Book Publishing Final Research Paper   English

5-2016

Foreign Word Alert, Foreign Word Alert: Rethinking Editorial Approaches to the Italicization of Foreign Terms

Katey Trnka
Portland State University

Recommended Citation

Trnka, Katey, "*Foreign Word Alert, Foreign Word Alert*: Rethinking Editorial Approaches to the Italicization of Foreign Terms" (2016). *Book Publishing Final Research Paper*. 14.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/eng_bookpubpaper/14

Foreign Word Alert, Foreign Word Alert: Rethinking Editorial Approaches to the Italicization of

Foreign Terms

Katey Trnka

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Writing: Book Publishing

May 10, 2016

Research Question:

Several style guides dictate that foreign words in running text be set in italics, but those

individuals concerned with marginalization are questioning this rule in increasing numbers. With

an eye to authorial intent and inclusiveness, is it time to do away with this stylistic dictum

wholesale, or are there valid reasons for keeping this convention in play?

In a 2014 YouTube video, author Daniel José Older addresses a question he frequently hears when he speaks about his works of speculative fiction: "Why don't you italicize non-English words in the text?"[1] For Older, the answer is simple: italicized foreign words add false emphasis. But for the benefit of a less-informed audience, he demonstrates the logic behind that claim through the use of dramatic pauses and costumes in the video. He changes camera angles and dons a panama hat before saying—in implied italics—he's been to el supermercado because he needed groceries, and he puffs a cigar when he says he went to la bibliotheca in search of some books. Older elaborates that "When a native speaker . . . switches back and forth between languages, it does not sound like this."[2] And yet, this is the way non-English text is marked according to *The Chicago Manual of Style* (the guide most commonly used in American trade publishing), the *MLA Handbook*, and the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. The only of the four major style guides to not use italics, the *Associated Press Stylebook*, uses quotation marks instead. The other two main uses of italics dictated by *The Chicago Manual of Style*—to provide emphasis and to illuminate key terms—don't necessarily align with their use for foreign words: italics have an "othering" effect, designed to slow down comprehension and exaggerate differences. For many authors and readers, especially those from marginalized communities and including those who identify as multilingual (or "codeswitching"), highlighting differences only further demonstrates an imbalance of power in the world of contemporary publishing. Though Older puts the sentiment that italics aren't appropriate for codeswitching in a humorous, visual context, he is far from the only author who has been vocal about it in recent years.

---

[1] Daniel José Older, "Why We Don't Italicize Spanish," YouTube video, August 4, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=24gCI3Ur7FM.

[2] Ibid.

Junot Díaz has famously railed against italicization of foreign words as a stylistic convention, and authors such as Gloria Anzaldua and Lois-Ann Yamanaka have also spoken in support of leaving foreign words in roman type. Whether these authors are part of a passionate minority or are pushing back against the established treatment of foreign words as part of a growing trend is worth considering, as are their motivations. Also important is whether or not a case can be made for preserving the standard formatting, and if any minority authors support this preservation. Are there alternatives to an either-or approach to italicized foreign words that allow for a greater sense of inclusiveness while still calling out unfamiliar terms to monolingual readers? Ultimately, should italics remain the standard format for foreign words, or is it time to investigate other options in deference to a more inclusive publishing market? While defaulting to italicizing foreign words is arguably an antiquated practice, several factors—including audience, literary mode, and authorial intent—must be considered before reaching a decision on the treatment of such terms.

Author Allison Green, who requested that her publisher not italicize Spanish[3] words in her memoir, *The Ghosts Who Travel with Me*, contends that there is likely a growing trend at work, but acknowledges her limited view of the issue: "I'm not sure how broad-based [it is]. Some writers who are multilingual or are writing about multilingual people are undoubtedly continuing in [other writers'] footsteps and demanding that languages other than English be considered normal and not foreign."[4] But Green has spoken with another author about the issue, and that author was "perfectly happy" to italicize Spanish in her novel set in Texas. She was in fact unsure of how to call out foreign words, however, she felt compelled to not use italics after

---

[3] It's worth noting that this paper will deal primarily with Spanish within an English publishing industry. Though other languages are mentioned in the research currently available, Spanish's place as the top minority language spoken in the US dictates that a large share recent scholarship focuses on native Spanish speakers and writers.
[4] Allison Green, "Interview Questions," e-mail message to author, April 22, 2016.

her agent shared her work with other authors who had more fully formed opinions on the issue. "This suggests there might be a growing trend—or it might just happen to be the writers her agent showed [her draft] to."[5] In other words, the vocal minority may be overshadowing a more complacent or less-informed majority. But it's likely that minority is growing in number.

