Journal of Sociolinguistics 3/4, 1999: 443–460

You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity[1]

Mary Bucholtz
Texas A&M University

ABSTRACT
Sociolinguistic research on the linguistic construction of identity has begun to attend to the construction of culturally normative, unmarked social categories such as whiteness and masculinity. The study of these categories involves the investigation of ideology as well as identity, because ideology produces hegemonic forms of white masculinity. Such ideologies of race and gender shape narratives of interracial conflict told by middle-class European American boys at a California high school. The article focuses on one such narrative, told by a white boy who aligns with black youth culture and uses elements of African American Vernacular English in his speech. Via language crossing and other discursive strategies such as constructed dialogue, the narrative positions black masculinity, in contrast to white masculinity, as physically powerful and locally dominant. At the same time, the narrative preserves the racial hierarchy that enables white cultural appropriation of African American culture through language crossing.

KEYWORDS: African American Vernacular English, language crossing, masculinity, narrative, whiteness, youth

INTRODUCTION

An outpouring of recent sociolinguistic research has demonstrated that social categories once thought to be fixed and unproblematic are in fact constructed via linguistic practices. Most work of this nature focuses on social categories, such as women and people of color, that are marked vis-à-vis some cultural norm and hence are easily visible to analysts. Relatively little research, however, examines the categories that constitute these cultural norms; indeed, their very supposed 'naturalness' insulates them from study as constructed and contingent dimensions of identity rather than as unexamined norms or baselines against which to compare purportedly 'deviant' others.

This article considers the intersection of two such categories – whiteness and masculinity – and their construction in the linguistic practice of crossing

108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden MA 02148, USA.

(Rampton 1995). Through a detailed analysis of a narrative about interracial conflict told by a middle-class European American boy who affiliates with African American youth culture, I argue that crossing into African American Vernacular English (AAVE), in conjunction with other discursive strategies, is a semiotic resource for the construction of identity at several levels. On the one hand, as a speech practice that the speaker engages in across contexts, it produces and projects the speaker's urban youth identity (see also Cutler this issue). On the other hand, in the context of a narrative of interracial conflict, these discursive resources are reworked to highlight racial and gendered dimensions of the self as well as the 'other': African American youth.[2]

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC INVESTIGATION OF WHITE MASCULINITY

Traditionally, sociolinguistic research has not focused on whiteness or masculinity as ideologically privileged categories. More recently, however, several studies have taken this issue as their starting point and have made it clear that such normative categories are constructed in relation to difference (Bell this issue; Cameron 1997; Hill 1998). But despite ideologies of normativity, neither whiteness nor masculinity is monolithic. Their local forms creatively respond to dominant ideologies rather than mechanically reflecting them. In the process, new ideological structures may emerge. *Whiteness* and *masculinity* are therefore terms that encapsulate both identity and ideology. For example, while most males can be said to project some form of masculinity in at least some contexts (that is, as identity), only a certain subset of possible or actual masculinities are culturally acceptable (that is, as ideology). And even culturally and institutionally dominant forms of masculinity may shift from moment to moment (cf. Kiesling 1998); as Robert Connell writes in his study of Western masculinity, '"Hegemonic masculinity" is not a fixed character type, always and everywhere the same. It is, rather, the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable' (1995: 76). Connell argues that in its current form hegemonic masculinity – the gender ideology and practice associated with institutional power – contains tensions between dominance and violence on the one hand and rationality and technical expertise on the other, with rational power replacing physical power as the source of domination. Physically based masculinities are thus becoming subordinated, in Connell's terms (see also McElhinny 1995). One type of subordinated masculinity, Connell notes, is black masculinity. In practice, black men's masculinities are multiple, but at the ideological level this diversity of gender identities is reduced to monolithic forms of masculinity that stand counter to the hegemonic white norm.

As a consequence of racism, black masculinity in the United States (and elsewhere) has long been ideologically associated with a hyperphysicality that involves physical strength, hyper(hetero)sexuality, and physical violence (Davis 1983), and blackness has often been ideologically linked more to men than to women, as Marcyliena Morgan (1999) notes. Because of this complex of

cultural ideologies, the use of AAVE can, in certain marked contexts, indexically link blackness and a hyperphysical masculinity. And because white masculinity can exist only in relation to other forms of masculinity (and to femininity), by crossing into AAVE middle-class European American males may paradoxically be constructing themselves as (certain kinds of) white men.

THE BAY CITY HIGH SCHOOL STUDY

This article offers one example of how AAVE may be used together with other linguistic resources in the production of white masculinity. The data are taken from a set of narratives of racialized conflict told by European American boys at a multiracial urban high school in California that I call Bay City High. I describe these conflicts as *racialized* rather than *racial* to emphasize that their racial meaning is not natural or inevitable (although the narratives imply that it is) but rather is constructed through discourse. Race is made relevant – indeed, race is made, along with gender – in the narrative choices of the storytellers.

