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Notes

Introduction

1. Named languages are categories given to linguistic patterns, typically organized by nations or social groups. Examples of named languages include English, Spanish, and French. While named languages are often identified in the singular (i.e., we refer to “English” rather than “Englishes”), I here reference named languages while acknowledging the fluid nature of all communication, understanding that there are multiple and constantly changing “Englishes,” “Spanishes,” and so on (Otheguy, García, and Reid).

Chapter 1

1. Plurinationalism is defined as the coexistence of different nationalities within a larger state. Bolivia is made up of nine departments, each of which have legal independence. As a result, each department can establish its official language(s), and all the official languages are recognized as national languages in the country as a whole.

2. Although this chapter specifically cites scholarship in sociolinguistics, rhetoric and composition, and translation studies, my development of translation moments as analytical units for studying language fluidity is also influenced by fluid and decolonial approaches to language and communication proposed by scholars of African American language, Indigenous rhetorics (including Chicanx rhetorics), and Latinx rhetorics and by scholarship on social activism and civic engagement in rhetoric and composition, technical communication, and English Education. I expand on this work in my discussion of multimodality and method/ologies and in the presentation of data throughout this book.

3. The diagram in figure 3 is a representative illustration of a written translation workflow. In this project, I discuss both written translations and spoken translations (i.e., interpretation). Translation moments can be experienced in both written translation and interpretation sessions and encompass a pause that signals rhetorical negotiation on the part of the translator or interpreter. However, the data in this project does not always distinguish between written translation and verbal interpretation. Transla-
tors who participated in this project frequently spoke to other collaborators when completing written translations, and participating interpreters frequently wrote or sketched things to clarify meaning during verbal interpretation sessions.

Chapter 2

1. Testimonios are stories told to reflect and represent the historical experiences of marginalized people (Torrez, “Translating”).

Chapter 3

1. Although I draw on the concept of “mestiza consciousness” as it is described by Anzaldúa, I acknowledge Gabriela Raquel Ríos’s important critique about “the problematic ways many Chican@s and others have taken in advancing a Nahua form of indigenous rhetoric because we have done so using primarily a Western frame of reference and because we exercise a Mestizaje hegemony over other indigenous peoples in Cemanahuac (Latin America) when articulating a Chican@ or Mestizaje rhetorical tradition” (“Performing,” 85). I also honor the important clarification by Eric Rodríguez and Everardo Cuevas, in “Problematizing Mestizaje,” that “Mestizaje has been used to create a sense of nationalistic pride that is colonial in its erasure of Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies.” While I find Anzaldúa’s concepts of “mestiza consciousness” and conocimiento to be useful in bridging conversations about language and multimodality, I do not intend to suggest that all Chicanx lived experiences are homogenous, and I honor the multiple and overlapping Indigenous cultures and practices that often go unrecognized and unacknowledged in discussions of Chicanx identities. I am grateful to Indigenous and Chicanx scholars and students who continue to expand my uptake of decolonial method/ologies and orientations in and beyond this project.