Editor and literary agent DongWon Song notes that, from his standpoint, "Ten years ago no one was talking about [the use of italics] and it was a non-issue. . . . Our understanding of how language and culture operates is constantly evolving and as underrepresented voices demand more of our time and attention, their issues are becoming more visible to everyone."[6] The lack of visibility of minority issues existed in part because of the longstanding oral tradition for marginalized authors, and strong cultures of collective storytelling are only one of a host of factors contributing to minority texts' relatively small share of the print market. Due to myriad issues, including colonialism and access to markets, only more recently have minority authors occupied such a large share of the trade publishing landscape, and much of the existing research on the issues of italics and codeswitching focuses on works published after 1990. Evelyn Nien-Ming Chen's 2004 book *Weird English* highlights authors who came to prominence in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, including Junot Díaz, Salman Rushdie, and Lois-Ann Yamanaka; Lourdes Torres's 2007 article "In the Contact Zone: Code-switching Strategies by Latino/a Writers" examines works by writers including Sandra Cisneros and Judith Ortiz Cofer; and more informal, candid discussions with contemporary authors on the issue of italicizing foreign words have appeared on *The Renegade Word* and Emerson College's *Ploughshares* blog within the past five years.

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] DongWon Song, "Interview Questions," e-mail message to author, April 23, 2016.

A focus on contemporary works also suggests a close association with the rise of postcolonial literature, a mode in which the effects of colonization are examined and aspects of native cultures and identity are reclaimed. As more minority writers produce postcolonial works, it seems only natural that we will see more literature designed to resist established norms, and specifically, the exploitation of otherness.

In general, the trend toward not italicizing foreign words is intensely political and social in motivation. As one of the more recognizable authors leading the movement, Junot Díaz relies on the changing ethnic landscape of the United States to justify his point of view that "Spanish is not a minority language. Not in this hemisphere, not in the United States, not in the world inside my head. So why treat it like one? Why "other" it? Why de-normalize it?"[7] In 2011, as the US population over 5 years of age swelled to 291.5 million, an American Community Survey study noted that Spanish was the second-most spoken language among households, with over 37.8 million people in this group (about 13 percent) using Spanish at home.[8] These findings do have several disclaimers—chief among them for our purposes that it's not immediately clear how well or how often Spanish is spoken in these households; however, speaking a language at home suggests a greater level of connection with that language—more often than not, a familial connection. Moreover, the number of Spanish speakers is continually growing, and expected to reach 41 million by 2020.[9] With this growth, Lourdes Torres notes, "it will be interesting to see if Spanish continues to muscle its way into what have been exclusively English language arenas. If radical bilingual literary texts prove to be viable in the marketplace, it is conceivable that in

---

[7] Evelyn Nien-Ming Chi'en, *Weird English*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 204.
[8] Camille Ryan, "Language Use in the United States: 2011," *American Community Survey Reports*, August 2013, https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acs-22.pdf.
[9] Mark Hugo Lopez and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera, "What is the future of Spanish in the United States?," *The Pew Research Center* (web), September 5, 2013, http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/09/05/what-is-the-future-of-spanish-in-the-united-states/.