The data were collected during ethnographic fieldwork at Bay City High in 1995–96. Despite its diversity, the school is racially organized along an ideologically defined black-white dichotomy that structures students' social worlds. Yet many European American students symbolically cross this divide through linguistic and other social practices that index their affiliation with African American youth culture, and especially hip hop. By drawing on a linguistic variety widely and almost exclusively associated with African Americans, the narrator of the story under analysis here, like numerous other white teenagers at Bay City High, uses elements of AAVE in his ordinary speech style as part of his projection of an urban youth identity influenced by African American youth culture (cf. Hewitt 1986 for an analogous situation among white youth in England). AAVE, as a symbolic marker of African American youth culture, becomes a commodity that urban-identified European American youth can easily appropriate, at least partially and imperfectly. I term such use *Cross-Racial AAVE*, or *CRAAVE*, where the acronym is intended to reflect speakers' sometimes ambivalent cultural and linguistic desire – a desire often encapsulated in other white students' scornful if inaccurate assessment, 'He (or she) wants to be black.' (Girls as well as boys use elements of AAVE, with consequences for both racial and gender identity and ideology; however, girls' language use is not analyzed in this article.) Although *CRAAVE* risks implying that cross-racial use of AAVE features has a single social meaning (much as the term *AAVE* itself implies a unitary speech community of users: Morgan 1999), it is useful for distinguishing between unmarked AAVE use by African Americans and marked AAVE use by European Americans at Bay City High. The term is shorthand for an indexical relationship between certain embodied and contextualized uses of AAVE and a particular European American urban youth identity.

CRAAVE is not a unified speech style; different speakers draw on different features of AAVE phonology, syntax, and morphology, and their speech does

not correspond to most African Americans' linguistic patterns. Yet CRAAVE is understood as an emblematic use of AAVE both by African Americans and by other European Americans. Not all European American uses of AAVE features count as CRAAVE: the social meaning of a particular feature in use depends on the details of context. For example, two case studies (Hatala 1976; Sweetland 1998) describe cross-racial AAVE use without commodification or appropriation, the difference being that the white speakers in those studies were fully integrated into the African American speech community. Such uses would not be classified as CRAAVE.

In the data analyzed below, the narrator, Brand One (a pseudonym), a middle-class European American boy, uses language crossing together with other narrative strategies to link race and gender both discursively and ideologically. He invokes race and gender identity explicitly, through the content of the narrative, and implicitly, through his linguistic choices in narration.

The occasion of the story was a discussion with me about current slang; the story was triggered by the mention of the threat *watch your back*. When asked if he uses this expression, Brand One narrated a recent confrontation between himself and an unnamed African American male antagonist who, according to the narrative, attempts to steal from Brand One's backpack and then threatens physical violence. In the narrative, Brand One ultimately escapes both physical harm and humiliation when two African American male 'gangsters' of his acquaintance arrive and come to his defense. That the narrative is shaped for its audience (a white female adult researcher) is shown in the glosses that Brand One provides for slang terms he uses during the narrative, such as *mugging* (line 71) and *break* (line 77), as well as in his willingness to raise the topic of race, which white students at Bay City High are usually reluctant to do outside of predominantly white settings. Also evident is the narrative's connection to masculinity: no European American girls in my study told me similar stories (although they may have told such stories in other contexts), and girls never featured in the stories told by boys. This is not to say that fight narratives are an inherently masculine genre: female speakers are equally able to represent themselves narratively in situations of conflict and violence (Shuman 1986). In the context of the study, however, fight stories served as resources for the construction of masculinity as well as racial identity in a public, for-the-record telling of personal experience to an outside researcher (cf. O'Connor 1997).

CROSSING AND CONSTRUCTED DIALOGUE IN NARRATIVE

Because narratives are performed and therefore highly self-conscious speech events, narratives may have no direct relation to speakers' experience. The analysis thus differentiates between the narrator and the protagonist, although they are the same biographical person (Brand One), and the term *figure* (Goffman 1974: 523) is used to refer to the characters in the narrative, in order to emphasize that they are narrative constructs rather than 'real' entities.

Crucial to the narrative's effect is the use of constructed dialogue (Tannen 1989). A useful perspective on constructed dialogue in Brand One's narrative is provided by Erving Goffman's analytic separation of 'speaker' into animator, principal, and author: his analysis highlights the fact that different interactional identities may be at work in a single quoted utterance. Further, different strategies of animation may be employed simultaneously, so that a single utterance may be at once a quotation, a 'say-for,' and a 'mockery' (to use Goffman's 1974: 534 terminology). Because quotation is the speech of both self and other, it shares with these other forms of animation 'the process of projecting an image of someone not oneself while preventing viewers from forgetting even for a moment that an alien animator is at work' (Goffman 1974: 534).

