A study of language varieties in once upon a time in America from the perspective of sociolinguistics

Caixia Wu

School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing Guangdong Province, P. R. China.
Email: comfly@163.com

ABSTRACT

This study adopts a sociolinguistic theoretical perspective, focusing on the phenomenon of language variation in the classic film Once Upon a Time in America. It delves deeply into the core role of language in shaping characters' social identities, transmitting cultural heritage, and constructing power relations. By systematically analyzing the dialogues and linguistic patterns of key characters in the film, the study emphasizes the multifaceted functions of regional dialects, sociolects, and ethnolinguistic features in advancing the narrative and characterizing individuals. It reveals how different language varieties precisely convey characters' social class differences, cultural belonging, and interpersonal interaction dynamics. Through meticulous interpretation of representative scenes and dialogue excerpts from the film, the study finds that language serves not only as a communicative tool among characters but also as a clear reflection of the complex social hierarchy and profound cultural conflicts in early 20th-century America, becoming an important medium for showcasing the historical context. The research findings further enrich academic discussions on the interactive relationships among language, society, and cinema, providing a deep and broad analytical perspective for interpreting the sociolinguistic implications of language variation in filmic representation, and offering certain reference value for subsequent research in related fields.

Keywords: Language varieties, Once Upon a Time in America, Power dynamics social identity, Sociolects, Sociolinguistics.

Highlights of this paper

- This paper provides a multidimensional analysis of language diversity in Once Upon a Time in America, revealing its pivotal role in shaping character identities and advancing narrative development.
- By adopting a sociolinguistic theoretical framework, the study explores how language reflects and constructs social identity, cultural heritage, and power relations, offering a profound understanding of the film's social context.
- Through language analysis, the paper illuminates the complex social stratification and cultural conflicts of early 20th-century America, enriching the film's socio-historical connotations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sociolinguistics investigates the interplay between language and society, analyzing how linguistic practices both reflect and construct social identities, power relations, and cultural frameworks. As a narrative medium, film offers a compelling site for examining these dynamics through its use of dialogue, accents, and linguistic registers, which collectively shape character portrayal and thematic resonance. Leone (1984) exemplifies the cinematic potential of language as a storytelling device. Set in the Jewish ghettos of Prohibition-era New York City, the film traces the decades-spanning lives of Jewish gangsters, employing linguistic variation to articulate their shifting identities, struggles with assimilation, and the intricate social hierarchies within their milieu. The dialogue, a mosaic of English, Yiddish, and Italian, mirrors the multilingual realities of the characters' world and the cultural hybridity of early 20th-century America.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, *Once Upon a Time in America* provides a rich case study for exploring the nexus of language, identity, and power within a historically and culturally specific context. This study analyzes the film's linguistic diversity—including regional dialects, sociolects, and ethnolinguistic markers—to assess their sociolinguistic significance and their role in advancing the narrative's thematic complexity. By applying sociolinguistic theory to cinematic discourse, the research contributes to an underexplored interdisciplinary field, offering a novel methodological framework for film studies. Leone's oeuvre, characterized by its acute engagement with social stratification and cultural tension, is particularly suited to such an analysis, as his films often foreground the linguistic manifestations of class, ethnicity, and power.

This study has dual objectives: first, to demonstrate how the strategic deployment of multiple language codes illuminates the psychological dimensions of the characters, revealing their internal conflicts and social positioning; and second, to advocate for sociolinguistics as a vital analytical tool in film scholarship, thereby expanding interpretive possibilities and enriching existing methodologies. By interrogating the linguistic textures of *Once Upon a Time in America*, the research underscores the film's capacity to embody the sociocultural contradictions of its era, while positioning sociolinguistic analysis as indispensable to understanding the symbolic economy of cinema.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Sociolinguistic Approaches to Once Upon a Time in America: A Review of Existing Scholarship

The analysis of language in film has emerged as a vital subfield within sociolinguistics, offering insights into how cinematic texts reflect and negotiate complex social and cultural realities. This review synthesizes prior research on Leone (1984) focusing on its linguistic diversity and sociocultural themes, to establish a foundation for the current study's sociolinguistic framework.

Traditional film scholarship has predominantly prioritized narrative structure, thematic coherence, and aesthetic formalism, often analyzing works through five interrelated lenses: (1) historical and social

contextualization, evaluating the tension between realism and fiction; (2) protagonist-centered interpretations of central themes; (3) psychological and behavioral profiling of characters; (4) biographical connections between the director's intent and the film's authenticity; and (5) the film's dialogue with the political or cultural milieu of its production era (Bordwell & Thompson, 2010; Smith, 2015). These approaches underscore the inseparability of content and form in cinematic storytelling, likening their relationship to that of a foundation and structure: neither can exist meaningfully without the other (Eisenstein, 1949). Applied to *Once Upon a Time in America*, such frameworks have yielded rich analyses of its narrative depth, character development, and thematic exploration of identity, power, and the American Dream, as well as its nonlinear portrayal of time and memory (Bondanella, 2009; Frayling, 2000). Notable works, including *The Cinematic Language of Sergio Leone* (Frayling, 2000) and *Nostalgia and Violence in Once Upon a Time in America* (Katz, 2012) exemplify this tradition.

