

Routledge Critical Studies in Multilingualism

Edited by Marilyn Martin-Jones, *MOSAIC Centre for Research on Multilingualism, University of Birmingham, UK*, and Joan Pujolar Cos, *Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Language in Late Capitalism
Pride and Profit
<i>Edited by Alexandre Duchêne and Monica Heller</i></p> <p>2 Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing
Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse
<i>Edited by Mark Sebba, Shahrzad Mahootian, and Carla Jonsson</i></p> <p>3 Multilingualism, Discourse, and Ethnography
<i>Edited by Sheena Gardner and Marilyn Martin-Jones</i></p> | <p>4 Bilingual Education and Language Policy in the Global South
<i>Edited by Jo Arthur Shoba and Feliciano Chimbutane</i></p> <p>5 Urban Schools and English Language Education in Late Modern China
A Critical Sociolinguistic Ethnography
<i>Miguel Pérez-Milans</i></p> <p>6 A Sociolinguistics of Diaspora
Latino Practices, Identities, and Ideologies
<i>Edited by Rosina Márquez Reiter and Luisa Martín Rojo</i></p> |
|--|--|

A Sociolinguistics of Diaspora
Latino Practices, Identities, and Ideologies

Edited by Rosina Márquez Reiter and Luisa Martín Rojo

- Leinaweaver, J. B. (2008). Improving oneself. Young people getting ahead in the Peruvian Andes. *Latin American Perspectives*, 35(4), 60–78.
- Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lipski, J. M. (2007). El español de América en contacto con otras lenguas. In M. Lacorte (Ed.), *Lingüística aplicada del español* (pp. 309–345). Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Lo, A. (2009). *Locating race in the language practices of Asian Americans: Intraethnic othering among Korean Americans*. Paper given at Symposium on Race and Ethnicity in Language, Interaction, and Culture, Los Angeles, CA.
- Louie, V. (2006). Growing up ethnic in transnational worlds: Identities among second-generation Chinese and Dominicans identities. *Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 13, 363–394.
- Mason Carris, L. (2011). La voz gringa: Latino stylization of linguistic (in)authenticity as social critique. *Discourse and Society*, 22(4), 474–490.
- McIlwaine, C. (2007). *Living in Latin London: How Latin American migrants survive in the city*. London: Queen Mary University.
- McIlwaine, C. (2010). Migrant machismos: Exploring gender ideologies and practices among Latin American migrants in London from a multi-scalar perspective. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 17(3), 281–300.
- McIlwaine, C., Cock, J. C., & Linneker, B. (2011). *No longer invisible: The Latin American community in London*. London: Queen Mary University.
- Pellegrino, A. (2008). *Migration from Latin America to Europe: Trends and challenges*, International Organization for Migration (2004). Accessed September 28, 2008, www.oas.org/atip/Migration/IOM%20Report%20Migration%20LAC%20to%20EU.pdf.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Office for National Statistics. (2012). *2011 Census: Key statistics for England and Wales, March 2011*. Accessed December 11, 2012, from www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_290685.pdf.
- Ronan, C. E. (1959). ¿Qué significa gringo? *Historia Mexicana*, 8(4), 549–556.
- Wade, P. (1993). *Blackness and race mixture*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Wade, P. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in Latin America*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wade, P., Urrea Giraldo, F., & Viveros Vigoya, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Raza, etnicidad y sexualidades: Ciudadanía y multiculturalismo en América Latina*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Centro de Estudios Sociales.
- Wei, L. (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Woolard, K., & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 55–82.
- Wright, K. (2010). It's a limited kind of happiness. Barriers to achieving human well-being among Peruvian migrants in London and Madrid. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 29(3), 367–383.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA, and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

9 The Deterritorialization of Latino Educación

Noncitizen Latinos in Israel and the Everyday Diasporic Subject¹

Alejandro I. Paz

In 2006, I was visiting the home of a Bolivian family in a working-class neighborhood in south Tel Aviv, helping the 12-year-old son remove malware from his computer. The son, Itsik, is Bolivian in the sense that many first-generation migrant children can be said to be from elsewhere.² He was actually born and raised in Israel, attended a Jewish-Israeli school in the neighborhood, and, although his Spanish is excellent, he speaks Hebrew most of the time with his brother at home and with his peers at school. Thus, Itsik is “Bolivian” through a process of what Appadurai and other scholars of globalization and migration in the mid-90s called deterritorialization (Appadurai, 1996; Basch, Schiller, & Szanton Blanc, 1994): Itsik is of Bolivian descent produced in diaspora. He is Bolivian, or more broadly Latino, also because, in hegemonic Israeli terms, he is a “foreign worker” (OVED ZAR),³ an example of what Simmel called the “stranger” (Simmel, 1950; see also Brodwin 2003, p. 386–388): for most of his life, Itsik could not even achieve legal residence in Israel, much less be perceived or perceive himself as part of the Jewish nation.