Like Goffman's frame analysis, Mikhail Bakhtin's definition of *double-voiced discourse* recognizes that multiple layers of identity of self and other may be present in a single discourse:

> It [double-voiced discourse] serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such discourse there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions. And all the while these two voices are dialogically interrelated, they – as it were – know about each other (just as two exchanges in a dialogue know of each other and are structured in this mutual knowledge of each other); it is as if they actually hold a conversation with each other. . . . A potential dialogue is embedded in them, one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages. (Bakhtin 1981: 324–325)

In Brand One's narrative, crossing is used in constructed dialogue and elsewhere to create this double-voiced effect through the animation of multiple voices. Ideologies of race and gender are invoked via such discursive strategies to construct a black masculinity in opposition to Brand One's own version of white masculinity.

RACE AND GENDER LEXICALIZED

It is not always apparent when speakers are constructing their own or others' racial and gender identities in discourse, especially unmarked identities like whiteness and masculinity. The ideologically normative position of such identities frequently makes their construction difficult to pinpoint because they are not always explicitly named. However, unmarked categories become visible when they are juxtaposed with social categories that are marked as 'other' by cultural ideologies. Thus the discursive construction of whiteness and hegemonic masculinity is often easiest to see in contexts where blackness and femininity or homosexuality are overtly mentioned in the discourse.

Race is made central in Brand One's narrative through a series of racial labels applied to himself as protagonist and other figures. At the opening of the narrative (Example 1), Brand One puts his audience on notice that race is important to the

story by elaborating on his initial description of his antagonist (*this dude*, line 1) with a racial label: *this this black dude* in line 6. (Transcription conventions and the full transcript of Brand One's narrative appear in the Appendix.)

1. 1 . . . two months ago this dude [du:d],
   2 um (1.5)
   3 ((tongue click))
   4 I was walking up to uh (.) to (.) the bus stop
   5 and he- and he was in my backpack right?
   6 This this black dude [du:d] was like six (.) maybe like fi:ve ten he was big,
   7 he was a lot bigger than me,

The antagonist's race turns out to be relevant to the story in part because, according to Brand One's telling, it is his antagonist who racializes the conflict:

2. 15 And then he walked up beside me right?
   16 And there was like a wall {right there kinda you know?} ((high pitch))
   17 And then (I pushed him up against it) and he's like,
   18 {"What you gonna do you little punk ass whi:te bi:tch,"}

In line 18, the antagonist calls attention to Brand One's whiteness with the label *you little punk ass white bitch*. This constructed utterance narratively justifies Brand One's introduction of race in Example 1. As the narrative unfolds, it becomes apparent that the race of other figures is significant as well. When Brand One the protagonist edges toward a group of boys he knows in hopes of finding assistance from them, Brand One the narrator makes a point of mentioning their race:

3. 36 Na- I went back like five feet where there was some dudes [du:?s] I knew?
   37 Like all black guys right?
   38 But he wasn't really intimidated of them because they weren't hard
   (('physically intimidating')) right

The racial detail (*Like all black guys right?*, line 37) invokes a cultural ideology of black masculinity by introducing a presupposition into the narrative: 'Male African Americans are intimidating and therefore useful to have as allies in a conflict.' Although the group of African American boys in the narrative violate this presupposition, the underlying racial ideology remains intact, as indicated by Brand One's use of the connective *but* (*But he wasn't really intimidated of them . . .*, line 38) to signal a contrast between what one might normally expect and what was actually the case (cf. Schiffrin 1987: 156).

Beside this ideology of black masculinity the narrative places an ideology of white masculinity through the voice of Brand One's antagonist. In line 18 of Example 2 above, the figure of the antagonist challenges Brand One's masculinity by linking him to femaleness (*bitch*) and homosexuality (*punk*). Such use of the term *punk* originates in African American slang; it began as a derogatory term for a gay man but then extended its meaning to include 'coward,' 'one who backs down from a fight or conflict' (Major 1994: 367;

Smitherman 1994: 186). Similar attacks on Brand One's gender identity recur in each of the utterances attributed to the antagonist:

4a. 11 "No:thing. pu:nk."

4b. 23 "What'd you say bitch,
24 I wasn't in your [jə] backpack."

4c. 32 "Whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ] bi:tch,
33 whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ] bi:tch,'

As in Example 2, the epithets *punk* (line 11) and *bitch* (lines 23, 32, 33) explicitly call Brand One's masculinity into question. As constructed dialogue, the utterances also work within the narrative to project a view of the antagonist's masculinity as constituted in ideologies of misogyny and homophobia. There is no indication that Brand One the narrator is critical of these ideologies; indeed, he himself draws on misogynistic discourse as he describes hypothetical outcomes of the conflict (*but then I'm a pussy so then he can know he could get me*, line 45): the label *pussy* (lit., 'vagina,' metaphorically, 'coward') associates failed masculinity with femaleness. Yet Brand One the protagonist does not directly participate in either ideology. The contrasting use of address terms by Brand One the protagonist and by his antagonist consequently builds contrasting versions of masculinity for the two figures. As discussed below, these two masculinities become further racialized in the course of the narrative, a process that is carried out in large part through the use of constructed dialogue.