However, this study diverges by adopting a sociolinguistic lens, shifting focus from narrative and aesthetic dimensions to the film's linguistic varieties—such as dialects, registers, and code-switching—as tools for revealing social, cultural, and psychological dynamics. While prior research has acknowledged the film's multilingualism (e.g., its interweaving of English, Yiddish, and Italian), few have systematically analyzed how these linguistic choices construct character identities, reflect ethnic hierarchies, or mirror the cultural tensions of early 20th-century America (Coulmas, 1997; Lippi-Green, 2012). By foregrounding language as a site of sociocultural negotiation, this study seeks to bridge gaps in interdisciplinary film-language scholarship, demonstrating how sociolinguistic theory can deepen interpretations of cinematic texts as both products and producers of social reality.

2.2. Language Varieties in Film: Theoretical Foundations and Scholarly Debates

Language, as a dynamic social phenomenon, manifests in diverse varieties shaped by contextual and identity-driven factors. Micro-sociolinguistics distinguishes two primary categories: *dialects*, which arise from geographical, socioeconomic, or ethnolinguistic divisions (Labov, 1972; Trudgill, 1983) and *registers*, which denote situational adaptations of language to field (Subject matter), tenor (Interpersonal relations), and mode (Communication channel) (Halliday, 1973; Montgomery, 1986). While dialects reflect stable group identities, registers capture the fluidity of language in response to shifting contexts, such as formal versus informal settings or professional versus casual discourse (Biber & Conrad, 2009).

Scholarly debates persist regarding the scope of registers. Narrow interpretations, advanced by Trudgill (1983) and Spolsky (1998) associate registers with specialized jargon (e.g., legal or medical terminology), emphasizing occupational and social group-specific usage. Conversely, generalized views, supported by Leech (1966), Bolinger and Scars (1981) and Hudson (1996) argue that registers encompass broader contextual factors, including formality levels and communicative roles. Halliday's tripartite model (Field, tenor, mode) remains influential, though critics like Verschueren (1999) caution against over-formalization, advocating instead for a fluid understanding of language variation as inherently tied to power relations and cultural norms (Fairclough, 1995).

In film studies, language varieties have been analyzed through both structural and critical lenses. Early work, such as Crystal and Davy (1969) focused on linguistic features distinguishing genres or directors' styles, while later scholarship (Lippi-Green, 2012) examined how accents and dialects reinforce stereotypes or subvert them. However, few studies have applied register theory to cinematic dialogue, particularly in multilingual contexts like *Once Upon a Time in America*, where characters navigate shifting linguistic codes to assert identity, negotiate power, or express alienation (Coulmas, 1997; Pennycook, 2010). This gap underscores the potential of sociolinguistics to enrich film analysis by treating language not merely as a narrative device but as a lived practice embedded in social structures.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Sociolinguistics and Language Variation: An Overview

Sociolinguistics examines the intricate relationship between language and society, focusing on how linguistic practices both shape and are shaped by social structures, identities, and interactions. Central to this discipline is the study of language variation, which explores how linguistic features—spanning phonology (pronunciation), syntax (grammar), and lexicon (vocabulary)—vary systematically across social groups, contexts, and individuals. These variations are not arbitrary but are deeply tied to social markers such as ethnicity, gender, age, socioeconomic status, and geographic origin. For instance, regional dialects may signal a speaker's geographic roots, while sociolects reflect their social class or educational background (Labov, 1972; Trudgill, 1983). Even within a single language community, choices between variants (e.g., "He don't know nothing" vs. "He doesn't know anything" in American English) can reveal speakers' identities, intentions, or awareness of social norms (Lippi-Green, 2012). In languages like Japanese, intricate honorific systems further illustrate how linguistic forms encode social relationships between speakers and hearers (Cook, 1999).

This framework posits that language is not a monolithic entity but a dynamic system of varieties, each emerging from the interplay of social forces and contextual demands. By analyzing these varieties, sociolinguists uncover how language functions as a tool for constructing identity, negotiating power, and maintaining social cohesion—or division.

3.2. Defining Language Varieties: A Neutral and Inclusive Approach

The term language variety serves as a foundational concept in sociolinguistics, offering a neutral, abstract lens to describe linguistic diversity without the hierarchical or culturally loaded connotations of terms like "dialect," "language," or "slang." Following Hudson (2000) definition, a variety refers to a set of linguistic forms sharing the same social distribution—that is, used by a specific community of speakers in particular contexts. Variants, in turn, are the individual linguistic units (eg., phonemes, morphemes, lexical items) that constitute these varieties.

This terminology enables researchers to avoid value judgments and focus on empirical patterns of language use. For example, rather than debating whether African American Vernacular English (AAVE) is a "dialect" or a "language," sociolinguists analyze its structural features, social functions, and historical development as a variety shaped by racial identity and social history (Rickford, 1999). Similarly, the concept of variety accommodates overlapping categories, such as regional dialects (tied to geography), sociolects (tied to class or ethnicity), and registers (tied to context), all of which may coexist in a speaker's repertoire.

3.3. Classifying Language Varieties: Dimensions of Social and Contextual Differentiation

Language varieties arise from two primary axes of differentiation: social identity (who is speaking) and context of use (where and why they are speaking). These axes intersect to produce distinct categories, each with unique features and functions.