As I worked on the computer, Itsik watched, chatted, and at times exchanged heated words with his mother, Barbara. We recorded the conversation as part of my study of bilingual communication among noncitizen Latino migrant workers in Israel. Altogether I conducted some 3 full years of ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork with Latin American labor migrants and their children in Israel, including extensive unscripted recordings (both with and without my presence) in domestic and school environments, as well as interviews about migration trajectories and language use.⁴

Only later, while working on the transcript of my visit, did I notice how Itsik had addressed me to ask how the computer was progressing. Speaking fluent Hebrew, he said:

Excerpt 1, Itsik

1	MA' ZE OSE?	WHAT'S IT [THE COMPUTER] DOING?
2	IM MUTAR LI LISHOL	IF I MAY ASK
3	KE'ILU, MA HU OSE AXSHAV'?	LIKE, WHAT'S IT DOING NOW?

Two aspects of this turn at talk surprised me. First, that the preteen had addressed me using an enormously respectful form, unusual for such

marginalized Latino youth. The respect shown is found in the intonation, especially in line 3, and in the line 2 request for permission to ask, a highly ritualized gesture to mitigate the threat to my face. That is, this interactional move constitutes a show of politeness (see Brown & Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1967; Watts, 2003). Latinos call such displays *educación*. Itsik took such care because I was a respected adult, a guest in his home, and also someone who was helping him with his computer. His display is probably also due to the fact that his mother had already berated him for approaching my recording equipment and more generally for downloading harmful (and sometimes costly) programs from the Internet. And no doubt Itsik was already a little impatient to receive his computer back.

The second surprising aspect, especially for Latino interlocutors who heard the clip (see the following), is that Itsik delivers this question entirely in Hebrew, which they associate with a lack of *educación*. Perhaps this perception is explained by Israeli interpersonal pragmatics. Certainly, literature on (especially middle-class) Israeli interactional practices has suggested a past commitment to directness (Katriel, 1986) or “solidarity-politeness” (Blum-Kulka, 1987)—although this is perhaps now shifting (Katriel, 2004; see also Maschler, 2009, pp. 166–170). At the same time, Hebrew speakers have every means at their disposal to present their ethical selves through formulae of politeness and attention to their interlocutors’ face, albeit perhaps not as elaborated as those in other societies where extensive honorifics or other specialized register phenomena are used extensively.

However, Latino adults and kids alike tend to subscribe to the language ideology that Hebrew is simply a language bereft of *educación*. Building on Irvine and Gal’s (2000) definitions of iconization and erasure as semiotic processes, we can say that this ideology is a kind of Herderian equation of language with culture, where a narrow understanding of the denotational code is taken as an icon that stands for (and thus is conflated with) interpersonal pragmatics of interaction. This ideology of “code for interactional pragmatics” erases the enormous sociolinguistic variation across individual repertoires and sites of interaction in any social formation. In this specific case, Spanish tends to take on the veneer of the language of *educación*, just as much as Hebrew tends to be treated as a language of *maleducación* or rudeness.

These tendencies, however, are not uniform, and, as Excerpt 1 shows, there are many occasions that Latinos could perceive or produce a split between the language as denotational code and the interpersonal pragmatics. Itsik’s accomplishment of displaying Latino pragmatics of *educación* in Hebrew—and Latinos’ ideas that it cannot be achieved—point to a key way that Latinos perceive themselves to be ethnolinguistically distinct from (Jewish-)Israelis. This perception is especially important since many of the children of Latinos grew up Hebrew dominant, spending much more time with Hebrew-speaking peer groups than with their parents’ networks. *Educación* much more than Spanish (as an ancestral or heritage language)

was believed to tie Latino generations together and thus to give the basis of Latino diasporic personhood.

This chapter discusses how the discursive practices associated with *educación* contribute in multiple ways to Latinos’ sense that they descended from an elsewhere. In that sense, this chapter considers how *educación* is deterritorialized.

NONCITIZEN LATINOS IN ISRAEL AS DIASPORIC SUBJECTS

Living in diaspora is fundamentally linked to an imaginary about being from an “elsewhere”, or as Clifford (1994) puts it, dwelling in displacement. This imaginary is often produced due to a historical rupture from the place to which a return is hoped for but is interminably delayed. That elsewhere, or homeland, does not necessarily exist, at least not in the form imagined or remembered by diasporic subjects, a point perhaps most forcefully made by Axel (2002). Further, the spatio-temporal signs of displacement do not arise mechanically in reaction to migration or crossing state borders, but rather diaspora is achieved through the emergence of locally embedded practices that produce for a group this historical awareness (Brubaker, 2005; see also Butler, 2001; Shukla, 2001; Yelvington, 2001; Zeleza, 2005). In other words, to study diaspora requires attention to those practices and how they produce this complex social imaginary. To study diasporic imaginary is to consider how certain characteristics of the homeland are deterritorialized; that is, these characteristics are understood to be from elsewhere even when they are produced through practices that are grounded in local sites.