LAMINATION AND THE REPRODUCTION OF IDEOLOGY

Where examples 4a and 4b construct ideologies of gender explicitly, through the antagonist's use of insulting address terms, in Example 4c the use of insult terms and hence the construction of gender becomes more complex. In 4c the antagonist employs the terms while mocking Brand One's previous utterance "*Whatever, whatever,*" in lines 26–27. This prior context for the antagonist's utterance is given as Example 5:

5. 25 And I was like,
26 "Whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ],
27 whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ],"
28 because {I couldn't really fight him.
29 You know?
30 He was a lot bigger than me.} ((creaky voice))

Such mockery of another's speech is definitional of the African American speech event of *marking*; indeed, in AAVE phonology the term is homophonous with and related to Standard English *mocking* (Mitchell-Kernan 1971: 137). Marking, as an instance of Bakhtin's double-voiced discourse and Goffman's animation, simultaneously incorporates two subject positions: that of the current speaker and that of the target of the mockery. Thus the antagonist's mocking utterance

incorporates Brand One's utterance (*Whatever*), including the Standard English phonological realization of postvocalic (r) as [ɹ], and then comments on it (*bitch*). That this phonology is marked within the animation is evident from Brand One's deletion of postvocalic (r) when animating an utterance by his antagonist that is not based on his own utterance ("*What'd you say bitch, I wasn't in your* [jə] *backpack*," lines 23–24). In Goffman's (1974) terms, the antagonist's utterance is a *lamination* overlaid on the original utterance – that is, a transformation of the original utterance into a new frame or context, with a resultant change in its social meaning. Through the lamination of animated speech, speakers may borrow others' words to simultaneously project both their own and others' identities. Thus, for example, the antagonist's utterance quoted by Brand One in lines 32–33, "*Whatever* [wʌɾɛvɚ] *bi:tch, whatever* [wʌɾɛvɚ] *bi:tch*," is a lamination of Brand One's prior utterance in lines 26–27 of the narrative, *Whatever* [wʌɾɚ], *whatever* [wʌɾɛvɚ], and the quotation itself constitutes an additional lamination, insofar as it represents the antagonist's (possibly fictional) original utterance in a new, narrative context.

Moreover, as animator and narrator Brand One is able to display not only his original statement and his antagonist's orientation to it but also his orientation to his antagonist's marking of him. This orientation is displayed through Brand One's own lamination, via marking, of his antagonist while animating this and other utterances (see below). It is also apparent in the contrast between the insulting terms the antagonist uses to address Brand One in each of his turns at talk, and Brand One's own use of neutral or null terms (*man*, lines 13, 35; *dude*, line 14; ∅, lines 9, 20–21, 26–27).

This contrast is especially clear in Brand One's use of parallel structure with variation in each constructed utterance in Figure 1:

"Whatever	∅,	whatever	∅."	lines 26–27
"Whatever	bi:tch,	whatever	bi:tch."	lines 32–33

Figure 1: Parallel structure and variation of address terms in laminated constructed dialogue

The device of structural parallelism results in heightened contrast when variation is introduced. The contrasting utterances index analogous contrasts in identity: where Brand One is constructed as reasonable and nonconfrontational, the antagonist is constructed as insulting and confrontational.

Parallelism with variation appears elsewhere in the narrative as well. As with the differential use of racial and gender labels, the use of structural parallelism in constructed dialogue implicitly differentiates or associates various narrative figures by highlighting differences or similarities in their speech. Tannen (1989)

has shown that repetition and structural parallelism may have a poetic function or may serve as devices for involvement and agreement. As the present data show, they may also be resources for displaying difference and conflict.

An example of the use of structural parallelism to differentiate narrative figures is found in the contrasting grammatical systems in the utterances in Figure 2:

"What	are	you	doing?"	line 9
"What	∅	you	gonna do . . .?"	line 18

Figure 2: Parallel structure and grammatical variation in constructed dialogue with differentiative function

Both utterances are constructed dialogue; the first, from line 9, is attributed to Brand One, and the second, from line 18, is attributed to his antagonist. The parallelism of the two questions highlights the structural difference between Brand One's use of colloquial Standard English and the antagonist's use of AAVE. The auxiliary is absent in the antagonist's question, while in Brand One's question it is present (although the vowel is reduced, in keeping with colloquial Standard English phonology). Just as the parallelism of the utterances in Figure 1 draws attention to the presence or absence of insulting address terms in each, so does the syntactic parallelism in Figure 2 emphasize the points of contrast between the two utterances, here a contrast of grammatical systems. And as with the utterances in Figure 1, those in Figure 2, because they are quotations, are laminated within Brand One's narration. There is no way of knowing whether Brand One or his antagonist did or did not use the grammatical systems assigned to them; the only available version of both utterances is mediated by Brand One's narrative and thus is shaped by his narrative strategies. Regardless of the historical accuracy of this representation, however, the contrasting use of the two systems in narration – that is, the use of crossing when quoting the antagonist – again discursively implies an analogous contrast in the identities of the figures of Brand One the protagonist and of his antagonist. Together with the lexical choices in each utterance, these dialectally contrasting syntactic structures now construct Brand One as nonconfrontational, reasonable, and *white*, and his antagonist as confrontational, threatening, and *black*.

