 sec.)) And was telling us, uh- He said two- Well, not just that, but he was talking about, couple different things, but- He said the one thing- He said if you talk…with Pittsburghese, and you use any of that language, you're not going get a job here in Pittsburgh, working for some company. That was- And- And I sort of got into it with him ((laughing)) about that 'cause I said well, well, why? Wh- What's the- And people they…they say a Southern accent is so charming, wh- what's, what's, what's, what's wrong- But this was- He was very adamant that…that you need to [not speak…]
2	BJ	[Do you] think that's true?
3	Dennis G.	I don't- You know what, I do not, I do- I don't know. Of course he also said that don't expect to get a job in the corporate world with a beard, that was aimed at me too, I think. (A good thing) too, because I have a beard, but, uh… I don't know if that's true or not. I- I've, uh- 'Cause I really haven't…really tried to get a…a job in the ((laughing)) corporate world here.
4	BJ	((Laughs)) Mm-hmm.
5	Dennis G.	I know- It didn't hurt me here at [[his workplace]] or anywhere else. I don't…believe it's hurt me anyplace that I've gone to get a job. ((Intake of breath)) No one's ever said to

me…that…they couldn't understand me, or anything like that. I- I know there's certain words that I use, and I- I- I know I probably <u>slur</u> certain words ((Intake of breath)) uh, that, that are common to Pittsburgh. But then again people, uh… ((Intake of breath)) But I never had anybody make- make- make fun out of me.

Dennis's experience of Pittsburgh speech has been complicated in other ways, too. Like Jason, he has encountered popular representations of "Pittsburghese," but unlike Jason, he has had trouble taking them at face value, as can be seen in excerpt (6):

(6) LV07, Interview 5

Dennis G.   ((Intake of breath)) I've read some, uh…I've read a few articles in some local- I don't know if it was one in- Can't remember where- where I saw that- It was a local article about Pittsburghese. And also I've- ((Intake of breath)) I've also picked up a few- few- There've been a few books, that I- Actually some books I've seen at bookstores that I don't agree- I don't agree totally with some of the words they had in there.

To summarize, the sociolinguistic world Dennis experiences is much more complex than that of either Esther or Jason. The indexical soundscape has changed repeatedly in his lifetime – from the white noise of first-order indexicality to the unconscious style-shifting and unarticulated and hence sometimes unshared indexicality of the second order, to the very public, much more regimented set of indexical meanings associated with the third-order indexicality of newspaper articles and books about "Pittsburghese." And unlike Esther, whose sociolinguistic world remained homogeneous, Dennis has been positioned to experience these changes.

4. A Phenomenological Approach to Language (-Ideological) Change

Describing these three speakers' sociolinguistic worlds from a phenomenological perspective suggests that the historical transition from first- to third-order indexicality – from a Western Pennsylvania accent that nobody noticed to a dialect called "Pittsburghese" that is hard not to notice – has not been as smooth as is suggested by a more abstract community-level representation like the one I presented at the beginning of this paper. In particular, change has affected some Pittsburghers more than others. The returnee I began this paper with experienced the transition from second- to third-order indexicality – from identifying regional speech forms with a working-class neighborhood to seeing such forms represented as examples of "Pittsburghese." She experienced this change discontinuously, so that, to her, it seems like a sharp and surprising break. To someone like Dennis G., who mostly stayed in Pittsburgh and experienced these ideological changes continuously, the process has felt bumpy and confusing, and it has called his identity into question in a way that has not happened to older or younger people. (Language-ideological change, I might note, is just one of many social and historical process that have affected Dennis G's generation of Pittsburghers disproportionately.) Dennis G.'s phenomenal sociolinguistic world has been chaotic, indexically disorderly.

There is more to be said about all this, but that will have to wait for future work. I end simply by suggesting that a nuanced account of language ideological change should describe such change not just from the perspective of "society," but also from the perspective of phenomenal experience, since it is at the interface of social order and individual experience that language occurs. And there is another reason for taking the time to explore people's own experiences of their particular sociolinguistic worlds. As analysts, we may have good reasons for wanting to describe speech and speech communities in abstract terms, but our descriptions are not going to make sense to the people we study unless they reflect their own lived experience.

References

Coupland, N. (2001). Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society, 30,* 345-375.

Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 317-331). Oxford/NY: Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, B., Andrus, J., & Danielson, A. (2006). Mobility, indexicality, and the enregisterment of "Pittsburghese." *Journal of English Linguistics, 34*(2), 77-104.

Johnstone, B., Bhasin, N., & Wittkofski, D. (2002). "Dahntahn Pittsburgh": Monophthongal /aw/ and representations of localness in southwestern Pennsylvania. *American Speech, 77,* 148-166.

Kiesling, S. F., & Wisnosky, M. (2003, October). *Competing norms, heritage prestige, and /aw/-monophthongization in Pittsburgh* Poster presented at New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 32, Philadelphia.

Labov, W., Ash, S., & Boberg, C. (2005). *Atlas of North American English*. Berlin, New York: Mouton/deGruyter.

Niedzielski, N. (1999). The effect of social information on the perception of sociolinguistic variables. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18,* 62-85.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Silverstein, M. (1995 [1976]). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In B. G. Blount (Ed.), *Language, culture, and society: A book of readings* (pp. 187-221). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication, 23,* 193-229.

Department of English
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
bj4@andrew.cmu.edu