By using the term “deterritorialization”, Appadurai (1996) suggested that the imaginings of community associated with large-scale social formations (like in articulations of nationhood) did not necessarily have to occur within the borders of a single state. The work that produces social imaginaries can occur also across discontinuous geographies, like those produced by groups that form across transnational circuits of migrating border crossers. Indeed, Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc (1994) further argued that marginalized nation-states are produced in deterritorialized form by those transmigrants in core countries who remain committed to such nationalism. The term “deterritorialization” has taken on other senses in the scholarly literature, but it is this work of imagination that I emphasize here. In that sense, although my meaning shares characteristics of what Rockefeller (2011) calls the “geographic” use in his well-taken caution against some terminology found in the globalization scholarship, I am not opposing it to a rooted notion of place. Rather, given nationalist practices that project some cultural characteristics as rooted in place, there are diasporic practices that make other cultural characteristics appear as if they have been removed from their place of origin. Thus, through such diasporic practices as instilling *educación* in Latino youth in Israel, it becomes possible for one like Itsik

to think of himself as having “Bolivian” characteristics, even if he has never set foot in Bolivia.

To understand the relation of diasporic personhood and the pragmatics of *educación*, some background information about the Latinos in Israel is necessary. The noncitizen Latinos of Israel are a small and highly marginalized group, and their migration stream is historically shallow. Non-Jewish Latin Americans began migrating as part of a large wave of what the Israeli state calls “foreign workers” in the late 1980s. A phenomenon that extended beyond Latin America to Eastern Europe, Africa, and Southeast Asia, this wave of migration has completely transformed Israel’s labor force. As sociologists Kemp and Raijman have discussed (2008), state-sponsored guest worker programs were closely linked from the beginning with the neoliberalization of the Israeli economy and the shifting geopolitics that sought to decrease the employment of noncitizen Palestinian day laborers in the territory, which the state perceives as its own. Latinos participated far less in formal guest worker programs than did those from other regions and tended to generate long chains of migrants who overstayed their tourist visas. They arrived mostly from Colombia, Ecuador, Chile, Venezuela, and Bolivia and came to number between 10,000 and 15,000, although this number was greatly reduced with the advent of the Immigration Police in 2002. Initially, many found work in all kinds of occupations, but today the overwhelming majority, men and women, work largely as domestic cleaners and to a lesser extent as caregivers. Although by no means the first group of Latin Americans to arrive in Israel, they are largely separated in socioeconomic space from authorized Jewish immigration, which consists mostly of Argentines. Indeed, these non-Jewish labor migrants generally distinguish themselves from the Jewish immigrants with the ethnonyms “Latinos” versus “Argentinos”.

Like those who cross many paradigmatic borders (Alvarez, 1995; Anzaldúa, 1987), Latinos see their arrival in Israel as a crossing from third to first world, of global South to North, and one where the crossing signifies for many Latinos the hoped-for transition to greater economic security. This transition is by no means assured, and the migration itself is full of risks. The diasporic awareness developed by Latinos in Israel can be best understood as one motivated by a sense of economic necessity (see Anzaldúa, 1987, pp. 10–13; Cohen, 2008, pp. 61–62). The sought-after economic security is itself conceived by Latinos as a personal modernization: greater individual independence and agency and yet greater isolation from family (including children) and friends and greater responsibility for others. Their migration narratives and practices fit what Dick (2010) has called the “modernist chronotope”, including the contradiction between maintaining an ethical life in the country of origin and gaining economic security in the destination country.

In many senses, the noncitizen Latinos in Israel are a classic diasporic subject. Especially during the majority of my fieldwork, they lived in liminal

conditions with respect to citizenship, residence, socioeconomic position, and national belonging. Both adults and youths maintain a sense that their distinctive culture is descended from their countries of origin, and several leisure-time institutions developed among them that helped to maintain this sense of distinctiveness.⁵ Some of their liminality with respect to citizenship was changing due to government resolutions in 2005, 2006, and 2010, which resulted in most children receiving recognition as potential citizens, and their families receive some status as a result. Even so, this group will no doubt continue to be considered as non-Jewish and descended from “foreign workers”. This and the other marks of foreignness do not disappear easily, and this makes for fertile ground for producing a notion of deterritorialized belonging.

PRAGMATIC CALIBRATION AND THE DETERRITORIALIZED IMAGINARY

In ground-breaking work on the relation of language and diaspora, Eisenlohr (2006) discussed the multiple temporalities always at work in a large-scale social formation and suggested how language ideologies help to mediate these different temporalities (see also Das, 2008). As part of this discussion, Eisenlohr describes how a “calibration of displacement” can be achieved for diasporic Hindus in Mauritius through the ideological association of a local variety of Hindi, with India the projected “homeland”. Also attentive to how language use articulates with space and time, Dick (2010) follows similar ideas to consider how Mexicans’ migration discourse conjures up the United States as a projected destination, filled with both possible economic benefits as well as moral perils.

