

**David Gramling
& Chantelle Warner**
University of Arizona

INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE: IN MEMORY OF RICHARD RUIZ (1948-2015)

Our colleague Richard Ruiz, who passed away suddenly last month, was one of the first people we sought out to help guide *Critical Multilingualism Studies* through its first years of publication. When we approached Richard about *CMS* in 2012, he quickly wrote back to us with this: “You want me to agree to take this very nice position on an editorial board? Throw in a pack of Oreos and I'm yours.”

As young editors in the emerging interdisciplinary field of multilingualism studies, a field made possible in part by Richard's own research since the 1980s, we found his habit of willingness, ease, and collaborative warmth almost miraculous—especially in view of the fact that scholarly consultation with Richard Ruiz has always been in high demand, from Aruba to Mexico City to Washington, DC. As recently as a few weeks before his death, Richard got in touch with us out of the blue to say he felt remiss as a *CMS* board member and wished we editors would give him more to do to help further the Journal's endeavors. It is extraordinary that such a scholar and administrator, a current Department Head of Mexican American Studies at the University of Arizona, and an active consulting researcher across multiple continents and disciplines would drop a line to ask for more ways to be of service. We did not get a chance to take Richard up on his gentle reminder.

With his pragmatist's sensitivity toward the evolving socio-political conditions for language planning and policy in the US, Richard Ruiz distinguished himself as a treasured critical friend to scores of transnational endeavors aiming to improve how societies recognize the lived languages and speech communities that compose them. In a 2002 essay on the schooling of US Latina/o children, Ruiz and co-author Luis C. Moll expanded on Angela Valenzuela's 1999 theory of *subtractive schooling* as follows: "This form of schooling has become a major feature of the education of poor and working-class Latino students all over the country. It results in disdain for what one knows and what one is, influences children's attitudes toward knowledge, and undermines their personal competence. That is, subtractive schooling creates a social distance between the students and the world of school knowledge. It creates the impression that someone else possesses great knowledge and expertise, whereas, in contrast, one is unskilled and incompetent—that one's language and knowledge are inadequate because they are not privileged (formalized and accorded special status) by the school." (365) Unsatisfied with mere structural fault-finding however, Ruiz and Moll envisioned three areas in which a "future educational agenda for Latino children" (370) could be pursued: a) building interethnic coalitions with African-American students and families, b) reinvesting in learners' transnational dynamics with heritage countries as funds of knowledge, and c) expanding a conception of linguistic human rights to include Latina/o students' language practices, experiences, and repertoires.

Though Ruiz and Moll's strategic recommendations were geared toward US educational contexts, they also seem to offer broader principles for researching multilingually. As a field, critical multilingualism studies has to rely on intergroup, interlingual, transnational, and international research communities. Within these emerging coalitions, linguistic differences—in all of their cognitive and hierarchical dissonance—constitute the conditions of possibility for insight, and not just the thematic object or social terrain upon which that insight is achieved. Speaking from domains of knowledge that are structurally obscured in Anglocentric institutions, multilingual scholars and subjects—like the learners Richard Ruiz advocated for—are routinely made to undertake invisible labors of self-translation. In contexts where these labors go unrecognized, research "on multilingualism" can quickly become *subtractive scholarship*, in the sense that Ruiz and Moll suggest above.

The critical work of multilingualism studies thus involves, among other things, an unflinching attention to the linguistic human rights of researchers as citizens of uneven

academic communities, in which fully recognized participation regularly requires self-translation by certain members and not others.

Developing this volume of *CMS* gave us the opportunity to confront a number of such language-border dynamics. *Editing* multilingually, for one, required us to make decisions that otherwise routinely fall outside the frame of critical inquiry, and into the bin of editorial triage. With an essay by Katrin Becker on the French legal historian Pierre Legendre, *CMS* publishes its first non-English-language article—though not in French, but in German. Such non-Anglophone contributions to any predominantly Anglophone scholarly venue inevitably present editors, staff, and peer reviewers with challenges that vex our presumptions about order, format, and the politics of accessibility. Out of this Pandora’s box come not only questions of usage, punctuation, formatting, audience, expertise, readability, fact-checking, and correctness, but also of scholarly tradition, citational standardization, prosaic mood, and the (in)visibility of the researcher’s voice.

We open this issue with Till Dembeck’s exploration of homophonic translation as a critical tool for cultural politics. Through readings of Ernst Jandl and Oskar Pastior’s homophonic translations, Dembeck’s analysis opens up a similar space for translanguaging speculation as did Cole Swensen’s essay “Friendling Translation” in Issue 2.1. In Dembeck’s words, homophonic translation—though often passed over in criticism as ludic caprice or parlor game—“aims to highlight continuity where the ‘monolingual paradigm’ presupposes rupture. It opens a semantic space between *langues* and makes them communicate in a way that seems to be systematically ruled out” (20). Swensen’s essay reads particularly well alongside Dembeck’s contribution, as they both are interested in the meaning-making that occurs when two or more languages engage in questionably appropriate ‘friendships’ with one another, beyond the proprieties of translational monolingualism.

Matthew Coleman’s research on multilingual clay pottery receipts from Roman Gaul offers the first article published in *CMS* that focuses intensively on the pre-modern world. With its nuanced attention to the material, function, and location of these clay artifacts, Coleman’s argument engages in the kind of investigative historical sociolinguistics that Jürgen Leonhardt called for in his *Latin: Story of a World Language*. Though the merits of Coleman’s research for Classical Studies are clear, such work also offers modernists a new palette of concepts with which to explore translanguaging practice. Coleman chooses for his analytical purposes not ‘code-switching’ or ‘bilingualism’, but rather ‘linguistic

entanglement', which he describes as the "site-specific choices and negotiations [that] combine to become a larger phenomenon, thus dispelling the notion of singularly valid versions of translations." (27) *CMS* sees such research in pre- and para-modern contexts as indispensable to understanding what multilingualism is, and we eagerly welcome further contributions from historians, classicists, and medievalists.