The prosodic characteristics of the two utterances underscore this contrast: as narrator and protagonist Brand One uses speech of higher frequency, with a greater range of pitch variation, and at a faster average rate than his speech as animator of his antagonist. Brand One's restriction of his intonational range when animating his antagonist may not reflect actual intonational patterns of male African Americans and European Americans: John Rickford (1977) reports that African American men exhibit greater intonational variation than their European American counterparts. Possibly the stereotyped association of wide

pitch range with gay men (Gaudio 1994) or the stereotypical link between flattened pitch and masculinity (McConnell-Ginet 1983) influenced Brand One's prosodic choices in constructed dialogue. In any case, the use of prosodic features is typical of marking, 'a style of quotation which is characterized by the reception of the quoted individual's remarks accompanied by a mimicry of the paralinguistic features' (Mitchell-Kernan 1971: 70). Lexical, syntactic, and prosodic forms thus work together to produce a narrative contrast between Brand One and his antagonist.

But the same devices can have the opposite effect, by underscoring similarities between two narrative figures. In Brand One's narrative, such an associative link is forged between the two central African American figures: the antagonist and Brand One's rescuer, Steven (Figure 3):

". . . you	little	punk ass	white	bitch . . ."	line 18
"You		punk	mother-fucking	bitch . . ."	line 80

Figure 3: Parallel structure in constructed dialogue with associative function

Although Brand One never labels Steven African American, it is clear that he is from several narrative and ethnographic details:

1. he is on the school's basketball team, which is almost entirely black;
2. he uses the term *nigger* as a positive in-group term (line 81), which normatively indexes an African American speaker (Spears 1998);
3. he uses lexical and prosodic forms that are characteristic of AAVE and that have already been narratively connected to the black antagonist.

(I also knew Steven's racial background independently of the narrative, from my ethnographic research at the school, although Brand One was not aware of this fact.) The utterance from line 18 is attributed to Brand One's antagonist and is addressed to Brand One, while the utterance from line 80 is attributed to his rescuer, Steven, and is addressed to his antagonist. Although there are clear differences between these two constructed utterances – the epithets *punk ass* and *white* in line 18 are replaced with *punk* and *motherfucking* in line 80, the epithet *little* in line 18 has no analogue in line 80 – these minor differences of form are less significant than the parallels of structure and lexicon that unite them across several minutes and over sixty transcribed lines of discourse.

Again, prosody as well as lexicon and syntax contributes to this effect: both utterances are slower, lower-pitched, and more restricted in pitch range than Brand One's utterances as narrator and protagonist. For this reason, both are best understood as examples of crossing into AAVE but not of CRAAVE. Brand One is not making claims to AAVE as his 'own' variety in animating these

utterances. On the contrary, he projects AAVE and speakers of AAVE in contrast to his own speech and identity. These examples of language crossing do not merely index blackness; they also index a threatening stance, as shown by the fact that the non-threatening utterances of Steven and his companion Kevin (*Naw he's walking away*, line 73; *Why*, line 75) do not show the same prosodic shift. As a consequence, Steven and the unnamed antagonist are linguistically linked to a broader cultural ideology of black masculinity as physically powerful and dangerous. By turns fearful and grateful in his orientation to this ideological construct, Brand One, as narrator and protagonist, consistently reinforces and reproduces a monolithic image of male African Americans. (As noted above, lines 36–38 of Brand One's narrative show awareness that not all male African Americans measure up to this image, but this awareness does not in itself challenge the ideology.) At the same time, Brand One uses the linguistic resources of black masculinity to reorganize his own identity within the narrative.

CROSSING AND THE REORGANIZATION OF IDENTITY

Thus far, the discussion has analyzed how Brand One's narrative reproduces an ideology of black masculinity from which he separates himself as protagonist. But Brand One's identity is more complex than this analysis alone would suggest. Unlike most other European American teenagers at Bay City High, he projects an urban youth identity that aligns him culturally with African American youth. His use of CRAAVE in his ordinary speech is part of this self-presentation. He achieves a black-influenced speech style through frequent use of several phonological forms that are characteristic of AAVE: monophthongal (ay), glottalized word-final (d), and vocalized or deleted postvocalic liquids. He also uses many lexical forms associated with African American youth slang and occasionally employs nonstandard grammatical structures.

Many of these features are put to strategic, rhetorical use in the narrative, especially those that are particularly marked as African American. The features are not evenly distributed but form a cluster toward the end, when Brand One's rescuers appear. The deployment of CRAAVE at this stage of the narrative effects a reorganization of Brand One's discursively created identity.

