INTRODUCTION

SETTING THE STAGE

1979. Nuevo Laredo, a small Mexican city on the Mexican side of the Mexico–U.S. border. Ramón Pérez, a nineteen-year-old bilingual Zapotec Indian from Oaxaca, is waiting to cross into Texas. Before making his way hundreds of miles north to the border, Pérez had been a *guerrillero* in a peasant rebellion in the southern Mexican state of Oaxaca. He and his fellow *compañeros* had been fighting to defend their communal lands against encroachment by multinational agribusiness companies in the 1970s. Their leader, Florencio Medrano-Mederos, *el güero*, is assassinated in 1979. Pérez and his compañeros are arrested, tortured, and released from prison. Pérez cannot return to San Pablo de Macuiltianguis, his indigenous village, because his actions as a guerrillero have compromised its safety. His actions have made the village vulnerable to government attack. Desperate to leave Mexico, he contacts Dick Reavis, a white, bilingual, Anglo-American journalist and editor he had met earlier in the 1970s when *Texas Monthly* sent Reavis to cover the Zapotec rebellion. Pérez had been Reavis's guide through the treacherous mountains of Oaxaca. They became friends. By 1979, Reavis lives in Houston.

Waiting to cross, Pérez, with $100 in his billfold and $550 sewn into the lining of his jean jacket, misjudges. Thinking that no one will steal his clothes, he takes off his jacket, falls asleep, and is robbed. Later, he attempts the precarious crossing, but his group is caught by *la migra* (the U.S. border patrol). They interrogate everyone, confine them in cells for a day, and then return them to the Mexican side. Reavis has been a shadow presence thus far,[1] but now decides to become more involved in Pérez's journey. He crosses *la frontera*. He locates and pays a *patero* (literally a "duck-man") to ferry Pérez clandestinely across the north bank of the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo. He tells him where he will wait on the U.S. side. After a perilous river crossing, Pérez meets Reavis in a little-known spot near Laredo, Texas. They drive through this road until they arrive in Houston. Here, Pérez begins the life of an undocumented worker in the United States. His journey will take him to other areas of the Latinx Southwest over the next seven years. In 1986, aware of the impending passage of the most comprehensive immigration reform bill in several decades that might provide him legal status, Pérez ironically decides to return to Mexico.

When Pérez returns to Mexico after his seven-year sojourn in the United States, Reavis suggests he write his memoir. To encourage a novice writer, he offers to pay Pérez a dollar per page.[2] Pérez writes a draft manuscript that he calls "Diario de un mojado," and Reavis translates it to English, calling it *Diary of a Wetback*. Pérez "crosses" the border in several ways. First, he chooses to cross the river. Second, he "is crossed" by Reavis, in the sense that he could not have done it without Reavis's help; the latter travels to the border to direct his crossing. Then, a third way, Reavis translates his story. Few source texts and translations provide as tight a nexus between the author and the translator: the translator literally crosses his subject across national borders and discursively when he translates his subject's work. The translator orchestrates the author's actual crossing and several years later transfers him, metaphorically, between two sovereign countries.

Years after, Pérez in Mexico and Dick in the United States, conduct a transnational epistolary relationship, sending the manuscript back and forth, editing and improving it. Their task completed, Reavis, unable to convince Mexican houses to publish the Spanish original,[3] takes his draft-translation to Houston's Arte Público press that rewrites the title of the memoir and publishes it as *Diary of an Undocumented Immigrant* (1991), probably because a Latinx press would deem "wetback" an ethnic slur, which would be off-putting to its Latinx audience. Twelve years later, Pérez's manuscript is published by Arte Público using the original title, *Diario de un mojado* (2003).[4] Pérez's title (and book) runs a full circuit of translation: from Pérez's *mojado* to Reavis's "wetback" (Spanish to English), then to the press's rewriting of "wetback"

to "undocumented immigrant" (English to English), and finally a full return from "undocumented immigrant" to its original mojado in Spanish (English to Spanish).

Pérez told me this story, the same story he narrated in *Diario*/*Diary*, when I visited him in Jalapa, Vera Cruz in 2011, where he has made his home. His story provides a context situation for this book. His story is a metaphor of inextricable connections between migration and translation, translator and translation, Spanish and English languages, and source and translated texts. These thematic pairs are the major sets of parameters that guide the text-centered analyses around three imaginative narratives and their translations classified under the wide and porous net of U.S. Latinx literature. The literary narratives are the Chicano novel *Pocho* ([1959] 1970, 1984) by José Antonio Villarreal and the mainland Puerto Rican memoir *When I Was Puerto Rican* (1993) by Esmeralda Santiago, and, of course, the Mexican-Latinx *Diario de un mojado* (2003). The corresponding translations are *Pocho en Español* (1994) by the Chicano Roberto Cantú, *Cuando era puertorriqueña* (1993) by the author, Santiago, herself, and *Diary of an Undocumented Immigrant*.[5] The first two textual pairs, *Pocho*/*Pocho en español* and *When I was Puerto Rican*/*Cuando era* are from English to Spanish; the third, *Diario* and *Diary* is from Spanish to English. However, the latter follows the same pattern of the first two texts (from English to Spanish) in that the publication of the translation precedes that of the original. These texts offer examples of both Spanish-to-English and English-to-Spanish translations because it is important to recognize a bidirectional movement in the translation of Latinx literature. The translation of Latinx narratives had been primarily a one-way street (Spanish to English), but in the 1990s, the translation of Latinx narratives became a two-way street (English to Spanish).