Both Eisenlohr and Dick in essence show how language used in particular contexts can help project an imaginary that cuts across otherwise discontinuous geographies. They do so by drawing on Silverstein’s (1993) discussion of pragmatic calibration (pp. 48–53), one of the three dimensions the latter discusses as relations between pragmatics and metapragmatics.⁶ By calibration, Silverstein denotes how the multiple indexicals of a stretch of discourse map onto—and thereby characterize and come to be characterized by—the ongoing interactional event.⁷ Silverstein sets out three general types of calibration—reportive, reflexive, and nomic—and distinguishes them according to the kinds of metapragmatics by which the discourse typically comes to be regimented as part of the interaction. Broadly speaking, reportive calibration often involves the strong salience of explicit metapragmatic devices, like verbs of speaking and deictics, and the paradigmatic example is reported speech. Reflexive calibration, on the other hand, functions through more implicit devices, like the poetic organization of speech, and the discourse comes to be interpreted in relation to a type of event, “as in routinized forms of interaction like greetings” (Dick, 2010, p. 281). Finally, nomic calibration comprises discourse thick with

signals that the event being experienced is of a distinct ontic realm from that of the typical interactional world (as with expressions of scientific or cosmological universality), and elaborate rituals are the paradigmatic example.

While Eisenlohr (2004) studies how a large-scale ritual can help produce the association of a language with the ancestral spacetime, Dick (2010) investigates in depth how the migration discourse of Mexicans routinely produces the US as a distinct realm in everyday contexts. I build on these suggestions of calibrating displacement by considering how practices of discursive interaction, like facework and politeness, also are routinely calibrated in Latinos' talk to another place and time, to a diasporic homeland—Latin America. There are highly ritualized events that help to achieve this calibration, but here, like Dick, I am considering everyday domestic contexts. One of Dick's contributions is to suggest that it is not only a language seen as a distinct code but also the interactional practices in the sites where it is spoken that are crucial for producing the ontically distinct world. To comprehend this better, and indeed to see how *educación* has been deterritorialized, it is necessary to examine the contradiction between the practices of *educación*, on the one hand, and the ideology of Spanish as the language of *educación*, on the other.

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES OF EDUCACIÓN AND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND INTERACTIONAL PRACTICES

Latinos in Israel are fond of saying that "*la educación empieza en la casa*", *educación* begins at home. This expression also shows how *educación* is associated especially with domestic contexts of interaction, paradigmatically with interactions between parents and their children. As with other kinds of discursive practices (Agha, 1998), any discussion of *educación* is realized by Latinos through the (ideologically simplified) speech of a series of stereotyped characters. Latinos generally perceive Israelis to lack *educación* and explain this as a result of Israeli parents not understanding how to socialize—educate—their children. This lack of *educación* is doubly true for Israeli children when they address an adult and particularly when they address their own parents. When Latino children, most of whom are Hebrew dominant, refer to this lack of *educación*, they use the Hebrew term, *XUTSPA* "cheek" or "gall" (cf. English *chutzpah*). These kinds of intuitions are typical of language ideologies (Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998), and point to how, rather than the use of Spanish as code, it is the practices associated with *educación* that are crucial to constituting a sense of diaspora among Latinos, young and old.

Educación is seen as a characteristic of Latino personhood, whether describing the Spanish-dominant adult generation or the Hebrew-dominant generation growing up in Israel. It is understood as part of the sacred relation of parent and child and thus helps produce an indexical relation to an

imagined homeland. Parents and children are understood to have a relation of reciprocity. A child displays their *educación* by showing respect (*respeto*) toward their parents. The parent, on the other hand, provides for and, at the same time, educates the child. This relation means that Latinos often considered a child's behavior as evidence of the parents' *educación* and ultimately of the parents' country of origin. Whenever rival parents complain about each other's children, they generally blame the parents. The link is often very explicit: so-and-so doesn't know how to educate her or his child, and it is obvious from the child's behavior. For example, in interviews, when asked to judge interactional behavior, adults often qualified their remarks by noting that different countries have different "cultures", and perhaps "that's how they do it there". *Educación* is thus seen as producing an indexical chain pointing back up through the lineage of the family and ultimately to that shared homeland that noncitizen Latinos in Israel imagine unites them.