3.3.1. Standard Language: Normativity and Power

The standard language is a codified, institutionally sanctioned variety associated with formal education, governance, and media. It emerges through processes of standardization, often reflecting the linguistic practices of dominant social groups (e.g., Received Pronunciation in British English or Modern Standard Arabic). While serving as a unifying national or cultural symbol, the standard language also perpetuates linguistic hierarchies by

marginalizing non-standard varieties (Bourdieu, 1991). Its study reveals how linguistic norms are tied to ideologies of prestige, authority, and social inclusion/exclusion.

3.3.2. Dialects: Geographic, Social, and Temporal Dimensions

Dialects are varieties distinguished by systematic linguistic features tied to geographic regions, social groups, or historical periods. Three subtypes are particularly salient:

- Regional dialects (e.g., Southern American English, Cockney) arise from geographic isolation or migration patterns, often reinforced by natural barriers (e.g., mountains, rivers) in pre-modern societies. Though modern technology has reduced geographic linguistic isolation, regional dialects persist as markers of local identity (Chambers & Trudgill, (1998).
- Social dialects (or sociolects, e.g., AAVE, working-class British English) reflect speakers' social class, ethnicity, or peer-group affiliations. These varieties often carry stigmatized or prestigious connotations, shaping access to social opportunities (Labov, 2006).
- Temporal dialects (or chronolects) capture linguistic changes across generations, such as shifts in vocabulary or pronunciation among youth subcultures (e.g., Millennial slang vs. Gen Z internet language).

3.3.3. Registers: Context-Driven Variation

Registers are varieties adapted to specific communicative contexts, varying in formality, tone, and lexical choice. Halliday (1978) register theory identifies three key dimensions:

- Field: The subject matter or activity (e.g., legal discourse vs. casual conversation).
- Tenor: The social relationship between participants (e.g., formal vs. intimate tone).
- Mode: The channel of communication (e.g., spoken vs. written language).

Registers reflect social hierarchies and power dynamics; for instance, the ability to use formal registers (e.g., academic jargon) is often linked to education and professional status. Code-switching—the alternation between registers or languages—further illustrates speakers' linguistic dexterity in navigating multiple social worlds (Gumperz, 1982).

3.4. Synthesizing the Framework: Varieties as Social Practice

This framework treats language varieties not as static categories but as dynamic practices embedded in social life. By analyzing how speakers deploy varieties across identities and contexts, sociolinguists reveal the mechanisms through which language reinforces or challenges social structures. This approach is particularly relevant to studying film, where characters' linguistic choices—whether dialect, register, or code-switching—can signal identity, negotiate power, or critique societal norms. The current study applies this framework to *Once Upon a Time in America*, examining how its linguistic diversity reflects the film's exploration of ethnicity, class, and memory in early 20th-century America.

4. ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE VARIETIES IN *ONCE UPON A TIME IN AMERICA*

Delving into the linguistic diversity showcased in *Once Upon a Time in America* offers a distinctive perspective for scrutinizing the film's depiction of societal interactions and cultural identities. Through a meticulous examination of the linguistic expressions employed by its characters, this analysis unveils the pivotal role language plays as an indicator of social stratification and cultural affiliation. The subsequent section will further explore the

intricate connection between social class and linguistic variations, emphasizing how linguistic patterns not only mirror but also perpetuate the hierarchical frameworks embedded within the storyline.

4.1. Social Class and Language Varieties

The interplay between language and social class is a crucial element in the film's narrative. To fully understand this relationship, we must examine how language varieties are specifically employed to reflect the social standing of the various characters.

4.1.1. Analysis of How Language Reflects the Social Class of Characters

The dialogue in *Once Upon a Time in America* is a rich tapestry woven with threads of different linguistic styles, each reflecting the characters' social class, ethnic background, and personal history.

Noodles (David Aaronson), Max, Patsy, Cockeye, and Dominic represent the archetypal street gang, growing up in the Jewish ghetto of the Lower East Side. Their language is heavily influenced by Yiddish, Italian, and other immigrant languages, forming a distinct patois of the streets. This language serves multiple functions: it's a badge of identity, a means of excluding outsiders, and a tool for navigating their world of petty crime and survival.

The dialogue is saturated with informal expressions, idioms, and slang terms that reflect their streetwise upbringing and immersion in a world of petty crime. Consider the use of words like "stoolie" (Informant), "schmuck" (fool), "yutz" (A foolish or ineffectual person), "shikker" (Drunkard), and frequent, colorful curses. These terms not only denote specific concepts but also signal membership in a particular social group and worldview. The intermingling of Yiddish words into their English conversations acts as a cultural marker, reinforcing their heritage while simultaneously adapting to their American context. This code-switching demonstrates the gang's unique hybrid identity, rooted in their immigrant past but forged in the crucible of the American urban experience.

The characters frequently deviate from standard English grammar, a linguistic feature characteristic of working-class speech during that period. Sentences like "I don't know nothing about nobody no more" are not simply errors but deliberate stylistic choices that emphasize their lack of formal education and their distance from mainstream American norms. These grammatical variations also contribute to the authenticity of their characters, grounding them in the reality of their social conditions. They highlight the linguistic struggles of assimilation and the development of unique dialects within immigrant communities.