Brand One begins his shift toward a black-influenced identity in his description of his African American rescuer, Steven:

6. 55 Steven's on the basketball team,
   56 on varsity,
   57 he's like six {three:}, ((creaky voice))
   58 big ass (.) fool (('big guy')),
   59 hella ((intensifier)) sca:ry,

The modifier *big ass* in line 58 echoes the use of a parallel form, *punk ass* (line 18) by Brand One's antagonist, applied to Brand One himself. The compounding

form *-ass* is an intensifier in African American slang (Spears 1998). In using this form (but no other lexical items used by his antagonist), Brand One indexes his affiliation not only with African American youth culture but also with a particular individual, Steven, within that culture: he narratively counters the construction of himself as a 'little punk ass white bitch' with the 'big ass fool' who acts as his ally. (Here *fool* is a generic term like *guy* or *dude*, with no negative connotations.)

A similar indexical process occurs at the phonological level when Brand One the protagonist addresses Steven and Kevin:

7. 71 {"Is there like a dude [du:ʔ] back there [ðɛə] mugging me or still looking at me"} ((slower rate, lower pitch)) you know?

In this constructed utterance Brand One produces a much denser cluster of CRAAVE features than at any prior moment in the narrative. He employs both a glottalized final (d) (*du:*ʔ), a feature which is apparently unique to AAVE (Bailey and Thomas 1998: 89), and a vocalized postvocalic (r) [ðɛə], an AAVE stereotype. Until this point, five of his six productions of *dude(s)* have contained a full alveolar stop [d] in final position, and all tokens of postvocalic (r) have been produced with constriction (except when quoting the antagonist in line 24). Additionally, in this constructed utterance Brand One draws on the prosodic features that he has developed elsewhere to index an African American speaker: his speech is slower, lower-pitched, and reduced in pitch range.

It is clear that this shift, which again may or may not be historically accurate, is deliberate (though not necessarily conscious), for Brand One does not represent himself as using CRAAVE to his antagonist, and his use of these features as narrator is also minimal. Once again, Brand One indexes his affiliation with African American youth culture and with these particular African American youths by using linguistic features narratively and culturally associated with AAVE and African Americans.

This sudden introduction of CRAAVE is not restricted to Brand One's role as protagonist. Within his narration, too, features of CRAAVE appear – strikingly, immediately after Steven refers to Brand One as *my nigger* in constructed dialogue. This pivotal moment is shown in Example 8:

8. 80 {"You punk motherfucking bitch,
   81 going in my nigger's backpack,
   82 I'm gonna get you,"} ((slower rate, lower pitch))

The referring term *nigger* refutes the antagonist's characterization of Brand One as a *little punk ass white bitch* by temporarily reassigning Brand One's racial and cultural identity from white to black. Whereas African Americans may use *nigger* without racial implicature, Brand One's inclusion of the term in this racialized narrative strongly suggests that the racial dimension is operative for

him. Brand One contributes to the reorganization of his identity by continuing to use CRAAVE as narrator following Steven's constructed dialogue:

9. 85 So whenever [wənɛvə] I see that dude [du:?] now I just look at him like,
   86 you know,
   87 {"That's} ((whispered)) {right."} ((creaky voice))
   88 You know?
   89 So I'm not I'm not scared [skɛəd] of that dude [du:d] anymore or [ə] nothing so.

In these lines, unconstricted postvocalic (r) (lines 85, 89) co-occurs with glottalized word-final (d) (line 85); in line 89 negative concord is used (*I'm not scared . . . or nothing*). Together, these features of CRAAVE work to extend the rhetorical effect of the preceding discourse, constructing Brand One as now aligned with rather than in opposition to black masculinity.

Through language crossing as protagonist and narrator, Brand One asserts his urban youth identity. In so doing he narratively reorganizes his gender identity from his antagonist's formulation of it to a more positive – and less white – formulation. Narrative choices, including language crossing, allow Brand One to borrow an honorary black status and its accompanying ideological form of masculinity as developed earlier in his narrative.

CONCLUSION

These data reflect at least three interacting ideologies: of gender, of race, and of language. The operative gender ideology links successful masculinity to physical power and especially violence. The operative racial ideology links power and violence primarily to blackness as opposed to whiteness. And the operative language ideology links AAVE both to blackness and to masculinity. The narrative concerns gender as well as race through the construction of a specifically white masculinity that is placed in opposition to an ideology of a unified black masculinity. The narrative is not merely racialized but racist insofar as it projects essential qualities onto racialized groups and evaluates the degree to which group members measure up to these projections.