The central questions of this book are the following: What does it mean for the New York multinational mainstream presses to translate English-language Latinx texts to Spanish within the same nation-state? What happens to the bidirectional, multilingual features of Latinx narratives when they are translated to Spanish? When mainstream presses take on the translation of Latinx narratives already in English (as Random House, HarperCollins, and other publishing houses did in the 1990s) they take on products emerging from Latinx communities that have a history of colonization, conquest, and annexation. Notably, they translate the products of acculturated populations into the language suppressed, "forgotten," in the colonization. So, what happens when these multilingual texts from historically marginalized cultures are commissioned for translation into Spanish? Likewise, does the translation to English of narratives into Spanish keep the two languages separate? Or does

some slippage of the original linguistic features manifest itself in the translation text? What happens when a narrative, written in Spanish, in a country where it is the primary language, enters a national space where Spanish is a minor language and undergoes translation to English? As translation changes the status of the texts, does the translation retain the untranslatable words and expressions and other multilingual variants explicit or submerged in the original texts? Or does it flatten these marks of difference, and linguistically make the texts captive to the cultural matrices of standard Spanish or English, depending on which direction the translation goes? Does it matter if works are translated inside the same nation-state for domestic audiences, or across national borders for "foreign" readers?

Whether coming from outside or inside the nation-space, Spanish-to-English literary translation (not English-to-Spanish) is the more commonplace occurrence when these two languages are in play. I borrow the aphorism "dog-bites-man" from journalism to denote the ordinary occurrence of Spanish-to-English translation. The "dog-bites-man" angle represents the direction we expect language transference to take in multilingual countries where English is the dominant language, such as the United States. Such translation of Latin American narratives has occurred since the nineteenth (Allen, "Will to Translate" 83; Lomas, "Thinking-Across," 13)[6] and early twentieth century by New York publishers for a domestic market. Notable examples of the late twentieth century are the 1960s and 1970s watershed translations of Latin American "boom" narratives.

Spanish-to English translations of Latinx literary texts first began in the 1970s—not by mainstream presses but by alternative Latinx presses. Tomás Rivera's *. . . y no se lo tragó la tierra* (*And the Earth Did Not Swallow Him*), the first Chicano novel translated to English, was published in a bilingual format edition in 1971, republished by Arte Público in 1987 with a new translation by Evangelina Vigil Piñón, in print to this day. Rolando Hinojosa Smith's Spanish language *Klail City y sus alrededores*, winner of Cuba's prestigious Premio Casa de las Américas in 1976, was initially published in Cuba and translated in a bilingual edition as *Generaciones y semblanzas* in 1977, translated by Rosaura Sánchez. It was republished as *Klail City* (*Klail City y sus alrededores*) by Arte Público Press in 2014.[7] Both first editions are Spanish on the left-side page and English on the right-side page. If it is true that the Western eye goes to the right-side page, making this side primary, then the publishers of these first editions must have wanted to emphasize the translated tongue, suggesting that the bilingual edition was primarily for the English-dominant reader. The later editions of Rivera's novel are sequential Spanish-English presentations; the 2014 *Klail City* edition, alternatively, is a sequential English-Spanish format.

English-to-Spanish translation is the new contrarian translation, the "man-bites-dog" angle of this book. The reversal of the aphorism denotes an unusual occurrence: English-to-Spanish translation goes contrary to expectations, given the long tradition of Spanish-to-English translation by mainstream U.S. publishers. These translations are transnational, even counternational because they overturn the linkage between the English language and the United States. When the source narratives, ironically, cross over into the English-language mainstream, they are translated to Spanish by the major commercial presses (like Random House and HarperCollins) that initiated this translation, mainly (but not exclusively) for a U.S. market. The translations are especially unexpected because authors of Latinx literature come from marginalized communities that have been pressured, historically, to adopt English as a sign of their assimilation. Such endeavors have yielded a bumper crop of reverse crossover translations from 1990 to 2010. I discuss this "new" and contrary-to-expectations phenomenon in chapter 2.

All three texts dramatize acts of migration, either by the protagonist or the protagonist's immediate family members. The migration routes imply deep changes in the writer's/protagonist's ancestral roots. One deeply important area of change is language. All three writers are "language migrants" (Besemeres 10) either because they did the migrating themselves, for example Santiago and Pérez, or because they were brought up to speak their migrating parents' language at home and then drawn into English through schooling, for example Villarreal (Yildiz calls the latter "postmigrants"; Yildiz 170). They are all bilingual and their literary language is not their mother tongue. Villarreal and Santiago are U.S. American writers from working-class backgrounds whose first language was Spanish.[8] Pérez is a Zapotec Indian Mexican whose mother tongue is Zapotec but is literate in Mexican Spanish. All three come from ethnic groups in the United States and Mexico that have been dispossessed of their mother tongue in confrontation with a dominant national language.