But what is *educación* to noncitizen Latinos in Israel? Or more to the point, what has it become? *Educación* is not a uniform or monolithic set of practices that stayed the same as Latin Americans crossed into Israel. Just as this marginal group of migrants came to understand themselves as distinct from (Jewish) Israelis, so has *educación* transformed in relation to how the Latinos perceive themselves in encounters with stereotypic Israelis.⁸

To understand this changing set of practices better, I used a variety of methodologies. One important methodology was to use excerpts like Excerpt 1 in an interview. I first did tens of hours of recordings of natural conversation in domestic and educational settings (sometimes with and sometimes without my presence). From my ethnography, I knew that, while Spanish was an important marker of ethnolinguistic identity, much more important was the Latinos' sense that their *educación* distinguished them from (Jewish) Israelis. However, as I went over recordings, especially those between parents and children, I realized that I could not judge what the Latino participants would and would not consider examples of speaking with *educación*. I therefore devised an interview, administering it to 52 Latinos (27 adults: 6 men and 21 women; 25 youths: 15 male and 10 female). In the interview, I asked them to describe the interaction and judge whether they felt the participants were using *educación*. I also requested from interviewees that they produce an example of a way to interact with a greater degree of *educación*, if possible.

The reactions to Excerpt 1 are very instructive about how Latinos can perceive interactional behavior to be distinct from the denotational code or language. This distinct perception is crucial for understanding the way *educación* can involve a calibration of displacement. Of all the excerpts I played for interviewees, Excerpt 1 received the most positive response as clearly using *educación*, and many interviewees were hard pressed to find a better form, even in Spanish. Since Itsik spoke completely in Hebrew, many of the adults required a few playbacks and/or a translation to pick up on all of its subtleties. Indeed, there were four adults who perceived it with lukewarm reactions the first time around. Once they understood it better, they readily

endorsed it. What impressed them and other respondents the most was the subordinated request for permission in line 2, IM MUTAR LI LISHOL. The intonation contour also played a role (see what follows), but in general, it did not receive explicit comment.

One of the adults who changed his perception of Itsik's interactional move on a second hearing was a Colombian father, José (in his mid-40s and 14 years in Israel, with passable Hebrew). Just before this excerpt, I had played back two others between Itsik and his mother Barbara, where there was considerable tension. After listening a couple of times, he noted the difference between Itsik's behavior in Excerpt 1 and the earlier excerpts he had heard:

Excerpt 2, José:

1	<i>viene la parte latina</i>	<i>the Latino part comes out</i>
2	<i>o sea, hablando en hebreo y regresa la parte latina</i>	<i>that is, speaking in Hebrew and the Latino part returns</i>
3	<i>o sea, "puedo preguntar?"</i>	<i>that is, "can I ask?"</i>
4	<i>o sea, como pidiendo un ishur eh un permiso para preguntar</i>	<i>that is, as if requesting PERMISSION eh permission to ask</i>
5	<i>para preguntar, sí</i>	<i>to ask, yes</i>
6	<i>ya viene con mas educación</i>	<i>now it comes with more educación</i>

Clearly the Hebrew delivery had misled José when he first listened to Excerpt 1, because after hearing it a second time, he perceived Latino pragmatics even though Itsik was "speaking in Hebrew". Like most other interviewees, the fact that Itsik produces a request for his inquiry was immediately seized upon by José. José also was clearly impressed by the intonation contour, which he reproduced in Spanish in line 3.

In analyzing Excerpt 1, Teodora, a Chilean mother (in her 30s and some 7 years in Israel, also with passable Hebrew), explicitly compared Latino and Israeli interactional practices for requesting information:

Excerpt 3, Teodora:

1	<i>porque tu vistes</i>	<i>because you saw</i>
2	<i>él te pregunta "si es que te puedo preguntar"</i>	<i>he asks you "if it's possible for me to ask"</i>
3	<i>es que un israelita no te lo va a preguntar</i>	<i>it's just that an Israelite isn't going to ask you</i>
4	<i>no te va "IM MUTAR LI BIXLAL"</i>	<i>he's not going to you "IF I MAY ASK AT ALL"</i>
5	<i>BIXLAL LO</i>	<i>NOT AT ALL</i>
6	<i>te va a preguntar que estás haciendo</i>	<i>he's going to ask you what you're doing</i>
7	<i>y "LAMA VEKAXA VELAMA"</i>	<i>and "WHY AND LIKE THIS AND WHY"</i>
8	<i>"VELAMA KAXA"</i>	<i>"AND WHY LIKE THIS"</i>
9	<i>"VELAMA VEKAXA"</i>	<i>"AND WHY AND LIKE THIS"</i>
10	<i>pero nada que "MUTAR LI"</i>	<i>but nothing that "MAY I"</i>
11	<i>BIXLAL LO</i>	<i>NOT AT ALL</i>

Teodora establishes a contrast between the voice of a Latino who mitigates the imposition of his or her question with an explicit request (lines 2 and 4) and the voice of an Israeli who increases the interactional imposition by impatiently asking "why" over and over (lines 6–10). Following this excerpt, she agreed that Itsik was very polite (*educado*) and contrasted this display of *educación* with what one hears in the street or at work, meaning, in other words, from Israelis.