The gang's language tends to be direct, pragmatic, and focused on immediate concerns and concrete actions. They prioritize efficiency and clarity over politeness or nuance. This is reflected in their frequent use of the imperative voice ("Stay here," "Lock the door," "Get ready!") and their preference for simple, declarative sentences. In essence, their language is functional, designed for communication within their close-knit group and for navigating the challenges of their environment. The directness also reflects their often-adversarial relationship with the wider world, where they must be assertive and quick-witted to survive.

The frequent use of profanity and vulgar language is another significant marker of their social class and the harsh realities of their lives. Swearing functions as a way to express frustration, anger, and defiance against authority figures and the societal constraints they face. It also serves as a bonding mechanism within the group, creating a sense of solidarity through shared transgression of social norms. The vulgarity, particularly in relation to women, reflects the prevailing attitudes towards sexuality within their community and the limited opportunities available to women in their social milieu.

Deborah, Noodles's love interest, occupies a more complex position within the film's social hierarchy. While she shares a similar ethnic background and upbringing with the gang, she aspires to a different life, one that

transcends the limitations of her social origins. This ambition is reflected in her more refined speech patterns and her conscious effort to distance herself from the language of the streets. Deborah generally speaks in more grammatically correct sentences and possesses a wider vocabulary range compared to Noodles and his friends. This indicates her engagement with formal education and her exposure to more mainstream cultural influences. Her conscious effort to speak "properly" signifies her desire to be taken seriously and to be perceived as someone capable of achieving success beyond the confines of the ghetto.

Her elocution lessons are a crucial symbol of her aspirations to become an actress. These lessons represent a deliberate attempt to acquire the linguistic skills necessary to navigate higher social circles and to project a polished, sophisticated image. The very act of taking these lessons demonstrates her understanding of language as a tool for social mobility and her willingness to invest time and effort in improving her linguistic capital.

Deborah's references to poetry, literature (Such as the "Song of Songs"), and classical art set her apart from the more rough-spoken characters. Her ability to quote from literary works demonstrates her intellectual curiosity and her engagement with a world beyond the immediate concerns of the streets. These references serve as a cultural marker, signaling her membership in a more educated and refined social class. The contrast between her poetic language and Noodles's more pragmatic speech highlights the growing divide between them and the challenges they face in bridging their differing social worlds.

In moments of emotional intensity, Deborah often reverts to a more formal and controlled style of speech. This contrasts sharply with the more unrestrained expressions of emotion exhibited by Noodles and his gang. This linguistic difference underscores Deborah's attempt to maintain a sense of decorum and to project an image of self-control, even in challenging situations.

Frankie Monaldi, the gangster from Detroit, represents a different form of social power, one rooted in organized crime and violence. His language reflects his position within this hierarchy, characterized by bluntness, authority, and a calculated use of intimidation. Monaldi's language is direct, blunt, and often laced with threats, leaving no room for ambiguity or misinterpretation. He uses language as a tool for asserting his dominance and ensuring compliance from those around him. Sentences like "You'll put up, and you'll shut up" exemplify his authoritarian style and his willingness to use intimidation to achieve his goals.

Monaldi skillfully mixes standard English with slang and underworld jargon. This code-switching reflects his ability to navigate different social contexts and to project different personas as needed. When speaking to Noodles and his gang, he employs slang to establish rapport and signal shared experiences, but when dealing with those outside his criminal circle, he adopts a more formal style to maintain an air of respectability. Monaldi talks openly and explicitly about illegal deals, violence, and the economics of crime, demonstrating his comfort and familiarity with these topics. His matter-of-fact tone normalizes these activities and reinforces his image as a ruthless pragmatist who is willing to do whatever it takes to achieve his objectives. The detailed descriptions of his criminal enterprises also serve to intimidate those around him, reminding them of the potential consequences of crossing him.

Secretary Bailey represents the highest echelon of social power, one rooted in wealth, political influence, and social connections. His language reflects his position, characterized by formality, ambiguity, and a calculated use of rhetoric. Bailey's vocabulary is highly refined, and his grammar is impeccable, reflecting his formal education and his membership in the upper echelons of society. He employs language as a tool for constructing a respectable public image and for maintaining a distance from the messy realities of the criminal underworld. The formality of his speech also serves to intimidate those who lack his linguistic skills, reinforcing his social superiority. When questioned about allegations of corruption and criminal activity, Bailey employs carefully constructed language that

is designed to deflect blame, minimize his involvement, and maintain an air of innocence. He uses vague phrases, avoids making direct statements, and relies on complex legalistic arguments to obfuscate the truth. This evasive style reflects his understanding of language as a tool for deception and manipulation. In his public statements about the union and the working class, Bailey adopts ideological language, appealing to patriotic sentiments and portraying himself as a defender of American values. He uses phrases like "American labor movement" and "clean hands" to position himself as a champion of the common good, even as he engages in corrupt and exploitative practices. This ideological rhetoric serves to legitimize his actions and to deflect criticism from those who challenge his authority. By carefully examining these different linguistic styles, it becomes clear that language is not simply a neutral tool for communication but a powerful marker of social class and identity in *Once Upon a Time in America*. The film uses linguistic differences to illuminate the characters' backgrounds, social standing, and aspirations, and to underscore the complex social dynamics that shape their lives. These linguistic choices enrich the narrative, adding depth and realism to the film's portrayal of early 20th-century America.