Acts of translation are generally thought of as acts of crossing over from one nation-state, culture, and language to a different nation-state, culture, and language; acts of migration are encounters with the "foreign," as are acts of translating literary texts because they involve the interaction of different languages and cultures. The social processes of migration and translation can result in the assimilation of "foreign" persons and texts to make them fit the cultural norms of what is designated "native" (say, English), or they can result in allowing nonnative persons and texts to maintain traces of their "foreign" selves (say, non-English). Put another way: a translator can bring the source text closer to the reader or she can bring the reader closer to the source text.

My preference is the latter. My interest is to uncover the contradictory moments in which the "foreign" elements of these writers' texts cross over into a reader's experience in both directions, from Spanish to English and English to Spanish.

I bring to the fore the tensions and contradictions posed when U.S. Latinx narratives are translated from English to Spanish and Spanish to English. I discuss both source and translation texts as interdependent coequals, as opposed to the historical hierarchical relationship between the author and original text as the prime generators of meaning, and the translator and the translation text as imitators and imitative, producing a derivative product. Especially in the Anglo-American tradition, the author is the originator of meaning, the primary mover, the creator of the original text; the translator and translation text are secondary, subordinate to the author and the original text. The author and his work are "authentic"; the translator and his work are copies. They merely transmit, supposedly, a meaning already present before their existence. Seen as such, translation is perceived as a second-rate activity. Robert Wechsler in *Performing Without a Stage*, laments that derivativeness has defined the translator's work (7). The translator, he says, is a "performer without a stage" (7). Actors are praised (or condemned) for embodying a role in a play, a dancer for interpreting a choreographer's composition, a pianist for interpreting a musical score, a singer for interpreting a songwriter's piece. Translators are not, who also interpret and perform a written composition. An actor, a dancer, a pianist, or a singer must operate in different mediums than the playwright, the choreographer, the musical composer, or the songwriter, a reality that contributes to establishing the independence of their medium; but the translator's work takes the same form of the author's—it is also writing. This is one reason why it is underappreciated, a translator translating is "nothing but ink on a page" (7). This hierarchical relationship also has masculine–feminine implications. Lori Chamberlain does an excellent critique of the masculinist tradition in theories of translation in "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation." She uncovers the metaphors of gender bias and their implications that maintain the hierarchical relationship of the author as originator (masculine) and the translator as a secondary and derivative force (feminine) in translation theory since the seventeenth century.

I read original and translation texts in tandem not to insist upon the old adage that a translation is no substitute for the original. Rather, I do it to show that a translation is only a translation in relation to a source text, or in some cases, in relation to its other translations.[9] Except in classroom settings on translation, source and target texts usually are not read together, but translation raises important issues about language difference and language trans-

ference that can only be confronted if both the original and translated texts are side by side. Consider that both translations of *Pocho* and *When I Was* had a prior text to consult, but *Diary of an Undocumented Immigrant* stood alone in the book marketplace for twelve years before *Diario* was published. This text thus went from Spanish to English in terms of translation, and then from English to Spanish in terms of publication. Chapter 5 demonstrates the prime moment of cultural and linguistic complexity enacted in this text that was delayed because there was no antecedent to the translation available until twelve years later.

STRUCTURING TERMS

The original versions of many Latinx narratives with English as a linguistic base, in the case of the first two texts, contain overtly bilingual and multilingual features. The terms bilingual and multilingual are important, and I use them throughout the book. In the twentieth century, the term "bilingual" has been linked inextricably with Spanish and English languages with mainland Puerto Ricans and in the context of U.S. immigration specifically with Mexican Americans, the two largest subgroups of the U.S. Latinx population. Historically, the term described East Coast German immigrant communities responsible for establishing the country's first bilingual schools. (Mexicans are sometimes referred to as the "new Germans"). More often, "bilingual" is thought of as limited to two languages, but some scholars of language consider "bilingual" as the broader category that subsumes "multilingual." Despite its prefix, "multilingual" is commonly used when two linguistic phenomena are in play (Clyne 301).[10] The meaning and usages of the terms overlap, but I emphasize multilingual because Spanish is not the only "other" language spoken in this country (bilinguals speaking other languages exist here and elsewhere in the world). I situate Spanish speakers within the multilingual history of the United States and a global world.