This study's findings are in some ways reminiscent of Nigel Edley and Margaret Wetherell's (1997) work on gender identity among teenage boys of subordinate status at a U.K. school. Edley and Wetherell found that the boys created their identities in opposition to the physical masculinity of the rugby players who dominated the school; the authors make the important point that masculinity is not unitary but multiple. But the picture is complicated by race and class in the U.S. situation described here. Whereas the British boys almost entirely reject the superiority of the dominant masculine style, overtly acknowledging black masculinity as superior allows European American boys like Brand One to disclaim their own structural advantages as members of privileged racial, class, and gender categories. Other researchers on crossing (Hewitt 1986; Rampton 1995, this issue) have found that, in some contexts, certain uses of

the 'other's' language can build cross-racial affiliations that may usher in a 'new ethnic' identity category (Hall [1989] 1996). Brand One's use of CRAAVE in this narrative, however, does not suggest the formation of such an identity; the double-voiced discursive effects of animation and lamination either separate him from African Americans or appropriate African American language and culture without challenging racial ideologies. As Lanita Jacobs-Huey (1996) has shown, because of the longstanding white tradition of black cultural expropriation in the United States, cross-racial cultural affiliation does not necessarily produce meaningful cross-racial alliances. Nor does the use of CRAAVE in the present data break down racial boundaries. Instead, it tends to keep the social order intact by preserving ideologies of race, gender, and language.

NOTES

1. My thanks to Allan Bell and Ben Rampton for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. All remaining weaknesses are my own responsibility. 'You da man' is an expression of approval that was appropriated from African American Vernacular English to colloquial Standard English via the media in the mid-1990s. Many other African American English expressions have taken a similar route of cultural transmission, such as 'You go, girl' and 'Don't go there' (Lee 1998).
2. The term *race* rather than *ethnicity* is used in this article because race was far more important than ethnicity in organizing the social world of the high school where the study was based. This analysis rejects the distinction between race as a biological construct and ethnicity as a cultural construct: both are social constructions that do different but overlapping work. Throughout the article, the 'ethnic' terms *African American* and *European American* are used interchangeably with their 'color' counterparts *black* and *white* to designate the two racialized poles that emerge in the data; no theoretical distinction is implied by the selection of one term over the other.

REFERENCES

Bailey, Guy and Erik Thomas. 1998. Some aspects of African-American vernacular English phonology. In Salikoko S. Mufwene, John R. Rickford, Guy Bailey and John Baugh (eds.) *African-American English*. London: Routledge. 85–109.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cameron, Deborah. 1997. Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In Sally Johnson and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof (eds.) *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 47–64.

Connell, Robert W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Davis, Angela. 1983. *Women, Race and Class*. New York: Vintage.

Edley, Nigel and Margaret Wetherell. 1997. Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse and Society* 8: 203–217.

Gaudio, Rudolf P. 1994. Sounding gay: Pitch properties in the speech of gay and straight men. *American Speech* 69: 30–57.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Hall, Stuart. [1989] 1996. New ethnicities. In David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds.) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge. 441–449.

Hatala, Eileen. 1976. Environmental effects on white students in black schools. Unpublished Master's essay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Linguistics.

Hewitt, Roger. 1986. *White Talk Black Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Jane H. 1998. Language, race, and white public space. *American Anthropologist* 100: 680–689.

Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. 1996. Is there an authentic African American speech community?: Carla revisited. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Anthropology.

Kiesling, Scott Fabius. 1998. Men's identities and sociolinguistic variation: The case of fraternity men. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2: 69–99.

Lee, Margaret. 1998. Out of the hood and into the news: Borrowed black verbal expressions in a mainstream newspaper. Paper presented at the 27th annual meeting of the New Ways of Analyzing Variation conference, University of Georgia, Athens.

Major, Clarence (ed.). 1994. *Juba to Jive: A Dictionary of African-American Slang*. New York: Penguin.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 1983. Intonation in a man's world. In Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley (eds.) *Language, Gender and Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newbury House. 69–88.

McElhinny, Bonnie. 1995. Challenging hegemonic masculinities: Female and male police officers handling domestic violence. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (eds.) *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge. 217–244.

Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia. 1971. *Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community*. Berkeley: Language Behavior Research Laboratory.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1999. No woman no cry: Claiming African American women's place. In Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang and Laurel A. Sutton (eds.) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press. 27–45.

O'Connor, Patricia E. 1997. 'You gotta be a man or a girl': Constructed dialogue and reflexivity in the discourse of violence. *Pragmatics* 7: 575–599.

Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rickford, John R. 1977. The question of prior creolization in Black English. In Albert Valdman (ed.) *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 190–221.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shuman, Amy. 1986. *Storytelling Rights: The Uses of Oral and Written Texts by Urban Adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smitherman, Geneva. 1994. *Black Talk: Words and Phrases from the Hood to the Amen Corner*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Spears, Arthur K. 1998. African-American language use: Ideology and so-called obscenity. In Salikoko S. Mufwene, John R. Rickford, Guy Bailey and John Baugh (eds.) *African-American English*. London: Routledge. 226–250.