4.1.2. Examples of Vocabulary, Grammar, and Pronunciation Differences

Vocabulary in *Once Upon a Time in America*, acts as a powerful signal of a character's affiliations, aspirations, and position within the social hierarchy. The film meticulously crafts each character's lexicon to reflect their unique experiences and social circumstances. The gang's vocabulary is a direct representation of their shared ethnic heritage and their immersion in the criminal underworld. Their natural and frequent use of Yiddish words provides a clear link to their Jewish immigrant background. The word "schmuck," for instance, is not merely a synonym for "fool"; it carries a distinctly Yiddish sensibility, reflecting a specific cultural outlook and a shared set of values. Similarly, a term of endearment such as "bubeleh" conveys a sense of familial warmth and closeness that is deeply rooted in their cultural heritage. Beyond their ethnic heritage, their use of slang and underworld jargon serves as a key marker of their identity as street-smart criminals. Terms like "stoolie," denoting someone who betrays the group to the authorities, are more than just labels; they represent a culture of suspicion and a constant awareness of the dangers lurking in their world. The phrases "divvy up," representing the distribution of ill-gotten gains, underscores the gang's focus on financial reward and the transactional nature of their relationships. These words create a sense of exclusivity, reinforcing the boundaries between those "in the know" and those on the outside. It serves as an immediate identifier of allegiance. The use of nicknames such as "Cockeye" and "Fartface" is central to the portrayal of their close bonds. These familiar terms of address express a sense of intimacy, affection (however rough), and shared experience that exists within the gang. This intimate speech is something set apart from outsiders.

In contrast to the language of the streets, Deborah's vocabulary reflects her desire for social mobility and her commitment to intellectual and artistic pursuits. Deborah demonstrates a grasp of formal, standard English words, signifying her education and her ambition to assimilate into a more refined social world. The conscious choice to use correct grammar and avoid slang sets her apart from the gang. She frequently interweaves her conversations with references to art and literature, reflecting her intellectual curiosity and her engagement with a world beyond the immediate concerns of the streets. Quotations from the "Song of Songs," for example, signal her appreciation for beauty and her longing for a more meaningful existence. Her active participation in elocution lessons showcases a deliberate attempt to acquire the linguistic skills necessary for social advancement. She is keenly aware that language is a means of shaping perceptions and projecting a desired image, which is crucial to her acting career.

Frankie Monaldi's vocabulary is carefully crafted to reflect his authority within the criminal underworld and his ability to command and control those around him. His language is characterized by its directness, power, and

unwavering certainty. Monaldi uses declarative sentences and imperative commands to convey his wishes without any ambiguity or room for discussion. This authoritative tone signals his position at the top of the criminal hierarchy. Monaldi readily incorporates jargon and vocabulary specific to the criminal world. He can speak fluently about the mechanics of smuggling, the intricacies of money laundering, and the brutal realities of violence, demonstrating his deep knowledge of the criminal enterprise and his comfort with its darkest aspects. This vocabulary not only serves as a tool for communication within the underworld but also as a means of intimidating those who are unfamiliar with its workings. Monaldi's ability to code-switch—to effortlessly transition between formal and informal vocabulary—highlights his mastery of social interaction. He can seamlessly adapt his language to suit different audiences, code switching shows his range. Secretary Bailey, representing the upper echelons of society, wields language as a tool for maintaining power, obfuscating the truth, and manipulating public perception. He strategically uses words and phrases common to politics and law to create a smokescreen of legitimacy around his actions. This allows him to deflect scrutiny and portray himself as a respectable member of the establishment. Phrases such as "transport union pension funds" and "allegations" add an aura of complexity and authority to his statements, making it difficult for others to challenge him.

When confronted with difficult questions or accusations, Bailey demonstrates a remarkable ability to use indirect language, ambiguity, and carefully chosen words to avoid providing clear answers or admitting wrongdoing. This evasiveness is a deliberate tactic designed to protect himself from legal consequences and maintain a veneer of respectability. Bailey skillfully uses emotionally charged words and phrases, drawing on concepts such as patriotism, American values, and the common good. The carefully crafted words manipulated the other characters to agree with his schemes.

The characters' grammatical structures serve as further indicators of their backgrounds, their access to education, and their conformity to or rejection of societal norms. The use of non-standard grammatical constructions is a prominent feature of the gang's speech, reflecting their limited access to formal education and their defiance of societal expectations. The frequent use of double negatives, as in "I don't know nothing about nobody no more," is not simply an error but a well-established pattern of speech within certain working-class dialects. Similarly, the use of non-standard verb conjugations, such as "You was" instead of "You were," is a characteristic feature of their vernacular, signaling their membership in a particular social group. The omission of certain grammatical elements, such as linking verbs, further contributes to the informal, direct, and often fragmented nature of their speech.

In contrast to the gang, Deborah and Bailey generally employ standard English grammar, reflecting their higher levels of education and their desire to conform to societal norms. Their sentences are typically grammatically correct, reflecting a strong understanding of English syntax and a commitment to using language with precision. Even in informal settings, they tend to maintain a level of grammatical correctness and formality that underscores their social standing and distinguishes them from the more rough-spoken characters.