I also stress multilingualism to differentiate it from multiculturalism. The term "multilingual" more powerfully than "multicultural" puts the stress on language: if one is "multilingual," one is necessarily "multicultural," whereas the reverse is not necessarily so. Though the two are inextricably bound, cultural diversity stresses racial diversity and its relation to power, instead of language diversity which is also embedded in relations of power, given that different languages are assigned different amounts of power in specific situations. Shell, in "Babel," observes that America falters "always between its horror of race slavery and the ideal of race blindness and prefers to emphasize racial difference instead of language difference" (Shell 119). The homegrown movement of multiculturalism of the 1980s paid little attention to multilin-

gualism, and the interest in transnationalism of the 1990s on through the twenty-first century, also failed to implement a national awareness or support for linguistic diversity. In their introduction to the *Multilingual Anthology of American Literature*, Shell and Sollors call language a "blind spot" of the modern multicultural age of the 1980s, because languages are seldom factored into the multicultural equation (4). In the context of globalization, categories such as "transnational," "transethnic," "multiethnic," "multinational," and "multicultural" are abundantly attended to; but "translingual," "multilingual," or "interlingual" remain largely untapped domains. It is ironic that the interest in the "other" implied by both multiculturalism and transnationalism (albeit in different ways and for different reasons) fails to promote the interest and support for the study of languages spoken by those "others," either at levels of social practice (the everyday ability to communicate in a language) or academic scholarship (language study).

Epithets like "bilingual," "bilingual education," and "bilingual population" in the United States and elsewhere are most often attached to speakers of ethnic minority groups, frequently to those who mix two languages. This is one reason why, as Joshua Fishman asserts, bilingualism is traditionally thought of as a negative condition, "a stumbling block" to the modern image of progress, peace, and posterity (42). Seldom are the social attitudes and references to bilingualism positive. Though multilingualism is an everyday practice in the United States and elsewhere in the world, Aneta Pavlenko tells us in *Emotions and Multilingualism* that in "traditionally monolingual communities, bilinguals are often viewed with suspicion. . . in conflict with themselves, or as individuals whose shifting linguistic allegiances imply shifting political allegiances and moral commitments." (esp. 23–24). In an article titled "We have Room but for One Language Here," she states that the fiction of English monolingualism remains the symbol of Americanness in the narrative of U.S. national identity (164). Lei Wei, in "Dimensions of Bilingualism," explains that the dominant belief about bilinguals among educators and even linguists up until the 1960s, was that they were insufficiently competent in either language, presumably lacking in both ("semilingual"), or one language interfering with the ability to learn the other (19–21). Though these attitudes are still with us, he finds evidence of change in favor of bilingualism, as U.S. society perceives and recognizes that it can increase a person's employability and social mobility (Wei 18–24).

I develop three paradigms of translation for the three texts I discuss in the book: *international*, *transnational*, and *transborder* translation. International translation, the normative type of translation, occurs between different nation-states with different national languages and cultures, move from

one national language of one nation-state to a different national language of a different nation-state. Usually, they are done with monolingual readerships in mind. A German or Japanese novel translated into English in the United States or Britain is an example. I develop my next two categories against this normative type of translation. Transnational translation presumes a source text that is multilingual, involving the copresence of two or more languages. These translations are done within the same nation-state that the original text is written, published, and read; but they also move into global spaces, sometimes commissioned and published by "foreign" presses, especially when the translating language is a global language, such as Spanish or French. The translations of *Pocho* and *When I Was* are transnational translations. The translation of *Diario* is a transborder translation: it falls in-between these two kinds of translations. While the writing of the source text is fully on the Mexican side of the border, the publication, translation, and audience of both source and translated texts are in the United States.

Pocho and *When I Was* offer examples of external multilingualism, or the movement between two different languages within the same text, and internal multilingualism, varieties within English or Spanish (Walkowitz 41). They are openly bidirectional, multilingual narratives. Yet they are translated into a standardized Spanish that suppresses the terms of its dialects. For example, *Pocho en Español* contains regionalisms of northern Mexico, but it is still translated into highly literate Spanish. The translations replace instead of supplement the dimensions of external and internal multilingualism. *Diario*/*Diary*, my third pair of source translation texts, from which I take my opening anecdote, reverses this process because the translation language (English in this case) reveals the simultaneity of two different languages. More specifically, the central term (*mojado*) of the source text interrupts the monolingual flow of the core scene in the translation text. My readings of the translation texts expose the potential of multilingualism that connects the source and target-language texts.

One premise of this book is that no language is strictly speaking unilingual—all languages are mixed; they have "high" and popular registers: vernacular speech, dialects, idioms, slang, borrowed words from other languages. It is highly important to keep in mind, therefore, that English-to-Spanish and Spanish-to-English translation is not about just going from one discreet language into another discreet language (from language A to language B, so to speak) as though languages were singular flat planes, stable blocks or objects, or isolated units that do not mix or touch each other. As one scholar put it, languages are talked about as if they were apples and oranges (Sakai 73). Talking about languages this way may be unavoidable, but the downside

of such a perspective is to obscure from view the linguistic complexity and variety of any one language. What is even more at stake is the complexity and variety when two languages are involved in the translation of a literary text in two languages.