Nicholas Glastonbury's essay on "counterinsurgent translation" tracks the Turkish government's recent interest in translating Kurdish literary classics, as part of the ruling AK Party's 2009 'Kurdish Opening'. This initiative promised cultural, electoral, and civic inclusion for Kurds and Kurdish language, following eight decades of violent suppression and assimilation in Republican Turkey. Glastonbury analyses how the 17th-century Kurdish poet Ehmedê Xanî's love story *Mem û Zîn* has been re-translated under state auspices and also 'tradapted' for broadcast television. He investigates how this recent multilingual initiative dovetails with the government's overall strategy to incorporate select Kurdish voters and interests into a newly neoliberal view of Turkish multiculturalism. Researching trilingually, Glastonbury is thus able to marshal the methods of translation historiography to critique a complex contemporary political initiative.

John Cayley's essay in this issue extends Till Dembeck's speculative inquiry about the signifying space between languages, in and beyond translation. With a thought experiment ignited in part by the artist Xu Bing's installation *Book from the Sky*, Cayley invites us to fundamentally question what we consider to be the essential experiential bounds of 'translation'. Taking even our most modest presumptions about the prospect of universal language, aren't two parallel conversations about a given artifact ultimately in some 'translational' relationship with one another? Whether yes or no, what does our answer say about our beliefs on the relationship between world and meaning?

Natasha Lvovich's hybrid essay about Marc Chagall extends scholarly work on what Steven Kellman has called the "translingual imagination." Offering a narrative portrait and biographical context for Chagall's "translingual art," Lvovich takes the additional step of reflecting on Chagall's legacy as a touchstone for her own scholarly and linguistic migration from Soviet Russia to the United States. The research section of this issue of *CMS* closes with Katrin Becker's philosophical meditation on law and linguistic multiplicity, by way of Pierre Legendre's dogmatic anthropology. These six articles are

followed by three reviews of recent releases in the various disciplines contributing to critical multilingualism studies.

As *CMS* enters its fourth year of publication, we will continue to be guided by Richard Ruiz's gracious vision of education and scholarship in an unevenly multilingual world. Our editorial board members and previous contributors have encouraged the Journal's staff not only to keep a mindful eye on the costs of our Anglocentricity, but also to question our reflexive recourse to "in-house" stylistic and formatting standards—as these, too, often betray wider-ranging 'structures of feeling' about appropriate researcher identity and verbal hygiene. Does stylistic parsimony—say, in using italics to display 'foreign' words—really help readers understand which words are translingual and which are cislingual, or does italicizing instead merely induce linguistic discontinuity anew, underwriting the multilingual / monolingual dyad and reconstituting language borders? Natasha Lvovich, in her essay on translingual art chez Marc Chagall, italicizes for instance "Kindertransport" but not "Anschluss," two somewhat German words that became transnational through the Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe. A formerly Soviet Francophile of Jewish descent, now living and researching in New York, Lvovich works in a creative, critical lexicon of translingual admixtures that confound the foreignizing maneuvers of italics—which are, in her case, more a matter of historical becoming than one for editorial arbitration.

Further, what virtue does it serve to streamline various (French, German, and English) punctuation usage norms in the display of quoted or reported speech, other than the virtue of editorial rectitude? Should a journal, or press, maintain an undifferentiated policy on the display of translated and original-language quotations—regardless of language, genre, author, or argument? If so, do such policies truly exist so as not to incommode "the reader"? Katrin Becker's essay on Legendre, for instance, is augmented in and by presenting French, German, and English citational practices, where punctuation variance allows readers to experience epistemic multilocationality in the very terrain of its typeface. In his thought experiment on "Untranslatability and Readability," John Cayley employs both German fraktur typeface and invisible white typeface, further emphasizing how printed language—when allowed to matter in its manner of display—is capable of disclosing the essentially multilingual, essentially ecological ritual scene of literacy anew.

It is however increasingly accepted, particularly among the most prestigious academic presses and journal management platforms, to require that foreign language citations in

Anglophone manuscripts be truncated down to only those elements that the author insists are “crucial to the argument.” Some presses offer their Web pages as a compensatory site for posting extended multilingual versions of articles published in Anglophone form in their print versions, implicating that the ephemeral Internet is a more germane setting for multilingualism than the printed page. We find that such increasingly complex attempts to triage multilingual scholarship through in-house style and formatting guides—whether defended under the banner of accessibility, market appeal, editorial rigor, or aesthetic sense—are not as benign, and certainly not as necessary, as they hope to seem. Editorial domains like format, style, access, consistency, genre, and typography are not just the well-scrubbed anterooms of scholarship; they are kinetic fields upon which the multi / mono divide in language(s) is ceremonially reconstituted. The editorial staff of *CMS* accordingly hope to help scholars, when necessary or fruitful, to “unformat” those research norms that stand in the way of their researching multilingually.

In this spirit, we take the opportunity once again to thank Richard Ruiz for his service on the editorial board of *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, for his life-long contribution to language studies, and for modeling for us what engaged scholarship can achieve in one lifetime. We wish his family and friends many indelible memories of their sixty-six years with Richard.

We would like to thank Sarah Allen, Jenna Altherr Flores, Patrick Ploschnitzki, and several anonymous peer reviewers for their editorial contributions to this issue.

References

- Moll, Luis. C., & Ruiz, Richard. 2002. The schooling of Latino children. In *Latinos: Remaking America*, edited by Marcelo. Suárez-Orozco & Mariela. M. Pérez, pp. 362–374. Berkeley: University of California Press.