While it is challenging to analyze pronunciation directly from a written script, the dialogue in *Once Upon a Time in America* provides subtle clues about the accents and speech patterns of the characters, which further enhance their social differentiation. Although not explicitly represented in the script, it is likely that the characters would have spoken with accents reflecting their ethnic backgrounds (Jewish, Italian) and their regional origins (New York City). These accents would have further contributed to their distinct social identities and marked their place within the diverse tapestry of early 20th-century America. Stress and intonation patterns, though not directly visible on the page, would likely have varied across characters, reflecting their emotional states and their social roles. The frequent use of colloquialisms (Informal words or phrases) and contractions in the gang's speech would have

contributed to a more casual, conversational tone, while the more formal characters would have likely avoided such linguistic shortcuts.

In summary, *Once Upon a Time in America* masterfully deploys linguistic variation as a critical tool for character development and social commentary. The careful selection of vocabulary, the strategic use of grammatical structures, and the implied nuances of pronunciation all contribute to a rich and multi-layered portrayal of the complex social landscape of early 20th-century America. These linguistic differences are not merely superficial but rather serve to illuminate the deeper cultural, economic, and social divides that shape the characters' lives and destinies.

4.2. Ethnic Identity and Language

Ethnic identity is a pivotal theme in *Once Upon a Time in America*, which depicts a society shaped by immigration, where distinct ethnic groups strive to assert their place within the complex social and cultural fabric of early 20th-century America. Language serves as a powerful medium through which these groups express their cultural identities, preserve their heritage, and navigate the challenges of assimilation and acculturation. The film offers a nuanced exploration of how language functions as a critical component in the construction and expression of ethnic identity, particularly for its Jewish and Italian-American characters. It illustrates how language preserves cultural traditions, navigates the tensions of assimilation, and reinforces group solidarity. By examining how these characters utilize language, we gain insight into their complex identities.

Firstly, for the Jewish-American characters, especially Noodles and his childhood friends, Yiddish functions as a vital linguistic link to their ancestral roots and cultural heritage. The frequent integration of Yiddish words and phrases into their English speech is a defining feature. Terms like "schmuck," "yutz," "mazel," and "bubeleh" carry specific meanings and evoke the richness of Yiddish culture. This code-switching is a deliberate choice that reinforces their identity as Jewish-Americans while negotiating their new American reality. Yiddish expressions often convey values and concepts specific to Jewish culture, subtly reinforcing their sense of belonging to a historical community with a distinct moral and ethical framework. The shared use of Yiddish vocabulary, particularly among the gang members, fosters a strong sense of camaraderie and in-group identity. The language serves as a secret code, distinguishing them from outsiders and reinforcing their loyalty to one another. Thus, language is used to maintain both individuality and kinship.

Secondly, while the film provides a written script, the implied accents and speech patterns of the Jewish-American characters likely reflect specific dialectal features, further reinforcing their ethnic identity. The interplay of languages emphasizes their unique cultural identities.

Thirdly, the Italian-American characters, particularly those associated with organized crime, likely incorporate elements of Italian and regional dialects into their speech. The inclusion of Italian words and phrases, often related to family, food, or strong emotions, conveys a sense of cultural pride and a connection to their homeland. Their ability to navigate their dual cultural identity is reflected in their language. For the Italian-American characters, language is closely tied to their deep-seated values of family, loyalty, and honor. For instance their use of Italian phrases to express familial bonds or terms showing respect underscores the importance of family in their culture. In dialogues, their emphasis on honor reflects their social norms and understanding of loyalty, principles clearly conveyed in their speech. Similarly, when speaking English, the Jewish-American characters often retain linguistic traits that demonstrate their cultural influences.

In conclusion, *Once Upon a Time in America* illustrates the central role of language in constructing and expressing ethnic identity by examining how the Jewish and Italian-American characters utilize language.

Language becomes a vehicle for preserving cultural traditions, navigating the tensions of assimilation, and reinforcing group solidarity. The film's characters use language to express complex identities and advance their goals, demonstrating the unique cultural landscape of America.

4.3. Language and Power Dynamics

Once Upon a Time in America masterfully uses language to go beyond mere communication, instead showcasing the complex power dynamics that shape the characters' relationships and their societal standing. This part will closely examine how language is used to assert dominance, express submission, and negotiate power imbalances. This exploration highlights how language is a central element in the construction of social hierarchies and the interplay of control and vulnerability within the film's narrative.

4.3.1. Analysis of How Language is Used to Assert Dominance or Submission in Interactions

Once Upon a Time in America masterfully employs language to reveal the intricate power dynamics that govern the interactions between its characters. In fact, the film expertly demonstrates how language—encompassing vocabulary, syntax, tone, and conversational strategies—becomes a crucial tool for asserting dominance, expressing submission, and navigating the often-unequal power dynamics at play.

First and foremost, the assertion of dominance is consistently achieved through linguistic strategies that project control, directness, and the deliberate use of intimidation. For example, the character Frankie Monaldi, with his prominent role in organized crime, frequently wields a language of command and threat, often using these tools to control a conversation. Consequently, his sentences are deliberately short, forceful, and delivered with a tone of unwavering certainty. Phrases such as, "You'll put up, and you'll shut up" are highly effective because they show authority and leave little space for challenge or negotiation, thus conveying a sense of absolute control, silencing any potential opposition. Moreover, Monaldi often assumes control over the flow of a conversation; indeed, he may interrupt others, abruptly change the subject, or issue direct orders to maintain his dominance. This often includes a raised or loud tone to maintain his dominance, and the purposeful use of profanity, insults, and derogatory terms further solidifies his power, demeaning others to create an atmosphere of fear and intimidation. Of course, it's important to note that non-verbal aspects of communication also play a vital role; for instance, a harsh tone of voice, or a glare, can enhance the feeling of power and control.