For example, if we think of translation as a substitution of one national language for another, or as a cultural technology that establishes communication between two apparently monolingual entities that, at the same time, allow the textual entities to maintain their monolingualism on either side of the translational divide (Bandia 424),[11] then *Diario*/*Diary* would be most likely refracted through monolingual frames of a Spanish "original" and an English translation. We would be reading it through a lens of translation, and *Diary* subsequently would be a monolingual conversion of *Diario*. On the other hand, if we read attentively and realize that the translator himself is capturing the author's Mexican mojado (the "wet one," because he crossed the river) and the translator's U.S. English slang "wetback" in a simultaneous presence, then we are in the realm of multilingualism (Grutman, "Multilingualism" 182). The English translation text surpasses the limits of translation and moves into multilingualism: the simultaneous presence of two languages within the same text.

In all respects, I visualize the two languages, English and Spanish, not as demarcated entities closed off from one another, but as discontinuous and shifting phenomena that lead to language contact, intersections, and mixing. Languages are social, not general abstract things; they are specific, spoken by specific communities in contact with other specific communities; they vary according to how people who speak them vary.

THE LITERARY TEXTS AND THEIR TROPES: POCHO, JÍBARO, AND MOJADO

My three narratives are inaugural texts. *Pocho* and *When I Was Puerto Rican* are "firsts," for different reasons, in their respective literary communities (i.e., the two Spanish-language origin communities, Chicanx and Puerto Rican, with the longest histories in the United States). *Pocho* was the first Chicanx novel written in English of the modern period, published in the pre-Chicanx movement years by Anchor Doubleday in 1959. It is the first, and perhaps the only one since that time, to make the pocho a foundational figure of Chicanx literature. The novel has remained viable, steadily appearing on syllabi of Chicanx literature courses, Chicanx studies, and Latinx studies since its second printing in 1970, when the world had prepared for it a fit audience—an active readership during the university campus militant years. It was then that Chicanos/as demanded to read relevant material from their specific histories.

Pocho is a multilingual text not because Villarreal offers words or phrases in Spanish immediately followed by their English counterparts (say in the typical way of one-on-one translation in bilingual texts), nor does he use intrasentential code-mixing, the alternation of Spanish and English at the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level. It is a dual language text because he chooses to appropriate the English language and varieties of vernacular Spanish to produce what Frances Aparicio called "sub-versive" narrative texts (795): texts with "undercover" meanings that reveal an author's bilingual and bicultural sensibilities by encoding references to lived realities beneath English, for example, deliberately filling Spanish syntax with English words, making their awkwardness apparent even to English readers. These are also examples of borrowing, "where the English element is [willfully] incorporated into the Spanish system" (Valdés 125). Such a bilingual technique joins two different languages, what Stavans calls "verbal promiscuity," a linguistic form "that refuses to accept anything as foreign" ("Introduction" 9, 15), showing us just how interdependent and interactive, in partnership or in conflict, the two languages and cultures are. In this sense, *Pocho* is important as a precursor to the advanced bilingual techniques, for example the variations of intrasentential code-mixing that emerged as a self-conscious literary style in the 1960s and 1970s, when the Chicano poet Alurista (1947), the dramatist Luis Valdez (1940), and the Puerto Rican poets Miguel Algarín (1941) and Miguel Pinero (1946–1988) began to write poetry in formats of vernacular Spanish and English.

In contrast to Villarreal's *Pocho*, Santiago's narrative (1993) is not a chronological first in the modern history of mainland Puerto Rican literary narratives. *Down These Mean Streets*, *Nilda* by Nicolasa Mohr, and *Family Installments* by Edward Rivera were all published years ahead of *When I Was*, in 1967, 1973, and 1982, respectively. It is the first, however, by a Puerto Rican woman—who was born on the island and came of age on the mainland—to take the identity of the island's jíbaro and twist this figure's gender and geographical location to make it central to the formation of her female literary identity: a *jíbara norteamericana*. While Piri Thomas in *Down These Mean Streets* exposed racially-charged linguistic terms (*moyeto*, *blanco*, *negro, moreno, trigueño*) commonly used by young Puerto Rican men of his time in a New York urban context to refer to African and Anglo Americans, Santiago is the first to take the marginalized figure of island rurality and transpose it to an urban Puerto Rican mainland literary narrative. Similarly, to pochos or pochas, jíbaros and jíbaras were a source of shame to middle-class, educated, island Puerto Ricans, an attitude internalized by working-class Puerto Ricans and jíbaros/as themselves, because they were judged to speak Spanish badly

("bad speech"). Such pejorative attitudes are not unknown today among those who judge bilingual English-Spanish speakers to speak Spanish "badly" because they mix Spanish with English and vice versa. The linguistic judgment often goes together with class-based, racial, ethnic, and gender stereotypes of *puertorriqueños/as* and Chicanos/as. *When I Was* offers various linguascapes of multilingualism, for example, translations of dialectal speech and transliteration.

Diario, the third text, is a "first" in that it presents a case of a Zapotec Indian and Spanish-speaking Mexican male, the author himself, who flees Mexico in the late 1970s for political reasons. He leaves behind his Zapotec Indian communal identity and his identity as a Zapotec guerrillero and becomes the Mexican mojado/"wetback." It is this marginalized identity that Pérez makes the primary trope of his book. *Diario* is the first text in the history of Spanish-to-English translation done by Latinx presses to describe the mojado experience in a sustained way through the eyes of a literate, Spanish-writing Zapotec Mexican.[12] Together with its translation text, it brings into relief a transborder nexus of translation and migration. The two acts are inseparably linked, at both literal and metaphoric levels.