Sweetland, Julie. 1998. Beyond crossing: AAVE in informal interaction between white

and black friends. Paper presented at the 27th annual meeting of the New Ways of Analyzing Variation conference, University of Georgia, Athens.
Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX: Full text of Brand One's narrative

Transcription conventions

All names in the transcript are pseudonyms. The transcript does not indicate phonological forms via spelling except in cases of grammaticalization (e.g. *gonna, kinda*). Details of pronunciation that are important to the analysis are transcribed phonetically.

.	end of intonation unit; falling intonation
,	end of intonation unit; fall-rise intonation
?	end of intonation unit; rising intonation
-	*self-interruption; break in the word, sound abruptly cut off*
:	length
underline	emphatic stress or increased amplitude
(.)	pause of 0.5 seconds or less
(n.n)	pause of greater than 0.5 seconds, measured by a stopwatch
h	exhalation (e.g. laughter, sigh); each token marks one pulse
( )	uncertain transcription
(( ))	nonvocal noise or transcriber comment; glosses of slang terms and idiomatic expressions appear in single quotes
{ }	stretch of talk over which a transcriber comment applies
[ ]	phonetic transcription

Brand One's narrative

1 . . . two months ago this dude [du:d],
2 um (1.5)
3 ((tongue click))
4 I was walking up to uh (.) to (.) the bus stop
5 and he- and he was in my backpack right?
6 This this black dude [du:d] was like six (.) maybe like fi:ve ten he was big,
7 he was a lot bigger than me,
8 he was in my backpack and I felt him and I turned around and I was looking at him and I was like,
9 "What are you doing?"
10 And he was like,
11 {"No:thing, pu:nk (('homosexual, coward'))."} ((slow rate, low pitch))
12 And I was like ((tongue click))
13 "Ma:n,

get out of my backpack du:de [du::d]."
And then he walked up beside me right?
And there was like a wall {right there kinda you know?} ((high pitch))
And then (I pushed him up against it) and he's like,
{"What you gonna do you little punk ass whi:te bi:tch."} ((slower rate, lower pitch))
and I was like,
"Just get out of my backpack.
Don't trip (('Don't get upset')).
And he was like,
{"What'd you say bitch,
I wasn't in your [jə] backpack."} ((slower rate, lower pitch))
And I was like,
"Whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ],
whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ],"
because {I couldn't really fight him.
You know?
He was a lot bigger than me.} ((creaky voice))
And he was like,
{"Whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ] bi:tch,
whatever [wʌɾɛvɚ] bi:tch."} ((slower rate, lower pitch))
and I was like,
"Man, just get out of my backpack."
Na- I went back like five feet where there was some dudes [du:?s] I knew?
Like all black guys right?
But he wasn't really intimidated of them because they weren't hard (('physically intimidating')) right
{It was like} ((whispered)) "So let me think"
I was thinking
"Am I ju- should I just walk up,
get whupped (('whipped')).
you know,
which (.)
"or should I (.) go back to school,"
but then I'm a pussy (('coward')) so then he can know he could get me.
You know what I mean?
Like furthermore.
But but um
{I know} ((stretching)) this dude [du:d] Steven Niles and this dude [du:d] Kevin Norton who are hella ((intensifier)) (.) gangsters right?
So luckily they came- they were walking up
and they were like (.) I guess where those doors are,
and he was like (.) right where that door is,
and I was sitting over there and he was sitting there and I saw [m̩] ((them or him))
and I watched [m̩] ((them or him)) and I was like (.) gave Steven a pound ((a ritual greeting gesture)),
Steven's on the basketball team,
on varsity,

57 he's like six {three:}, ((creaky voice))
58 big ass (.) fool (('big guy')),
59 hella sca:ry,
60 and then Kevin's just
61 he's like five ten but people- he's just- he's just- people are intimidated of him because of who he knows,
62 you know?
63 I came out,
64 I give them a pound,
65 I'm all y- [æ]-
66 and I was looking this way,
67 at them,
68 talking to them,
69 and the guy's back there,
70 and I was like,
71 {"Is there like a dude [du:ʔ] back there [ðɛə] mugging me or still looking at me"} ((slower rate, lower pitch)) you know?
72 And they were like,
73 "Naw he's walking away."
74 They're all,
75 "Why."
76 I was like,
77 "Because he tried to break (('rob')) me,
78 he tried to go in my backpack."
79 And then Steven's like,
80 {"You punk motherfucking bitch,
81 going in my nigger's backpack,
82 I'm gonna get you,"} ((slower rate, lower pitch))
83 you know?
84 So
85 So whenever [wənɛvə] I see that dude [du:ʔ] now I just look at him like,
86 you know,
87 {"That's} ((whispered)) {right."} ((creaky voice))
88 You know?
89 So I'm not I'm not scared [skɛəd] of that dude [du:d] anymore or [ə] nothing so.

Address correspondence to:

Mary Bucholtz
Department of English
Texas A&M University
College Station
Texas 77843-4227
U.S.A
bucholtz@tamu.edu