Conversely, the expression of submission, however, is characterized by linguistic choices that convey deference, indirectness, and a willingness to cede conversational control. The characters occupying a lower social status often adopt a linguistic approach that displays respect, deference, and a reluctance to challenge those in positions of power. For instance, when Noodles interacts with a character such as Monaldi or even the authorities, his language becomes more hesitant, and his tone becomes markedly more cautious, as he chooses his words more carefully to minimize the risk of offense. Subsequently, these submissive characters may employ polite language, avoid direct disagreement, and attempt to appease those in positions of power, often adopting a submissive posture, both verbally and nonverbally, such as avoiding eye contact or speaking with a lowered voice.

Furthermore, the film also skillfully demonstrates how language can be used to negotiate power imbalances, often through a process of give-and-take. In other words, the use of language in the film is often dynamic, changing depending on the setting and the character's audience. Therefore, a character might choose to be more assertive with one person and deferential with another. Thus, the act of alternating between language styles—code-switching—is a crucial tool for negotiating power, since a character might choose to speak with more authority

when dealing with a subordinate or competitor. Ultimately, the film does not portray a static power dynamic; instead, the language often changes to adjust to the setting and situation.

In conclusion, *Once Upon a Time in America* uses language in a nuanced and powerful way to expose the multifaceted nature of power dynamics. Through the careful selection of vocabulary, the strategic use of grammatical structures, tone, and conversational tactics, the film illustrates how language serves as a potent tool to assert dominance, express submission, and negotiate the intricate social relationships, thereby offering a nuanced view of how power shapes human interaction.

4.3.2. Examples of Power Struggles Reflected Through Dialogue

Once Upon a Time in America, as a matter of fact, elevates dialogue far beyond mere communication; instead, it uses it as a revealing lens through which the ceaseless negotiation of power unfolds, with characters striving to assert their dominance, defend against it, and navigate the treacherous complexities of their relationships. Consequently, the film presents numerous compelling examples of these power dynamics, often vividly illustrated through specific excerpts from the script.

First, Frankie Monaldi's character, with his dominant role in organized crime, epitomizes the assertion and maintenance of power, which is accomplished primarily through a carefully calibrated use of language. The effect, therefore, is the control of a conversation, built on a foundation of directness, threats, and strategic manipulation. For example, the initial confrontation between Monaldi and Noodles upon the latter's return offers a stark illustration of this dominating style. Indeed, the direct interrogation, beginning with "Where is he? Where is he hiding?" and the repetition of the demand, "I'm gonna ask you for the last time. Where is he?" establishes a forceful tone. Specifically, the abruptness, devoid of any polite preamble, immediately places Noodles in a subordinate role. The brutal assessment, "Who you protecting, you dumb asshole?" is designed to be a direct insult, and Monaldi further establishes a power dynamic. The orders that follow – "Stay here in case that rat shows up" and "You stay here with this barrel of shit" – are explicit commands, the absence of any justification or explanation reinforcing Monaldi's authority and Noodles's obligation to comply. Thus, the repetition of Noodles' name, coupled with the dehumanizing reference to the "barrel of shit," further solidifies the power imbalance, demonstrating the absolute control over the situation and the individuals involved.

Conversely, Noodles, as the protagonist, traverses a complex power landscape, shifting between positions of dominance and submission, depending on the context. Although his ability to control a situation is often limited, he asserts himself in moments. Hence, even within a context of subservience, Noodles occasionally asserts a degree of control; consider his statement, "I brought back the key to your clock," which, while ostensibly completing a task, is a claim of agency. This indicates his past importance. The subtle attempt is to suggest that he is still somewhat useful. By contrast, Noodles often adopts a cautious and deferential linguistic style to avoid provoking those in positions of power, therefore, his responses are often measured and his tone more cautious. In the same way, his submissive posture and choice of responses reveal an awareness of his own vulnerability, which shows his desire to avoid drawing further attention to himself. Finally, it is worth noting his attempt to control the flow of the conversation, indicating the power dynamics at play.

Furthermore, Secretary Bailey, while not a man of overt violence, exercises his power through linguistic manipulation and strategic ambiguity. As a result, his use of language becomes a core element of his power. His refusal to give direct answers, for instance, demonstrates how his strategic reticence controls the flow of the conversation and forces Noodles to question the nature of his own involvement. And the employment of rhetorical questions allow him to shape the conversation. He deflects the accusations by creating uncertainty and doubt.

136

Further still, Bailey's power resides in the implications of his words, rather than the overt statements. For instance, the discussion of the contract and the suitcase avoids naming names, which gives him power through his suggestions.

In conclusion, *Once Upon a Time in America* employs these and numerous other linguistic techniques to expose the subtle and often brutal power struggles that shape the characters' relationships. To that end, the specific examples of dialogue demonstrate the varying roles of characters, highlighting the constant negotiation of dominance and submission that defines their lives. Thus, the film effectively illustrates that language is not just for communication, but in itself, a tool of power, which ultimately reveals the intricate power dynamics shaping the human experience.