These texts present three hybridized cultural figures of marginalization—Villarreal's pocho; Santiago's jíbaro or jíbara, and Pérez's mojado[13]—central to the histories of migration of Chicanos/as, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans. These ciphers carry emotionally-charged connotations given the strong histories of racialization in the respective national contexts of these groups (the United States, Puerto Rico, and Mexico). They have been used pejoratively, but the recipients of the verbal sting have turned them and given them a liberating force. They turned the stigma of difference into the prestige of distinction. Like other idiomatic terms (pocho, mojado, and jíbaro/a), they are born "untranslatable" (Yildiz 31), yet, as Barbara Cassin explains in her introduction to *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, untranslatables are "expressions . . . syntactical or grammatical turns one keeps on (not) translating" (xvii). In other words, untranslatables are paradoxes: one has no choice but to translate them even though they impede translation, no choice but to make them intelligible though impossible to capture the full extent of their meaning in the native culture. In chapters 3, 4, and 5, I tell the story of these terms: their etymologies, their histories of usage, and their respective meanings.

Briefly, the pocho or pocha is specific to Chicano-Mexican cultural histories. It incorporates ethnicity and social class, but above all it indexes linguistic behavior: it refers to someone who mixes English and Spanish or simply someone judged to speak Spanish "brokenly." As a rule, the person to whom the term is attributed (and sometimes will assume self-consciously) grows up

in the southwestern United States. The term points to an individual who is the *result of generational migration*. The term jíbaro is a Puerto Rican identification, more generally Caribbean: the "white" peasant who lived and worked in the Puerto Rican highlands as opposed to the slave population that inhabited the coastal areas. Mojado is a term of clandestine migration, for whoever crosses from Mexico into U.S. territory without legal authorization and for whom the material reality of the identity is created *at the moment of crossing* water, specifically the Rio Bravo/Rio Grande, though it also through the years has come to be used more generally to include those who cross by land or more seldom by plane. Unlike pocho and mojado, the jíbaro (mostly male) became a national icon, after World War II for a specific group of island Puerto Rican intellectuals and nationalists. Coded as connected to the Spanish colonial past, it represents the national soul, primordial, and preindustrial Puerto Rico.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter 1 introduces the "new" translation of English texts to Spanish in the context of the development of the U.S. Spanish-language market in the last two decades of the twentieth century. Initially published in the English-language mainstream, *Pocho* and *When I Was*, along with many other texts in the 1990s by Latino men and women, did a reverse crossover, by which I mean from the English-language mainstream into Spanish translation. Other narratives, including Arte Público Press's best-seller *The House on Mango Street*, had been published first in English by Latinx presses, subsequently taken up and republished by mainstream presses, and then translated to Spanish. While there can be no absolute differentiation in a global world between inside (national) and outside (foreign), I argue that the mainstream presses involved in the translation of Latinx narratives envision, primarily, a domestic consumer market for their products. I explain *who* commissioned the translations, *why*, and *for whom* and why I think this direction in translation is a contrarian one—indeed unprecedented—in the context of a country that represents itself and is represented as a monolingual nation. The reverse crossover narratives (*Pocho* and *When I Was*) and the publication of the English translation *Diary* prior to the Spanish original *Diario* fit the three paradigms of translation: international, transnational, and transborder translations. I restate briefly. International translations cross national borders and involve different national languages and cultures; they aim to address monolingual audiences. Transnational translations occur within nations with multilingual histories and traditions and, at the same time, are connected to global markets that tend to "flatten" languages into monolingual unities. Transborder translations are neither fully international nor transnational—they are published for audienc-

es inside a country other than their own national audience or country. Lastly, I offer one example of the loss of a multilingual effect from Junot Diaz's *Drown* in the translation *Negocios*.

To underscore the importance of Spanish today in the United States, made up of many variants of Spanish spoken by the different Latinx communities (Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Central American), I highlight in chapter 2 the unique features of Spanish that, since the 1980s, have given it a "new" status: for example, the depth of its historical roots; its perennial subordinate position to English; and its size, scope, and concentration. To emphasize this new status, I compare the status of Spanish during the Latin American literary boom that occurred within the nation-state model of the 1960s and 1970s, and the many-faceted Latinx boom (beyond literature) that occurred in the era of the transnationalism of the 1990s. I discuss the new communications technologies that have made Spanish a global language and the second national language of the United States. These conditions undermine its past definition as a foreign language. Market economic forces in a U.S. national space, at once connected to broader global processes, drove large New York publishing houses (and smaller publishers too, but on a lesser scale) to conduct contrary-like translation. Concurrently, U.S. ideological nativist forces continued to lobby for the ideal of a monolingual nation and the elimination of the presumed dangers posed to it by the "little" languages (other than English) of ethnolinguistic groups, the "wild little people" (Fishman 45), or linguistic minorities, who need bilingual services.