Educación as an understanding of interactional pragmatics is thus highly associated to place, and, as with several other kinds of discursive practices, is also highly associated with the speech of stereotyped characters in those places. In a discussion of honorific registers, Agha (1998) explains how speakers tend to laminate together distinct levels of analysis (like word and sentence) and how the metapragmatic stereotype of characters with particular speech helps to unite these levels in ideological perceptions. In this vein, stereotypes of Latinos and Israelis are contrasted implicitly and explicitly in Excerpts 2 and 3. In Excerpt 2, lines 2 and 3, José characterizes the speech of Itsik as that of a typical Latino, and in Excerpt 3, this contrast is made explicit by Teodora. In typifying these contrastive voices, José and Teodora are able to dissociate *educación* from the ideological binary of Spanish and Hebrew.

CALIBRATING EDUCACIÓN: IM MUTAR LI LISHOL

If Latinos could distinguish *educación* from the language spoken, in spite of their prevailing language ideologies, how can *educación* be calibrated to a Latin American homeland? Given the ideologies just mentioned, it is useful to return to Excerpt 1 in order to discuss this question. Both José and Teodora (see earlier discussion) mention what they perceive as the Latino origins to Itsik's request for information. Beyond such a perception, one Hebrew-dominant 16-year-old that I interviewed, Cecilio (some 8 years in Israel, having come with his Colombian mother), even ascribed practically otherworldly qualities to Itsik's interactional move:

1	HU HITYAXES ALEXA KE'ILU ATA BENADAM XASHUV O MASHU	HE TREATED YOU LIKE YOU'RE AN IMPORTANT PERSON OR SOMETHING
2	HU DIBER ALEXA YAFE	HE TALKED TO YOU RESPECTFULLY
3	"IM EFSHAR LISHOL"	"IF I CAN ASK"

Repeating the IM MUTAR LI LISHOL, like José and Teodora, to emphasize the unusual nature of the utterance, Cecilio also added a bit later that this turn showed a "form that, like, most kids don't use to treat most people most of the time". That is, the utterance was from elsewhere.

Further ethnographic context helps to position the larger interaction in which Itsik's turn occurred. Excerpt 1 is taken from a recording during one

of my first visits to Barbara's home, where there were two principal objectives. First, Barbara was interested in having me help her son with the multiple malware problems on his computer, as well as consult with me about buying him a new, more powerful computer—for which she had saved up \$1,500 US, a large sum for Barbara. Obviously, Itsik was excited both to hear that I could repair for free the malware that his mother blamed him for and also that I would help his mother purchase a new computer for him. On the other hand, I was interested in having them do unscripted recordings for my research because Barbara was considered to speak Hebrew well by her friends. Thus, I had brought a sophisticated recorder and intended to go over the oral consent form that day, and eventually leave them a simpler recorder to use without me. In short, from the point of view of the various actors party to the event, there were multiple important goals at stake.

Given what was at stake for him, then, it is not surprising that Itsik was trying to be on his best behavior. When I arrived, Barbara was not yet home, and Itsik welcomed me. Also at home was David, Itsik's 4-year-old brother, for whom Itsik was caring. Despite many stories I had heard about how wild he was and what I myself had witnessed on occasion, Itsik played the part of host with as much *educación* as any of the preteens and teens with whom I worked. He invited me in graciously, asked me to sit down, and then offered me something to drink, going over all possible options. He tried calling his mother to let her know I was there, and then he asked me what I preferred to watch on television, noting that he had intended to change his younger brother's cartoons to King Kong just before I knocked. We then talked amiably for a while about King Kong.

Ultimately, all these actions are considered by Latinos as part of displaying *educación*, specifically when receiving guests. However, the reasons for the visit created a set of potential threats to face. These threats were manifested in a series of questions about me, about my research, and about my equipment. Besides the expectations of the new computer, my visit created a lot of curiosity: the lengthy oral consent form, the request to record, as well as the voice recorder itself were all sources of intrigue for mother and children alike. Added to this were Barbara's anxieties about the computer, both current and future, as well as about her sons' use of the Internet and of new technologies, which she clearly felt inadequate to monitor. All of this generated a series of questions to me that structured much of the interaction.

A second dynamic was the tension between Barbara and Itsik, and a third was David's attempt to gain the attention of his mother and older brother. Excerpt 1 captures Itsik's attempt to renew his line of questioning after an earlier rebuke. Earlier in the conversation, Itsik had also used highly polite forms. The first time came after a couple of rebukes he received from Barbara about not appreciating the Internet speed they had and about downloading games that cost money. Then David momentarily occupied Barbara's attention, and Itsik tried to take advantage by turning to me to request permission to look at my recorder:

Excerpt 4, Itsik:

1	EFSHAR LIROT SHNIYA?	IS IT POSSIBLE TO HAVE A QUICK LOOK?
---	----------------------	--------------------------------------

Itsik had thus opened up a channel between me and him distinct from his mother's participation. Despite my affirmative response, Barbara quickly snapped that he should not touch, leading to a brief showdown in front of me before she sent him to help his little brother. Excerpt 1 came a little while later when Barbara once again became engrossed with her younger son, and Itsik took advantage to open a channel with me outside of his mother's direct participation. This time he was successful. The interaction that followed Excerpt 1 was structured by a series of questions about the cost of my recorder and microphone, about who funded its cost, and how it was that I had arrived to Israel at all. None of these follow-up questions involve the high degree of attention to facework displayed in Excerpt 1.