5. CONCLUSION

The nuanced and multifaceted use of language in *Once Upon a Time in America* is not only central to its artistic achievement but also provides profound insights into American society. The film's narrative is intricately woven with diverse linguistic elements, ensuring that language is not merely a tool for communication but an intrinsic component that defines characters, advances the plot, and reflects the social realities of early 20th-century America.

First and foremost, the film masterfully employs varied language to construct characters with depth and complexity. The use of Yiddish and associated dialects by Jewish-American characters, such as Noodles and his gang, immediately roots them in their ethnic heritage, highlighting their upbringing in the Lower East Side and their shared immigrant experience. In contrast, characters like Deborah, who aspire to higher social standing, utilize a more refined and standard form of English, immediately signaling their differing social backgrounds and aspirations. Language variations further reveal facets of personalities; for instance, Frankie Monaldi's language underscores his ruthlessness, while Bailey's language reflects the importance of knowledge. The film also uses language to highlight intricate relationships, such as the intimate banter among Noodles' gang members and the linguistic disconnect between Noodles and Deborah, which emphasizes the social landscape and their struggles to understand each other.

As far as the Plot Advancement and Dramatic Tension are concerned, language in *Once Upon a Time in America* serves as a dynamic force that drives the plot forward and generates dramatic tension. Dialogue is crucial in conveying critical information, such as Monaldi's threats and criminal operations, which heighten the tension between characters. Disagreements and differing speaking habits create suspenseful scenes, ensuring that language is not just a backdrop but an active participant in the narrative progression. This strategic use of language keeps the audience engaged and enhances the film's dramatic impact.

Beyond individual character levels, the film's varied use of language provides a window into the social realities of early 20th-century America. By emphasizing the babel of immigrant voices, the film portrays the era's cultural diversity. The contrasting language styles among social classes, as well as its use as a tool for empowerment or marginalization, highlight societal inequalities. This sociolinguistic tapestry reflects the complex interplay between individual agency and broader societal forces, offering a nuanced portrayal of the era.

This study has its theoretical and practical implications. The sociolinguistic study confirms the central role of language in constructing cinematic narratives and reflecting social realities. By examining the characters' dialogue, grammar, and vocabulary, the study demonstrates how language serves as a powerful tool for signaling social class, expressing ethnic identity, and negotiating power dynamics. The analysis of dialects, registers, and code-switching patterns reveals that language is far more than a mere means of communication; it is a crucial marker of social identity, cultural heritage, and the intricate relationship between individual agency and societal forces.

While this study provides in-depth insights, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. Focusing on a single film restricts the generalizability of the findings, and reliance on a written script limits the analysis of pronunciation and non-verbal cues, which are vital components of linguistic communication. Furthermore, while the sociolinguistic framework offers rich theoretical insights, it is just one lens through which to view this complex film.

Future research could address these limitations by expanding the scope to include comparative analyses of language varieties in multiple films, examining the role of non-verbal communication in conjunction with verbal language, and integrating additional theoretical perspectives such as critical discourse analysis or cultural studies. A more detailed analysis of the film's reception among diverse audiences would further enrich our understanding of its sociolinguistic impact. Additionally, exploring the representation of language in contemporary films and television series could provide valuable insights into the evolving relationship between language, identity, and society in the 21st century.

In conclusion, *Once Upon a Time in America* strategically uses language to define characters, advance the plot, and generate dramatic tension, offering a profound commentary on the social realities of its time. The film's nuanced use of language serves as a powerful tool for expressing ethnic identity, negotiating power dynamics, and reflecting the complex interplay between individual and societal forces, making it a rich subject for further sociolinguistic exploration and future research endeavors.

REFERENCES

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bolinger, D., & Scars, D. A. (1981). *Aspect of language.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Bondanella, P. (2009). *A history of Italian cinema.* New York: Continuum.

Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2010). *Film art: An introduction* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.).* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chambers, J. K., & Trudgill, P. ((1998). *Dialectology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, H. M. (1999). Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the masu and plain forms. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(1), 81–113.

Coulmas, F. (1997). *The handbook of sociolinguistics.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1969). *Investigating English style.* London, UK: Longman.

Eisenstein, S. M. (1949). *Film form: Essays in film theory (J. Leyda, Ed. & Trans.).* New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London, UK: Longman.

Frayling, C. (2000). *The cinematic language of Sergio Leone.* London, UK: Faber & Faber.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language.* London: Edward Arnoid Ltd.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning.* London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, R. A. (2000). *Sociolinguistics.* Beijing, China: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Katz, E. (2012). *Nostalgia and violence in Once Upon a Time in America.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (2006). *The social stratification of English in New York City* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1966). *English in advertising.* London: Longmans.

Leone, S. (1984). *Once upon a time in America.* Italy/USA: Warner Bros.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Montgomery, M. (1986). *An introduction to language and society.* London, UK: Methuen.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice.* London, UK: Routledge.

Rickford, J. R. (1999). *African American Vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Smith, M. (2015). *Engaging characters: Fiction, emotion, and the cinema.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: OUP.

Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society.* London: Penguin.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics.* London, UK: Edward Arnold Ltd.