The centerpieces of the book are chapters 3, 4, and 5. In them I offer a way to read these texts that reveals the multilingual forms flattened by translation practices that prioritize rendering texts into the standard format of national languages. I think it important that we see and retain these multilingual forms. I favor an approach that makes readers aware of the translator and the translation itself. The translator makes a rhetorical turn that jars the predominant language choice and style of the rest of the text and that I interpret as a move that makes him or her visible. It is a translator's inadvertent slip that causes a disfiguration in the text, and these are precisely the moments of rupture that I look for in these texts. The translator lays her or himself bare and we recognize a mutual agency of the author and translator functions. The goal is not to arrange everything into a bicameral relationship of author-creator and translator-imitator, English and Spanish, domestic and foreign. I want to locate traces of the translator's voice in the author's voice and vice a versa, traces of the foreign in the familiar. I want to privilege moments of linguistic diversity. These disfigurations may be awkward and some readers might take them as signs of failure upon encountering them. But they are failures only if

we assume that fluency is the main value, only if we assume the translation should sound like the original, without "betraying" itself as a translation. To my mind, they are successes—productive failures—because they interrupt the impression of language as a coherent whole.

In the chapters that follow, I capture the interlocking pressures between the source and translated texts. The title of the first translation—*Pocho en Español*—epitomizes the central issue I take up in chapter 3. How is one to translate the source text when half of the translation title *en Español* signals a standardized formal Spanish? How should one translate a novel, whose central character is the pocho, into the language of the oppressive culture, because the pocho or pocha do not speak Spanish "properly" according to the ideal norms of Spanish, or, worse, mixing the two languages in forms of Spanglish, "el hablar mocho de los pochos" (chopped-up Mexican American speech) (Zentella, "Bilinguals and Borders" 15). The rhyme *mocho* and pocho in this formulaic utterance highlights the common denominator of the two terms: to be in a state of having been cut. One common colloquial usage of mocho is *te dejaron mocho* (they cut off too much hair) when commenting on someone's haircut for example. Likewise, *pocho/a* imply a state of being cut off from the center of gravity: the Mexican nation, its culture and language, implying a tinge of betrayal. The title signals a ready-made trap. Translator Cantú attributes to the character of the pocho a grammatically correct Spanish that he/she never spoke in the first place. Gone is the literal translation Villarreal uses in the novel's narration and dialogue to enact linguistic mixing, and no counterpart or analogous language appears in its stead. While Villarreal wrote *Pocho* in minimalist English prose—simple, straight-forward, unadorned—Cantú adopts a standard variety of prestige Spanish—excess, abundance, efflorescence. My reading exposes the contradiction of taking the pocho out of the pocho and finds a disfigurement in the text that goes against the elevated language that pervades the translation.

My reading of Santiago's source-translation pair—the focus of chapter 4—grapples with the question of how Santiago had to remember, to *unforget* the *forgetting*, the language she inherited at birth (Spanish). The process was not smooth or easy. It required her to create multilayered voices in her "English I" and "Spanish I," at levels of plot and rhetorical strategies. In the original, she uses external multilingualism (a movement between English and Spanish) to translate local idioms to her monolingual mainland audiences; in the English and Spanish texts, she employs internal multilingualism (varieties within one language) to produce transliterative effects to stress the idea that she is heard differently by different audiences. But the most intriguing tension occurs in *Cuando era* between standard Spanish and Spanglish, or what she calls *es-*

panglés in her introduction to this text where she admits that she mistook the standard Spanish expected of her by the Spanish publishing world—the press, her editors, and some in her audience—for Spanglish. She confesses, "el idioma que ahora hablo, el cual *yo pensaba que era el español*, es realmente el espanglés" (The language I speak now, the *one I thought was* Spanish, is really Spanglish [my emphasis, xvi]). In the translation, her jíbara self, the dialect she spoke and heard on the island in her childhood before the migration, and the code-switching she used as a teenager on the New York mainland after the migration, surface, become visible. In other words, the translation text brings to the foreground the forms of multilingualism erased in the source text. Translation becomes a site of potentiality, and not just a derivative copy of the original. Ironically, the translation becomes an agent of creativity complementing the source text that preceded it. This turnaround resists the usual hierarchy that attributes the creative power to the original and the derivative quality to the translation.

The source and target language texts of chapter 5, *Diario*/*Diary*, offer a different scenario of interdependent tensions between original and translation texts. For one thing, unlike the first two texts that enjoy a solid geographical place, published and translated within the same nation-state, *Diario* exists in a space-in-between two nation-states. Its cultural and literary roots are not located permanently in a single territorial or national space, though they lie more on one side than the other. Then, too, the pair is different in that *Diary* (1991), the translation, premiered in the United States twelve years before the Spanish original *Diario* was published in the United States in 2003. If readership rather than time of publication decides which text is the "original," the translation is the original because it was read before the source text. This upset the conventional "order of things," though differently than the previous text-pairing, the usual hierarchy that gives the original prime status over the translated text, usually published subsequently. What is most significant, however, about the relationship of this third pair of texts is that they reconfigure a transborder-transnational discursive field that is rooted in a nexus of migration and translation. Pérez "washes" his bilingual identity when his translator takes the responsibility of literally translocating him across the waters of the Rio Grande. Pérez is a translated man. Reavis reinterprets Pérez's mojado identity, one that comes from a long line of migrating men from his Zapotec community ("Somos un pueblo de mojados" [we are a village of wetbacks]), turning him into the Anglo, racialized "wetback." But the target text creates its own multilingual textual space, no longer translation or the substitution of one national language for another, but multilingualism or the contiguity of two terms in a simultaneous presence.