In some sense then, Itsik was playing the role that Teodora stereotyped as that of the Israeli kid (see Excerpt 3), rapidly asking somewhat invasive questions. Except that Itsik opens that series with the turn of Excerpt 1. That is, the *educación* on display in Excerpt 1 is relatively ritualized, almost like a greeting, to (re-)establish our footing for several turns, where a very politely worded question about my actions on his computer became a chance to interrogate me about my equipment and research. While Itsik questioned me, Barbara was distracted with phone calls to relatives abroad and occasionally added a few questions of her own about the computer she planned to buy.

How did Excerpt 1 differ from the series of questions that came in its wake? First of all, the use in line 2 of *IM MUTAR LI LISHOL*, "IF I MAY ASK". There is also the intonation. In line 1, the stress comes on *MA*, "WHAT", and there is no rising pitch for the question. Such intonation could actually sound impatient. This is corrected in line 3, with utterance final stress and rising pitch. Line 3 also has other characteristics to help set it apart. As a rephrasing of line 1, line 3 is started by the discourse marker *KE'ILU* ("LIKE") in the intonation unit initial position. Maschler comments in her chapter (2009, pp. 127–170) on *KE'ILU* as a discourse marker that this is a typical use and the most frequent position.⁹ Here it signals "realizing the need to rephrase" (p. 152). Significantly, in Itsik's rephrasing, he switches from the pronominal *ZE* (third person, singular, neutralized for case, formally masculine but often neutralized for gender in informal talk) to *HU* (third person, singular, masculine, nominative), as well as adding the temporal adverbial *AXSHAV* ("NOW") to focus his question.¹⁰ In keeping with contemporary sociolinguistic variation in Hebrew-speaking Israel, his use of *HU*—which maintains the grammatical gender and case distinction—in line 3 helps to reformulate line 1 in a more formal register.

In short, there are a great many reasons that interviewees were so impressed with Excerpt 1, simultaneously associating it with Latino

educación while opposing it to Israeli interactional pragmatics. These formal devices succeeded in calibrating the turn to a distinct realm that is treated as an elsewhere, not in Israel. The devices help to constitute Itsik's turn at talk as a bit of what Goffman (1967) called "interaction ritual". Itsik's ability to momentarily inhabit such a realm helps him to establish a new footing with me, which allows him to pry into my research with a constant stream of questions. This was especially effective given that his mother had already berated him and implied that he was not considerate. Indeed, it is very probably the sense that *educación* comes from elsewhere that enables the associated pragmatics to be so effective for the purposes to which Itsik and other Latinos used them. To avoid the stereotype of the impatient and nosy Israeli children, Latinos can integrate aspects of *educación* to produce a more Latino context into the ongoing interaction.

CONCLUSION

In Excerpts 2 and 3, José and Teodora react with astonishment to Itsik's interactional move in Excerpt 1. The astonishment they register—and here they represent the overwhelming majority of the 52 interviewees—is due in part to the contrast that they heard in earlier examples of Itsik and Barbara arguing. But it is also because of the dramatic degree of polished *educación* that the 12-year-old displays. It is as if Itsik is suddenly talking from another realm. The speaking subject Itsik manages to represent at that moment emerges from another world, the diasporic homeland. The astonishment interviewees sensed, which I shared, stems from this diasporic calibration. The poignancy is amplified by the fact that Itsik manages this while speaking his youthful, native Hebrew. Most noncitizen Latinos in Israel are not accustomed to hearing such refined speech from Latino youth, much less when they interact in Hebrew-speaking contexts. When it suddenly makes an appearance in Latino youth in this way, *educación* thus appears deterritorialized, from an ethereal realm called "Latin America" from which Latinos understand themselves to come.

In ways that can only be touched upon here, Excerpt 1 points to a much more complex process of language and deterritorialization. Indeed, as many adult Latinos themselves admit, their sensitivity to *educación* has shifted. They are not as strict as their own parents were, and, they sometimes would state, Israeli directness in interaction might offer a model of intimacy for a more modern relation with their children.