This book joins three areas of scholarly research that came together with the English-Spanish and Spanish-English translation of narratives by Latinas and Latinos during an almost twenty-year span (1990–2010) in the United States. This is the first study to put the three fields of inquiry—language and literary studies, Latinx studies, and translation studies—into conversation. Languages are the medium of literary expression, the raw material of literary studies and studies on translation, yet language systems often are passed over in silence and separated from the teaching and learning of literature in literary studies. Similarly, English and Spanish language systems receive thin and scattered attention in Latinx studies.[14] Likewise, the convergence of English and Spanish in Latinx contexts is seldom an object of serious inquiry in studies on translation. Scholars of Latinx studies fail to establish contact with those in translation studies and vice versa. Linking these disciplines is important to understanding the role language plays in promoting equality and dialogue between different language communities of people who live and have lived in the United States and the global world.

When commercial mainstream presses initiated the translation of a substantial number of Latinx narratives in English (with overtly bidirectional, multilingual features) to Spanish, they redirected and widened the long-standing, one-way street of Spanish-to-English translation into a bidirectional translational activity. This bidirectional activity underscores the need to fill the perceived vacuum in literary, Latinx, and translation studies. Latinx studies and translation studies have common developments and interests—each is a mainstream university subject; each is an interdisciplinary and independent discipline; each has expanded and diversified its methods and approaches since their institutional origins. While translation studies emerged unto the world stage in the 1970s, Latinx studies did so a bit later; and both came into their own in the 1990s. The subject of code shifting or language alternation (methods, functions, meaning) is well known in Latinx studies; contrastively, bilingualism and multilingualism in non-Latinx language contact situations has been an important focus of translation studies. While the first avoids the relationship of language contact to translation, even though code-mixing and code shifting as it operates in Latinx literature at times is translation, the second, given its interest in multiple languages, has almost no research on translation in a Latinx context. Latinx literature and translation are, generally, discussed independently of each other. Translation seems to belong to translation studies, except for researchers who do not always define themselves working in translation studies but have made important contributions to the area.[15] Language contact in Latinx literature has been an absent area of study in translation studies. Why?

One reason for the separation in these research disciplines is that ordinary and literary bilingualism in Latinx culture is largely an intranational phenomenon in the United States while translation studies is oriented primarily to English and other source languages in a global context. Susan Bassnett called for a cultural "turn" in translation studies in the 1990s (123), that is, for a change in approaches to studying translation, but the turn—this is the second reason—included primarily those literatures traditionally studied by translation scholars. The cultural "turn" did not turn wide enough to encompass Latinx literature, and, conjointly, scholars of Chicanx-Latinx literature have kept the study of translation at arm's length. Yet, a third reason may be that Latinx literature has emerged as an English-dominant discipline in the academy, even though Spanish-speaking communities are at its base.

The 1990s, the decade of the cultural "turn" in translation studies, saw the establishment of a series of alliances among translation studies and postcolonial theory (Niranjana, Robinson [Review, *Translation and Empire*]), translation studies and gender studies (Chamberlain), and translation studies and power (Cheyfitz, Rafael, and Tymoczko). But as far as I know no study to date has emerged to bring together Latinx studies and translation studies. The emergence of the translation to Spanish in the 1990s by U.S. mainstream presses of English Latinx literary texts with multilingual features provides an opportunity to lay the groundwork for a dialogue between the two disciplines. I want to begin to break down boundaries between these disciplines.

In the world of transnational communications and global relations, the ability to read and speak different languages, to understand and appreciate translation's role, and to generate knowledge about practices of translation become more necessary and important. Historically, the Mexican-origin population has required services in translation and interpretation but even more so today among the most recent arrivals from the New World Spanish Americas, in educational, medical, civic, and legal social networks. In the academy, some literary and cultural studies scholars have had to confront translation in researching nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Chicanx and Latinx literature and history. Yet, notwithstanding, its institutionalization since the 1980s, Chicanx-Latinx literary and cultural studies scholars have not focused overtly and directly on translation or multilingualism as a central concern. Therefore, this book is about three imaginative narrative texts and their translations in a long list of intranational Latinx translations from English to Spanish (less long in Spanish to English translations but no less important). My book is an exploratory attempt to inject the subject of translation into Latinx Studies about this translational phenomenon. It lies squarely in the middle of current debates around language, bilingualism and multilingualism, race and immigration policies, and other issues of vital national and global import.