The fact that Latinos are able to perceive a distinction between Spanish and *educación* as interactional pragmatics—despite their prevailing ideologies—also complicates questions that are traditionally studied as a migrant process of language shift or of code-switching versus borrowing. The intuitions of shifting interactional practices suggests that the complex interplay between language structure, use (or practice), and ideology requires multiple methodologies to

better capture what happens to language in diasporic and transnational contexts. Indeed, this chapter suggests that, to study such contexts, it is necessary to go beyond narrow definitions of and assumptions about code to see how shifting interactional pragmatics serve to found (and ultimately stabilize) the perceived boundaries of languages in multilingual settings.

NOTES

1. I am extremely grateful to the editors, Rosina Márquez Reiter and Luisa Martín Rojo, for carrying this project through with great patience and to Isobel Rainey for her editorial expertise. I am also indebted to the reviewers and Hilary Parsons Dick for excellent comments that improved this paper. All errors remain my own.
2. All names are pseudonyms to protect the privacy of my interlocutors in the field.
3. Throughout this chapter, I use *italics* for Spanish and SMALL CAPS for Hebrew. In some places I use both to indicate that the distinction between Spanish and Hebrew has been neutralized.
4. See below for more context about these noncitizen Latinos. The fieldwork took place intermittently from the late 1990s to 2007, the longest portion being from September 2004 to July 2006.
5. For more, see Paz (2009, 2010) and Kalir (2010).
6. It is worth noting that, for Silverstein, metapragmatics is an integral part of semiosis: the aspect of the signal that regiments indexical (denotational and nondenotational) phenomena. Roughly speaking, this occurs on a cline of explicitness to implicitness, including the metricized or textually contrastive.
7. This issue was earlier broached by Jakobson (1971) as a relation between narrated and speech event.
8. The social parameters for this transformation are the subject of several publications in progress, but a preliminary statement is in Paz (2010).
9. Other functions are hedging and focusing, along with incipient use in metapragmatic frames for quotation.
10. It is probably the case that ZE in this function also neutralizes number.

REFERENCES

- Agha, A. (1998). Stereotypes and registers of honorific language. *Language in Society*, 27, 151–93.
- Alvarez, R. R. (1995). The Mexican-US border: The making of an anthropology of borderlands. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 447–470.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Axel, B. (2002). The diasporic imaginary. *Public Culture*, 14, 411–428.
- Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*. Langhorne, PA: Gordon and Breach Science Publisher.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 131–146.

- Brodwin, P. (2003). Marginality and subjectivity in the Haitian diaspora. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 76, 383–410.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (2005). The “diaspora” diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28, 1–19.
- Butler, K. (2001). Defining diaspora, refining a discourse. *Diaspora*, 10, 189–219.
- Clifford, J. (1994). Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9, 302–338.
- Cohen, R. (2008). *Global diasporas: An introduction* (2nd ed.). London/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Das, S. (2008). Between convergence and divergence: Reformulating language purism in the Montreal Tamil diasporas. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 18, 1–23.
- Dick, H. P. (2010). Imagined lives and modernist chronotopes in Mexican nonmigrant discourse. *American Ethnologist*, 37, 275–290.
- Eisenlohr, P. (2004). Temporalities of community: Ancestral language, pilgrimage, and diasporic belonging in Mauritius. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 14, 81–98.
- Eisenlohr, P. (2006). *Little India: Diaspora, time, and ethnolinguistic belonging in Hindu Mauritius*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Irvine, J., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1971). Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. In Roman Jakobson, ed., *Selected writings, volume 2: Word and language* (pp. 130–147). The Hague: Mouton.
- Kalir, B. (2010). *Latino migrants in the Jewish state: Undocumented lives in Israel*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli sabra culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katriel, T. (2004). *Dialogic moments: From soul talks to talk radio in Israeli culture*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Kemp, A., & Rajiman, R. (2008). *Migrants and workers: The political economy of labor migration in Israel* [Original in Hebrew]. Jerusalem: Van Leer Jerusalem Institute.
- Maschler, Y. (2009). *Metalanguage in interaction: Hebrew discourse markers*. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamin.
- Paz, A. (2009). The circulation of *chisme* and *rumor*: Gossip, evidentiality, and authority in the perspective of Latino labor migrants in Israel. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19, 117–43.
- Paz, A. (2010). *Discursive transformations: The emergence of ethnolinguistic identity among Latin American migrant workers and their children in Israel*. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Rockefeller, S. (2011). Flow. *Current Anthropology*, 52, 557–578.
- Schieffelin, B., Woolard, K., & Kroskrity, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Shukla, S. (2001). Locations for South Asian diasporas. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 551–572.
- Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics* (pp. 33–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmel, G. (1950). The stranger. In *The sociology of Georg Simmel*, K. Wolff (trans.), (pp. 402–408). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Yelvington, K. (2001). The anthropology of Afro-Latin America and the Caribbean: Diasporic dimensions. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 227–260.
- Zeleva, P. (2005). Rewriting the African diaspora: Beyond the Black Atlantic. *African Affairs*, 104, 35–68.