the coming years Spanish will appropriate more and more textual space in Latino/a fiction published by mainstream presses."[10] With immersive language programs springing up in schools nationwide, the increasing appropriation of Spanish terms in English, and dynamic changes in our nation's demographics, Díaz's wish to "remind readers of the mutability of languages"[11] is well founded, and his particular application of that wish through his formatting choices appropriate. As for the readers who experience frustration when presented with foreign terms? Díaz advises them to consult a dictionary, and he passed this solution along to participants in a Voices of Our Nation Arts Foundation (VONA) writing workshop he facilitated. "[Díaz] knew what he was doing," author Jennifer De Leon, who was in attendance, says. "After all, if a writer from the majority culture uses specific terminology from polo or tennis, the reader is expected to look it up."[12]

Allison Green first associated the idea of not italicizing foreign words not with Díaz, but with Gloria Anzaldua, whose work mostly predates the movement championed by Díaz. Anzaldua's 1987 essay "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" illustrates not only the issue of unnecessarily calling out linguistic differences, but of reinforcing marginalization: "Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having always to translate . . . and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate."[13] To Anzaldua, drawing so much attention to her particular code not only others it, but reinforces the dominance of and catering to the majority.

[10] Lourdes Torres, "In the Contact Zone: Code-switching Strategies by Latino/a Writers," *MELUS* 32 (2007): 92. http://www.jstor.org/stable/30029707.
[11] Evelyn Nien-Ming Chi'en, *Weird English*, 204.
[12] Jennifer De Leon, "The Borderlands of Language: Using Italics for "Foreign" Words (Part 1)," *Ploughshares* (blog), August 27, 2012 (8:00 a.m.), http://blog.pshares.org/index.php/the-borderlands-of-language-using-italics-for-foreign-words-part-i/.
[13] Green, "Interview Questions."

Indian American author Mira Jacob ties the motivations of both Díaz and Anzaldua together quite well, stating in a 2015 speech on race and publishing:

> We are living in a time when what it means to be "other" is shifting dramatically. When my white best friend can and will help me unpack a racially fraught situation. When I can put a piece of a graphic memoir I'm working on right now—this little thing about my son's obsession with Michael Jackson and how it relates to everything from what happened in Ferguson [Missouri] to what happens in my marriage—[online] and it goes viral within an hour. I looked at who was sharing that, and guess what? . . . It was everyone. Because we are all so ready to talk about the world we are living in.[14]

While not calling for a movement away from italics explicitly, Jacob's argument easily extends to the issue, and samples of her work online[15] suggest she does not use italics for foreign words, either. The intersection of so many "other[s]" in a public forum dictates more inclusiveness on the part of that forum, and what better way to make a more inclusive environment than to normalize perceived differences? Indeed, De Leon argues the use of italics in this context offers a trigger warning of sorts, "signaling to readers—*foreign word alert, foreign word alert*[.]"[16] In the interest of allowing readers to absorb new linguistic experiences in an organic way, and to challenge them, it is in our best interest as mediators to withhold any unnecessary cues.

Other authors invested in the movement away from italicization cite issues of point of view in their writing. This is certainly the case for Lysley Tenorio, a Filipino American short-

---

[14] Mira Jacob, "I Gave A Speech About Race To the Publishing Industry And No One Heard Me," *Buzzfeed Books*, September 17, 2015 (2:42 p.m.), https://www.buzzfeed.com/mirajacob/you-will-ignore-us-at-your-own-peril?utm_term=.idLNPMkBN#.dxY0x8240.

[15] Mira Jacob, *The Sleepwalker's Guide to Dancing*, (New York: Random House, 2014), Google Books, https://books.google.com/books?id=KhmBAgAAQBAJ&pg=PT15&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=4#v=onepage&q&f=false.

[16] De Leon, "The Borderlands of Language."

story writer, who says that, "Since I mostly write in the first person, the use of italics feels odd to me . . . the idea of italicizing a word that is part of [a character's] everyday vocabulary, psyche, and reality, seems to make that word almost alien, as if suddenly defamiliarized within a context that's completely familiar."[17] If one of the goals of a piece of literature is to immerse the reader in a character's world, then the use of italics is distracting, and it creates more distance and interrupts narrative flow.

For all the benefits of not italicizing foreign words in primarily English texts—placing marginalized voices and the majority language on more equal footing, reflecting actual speech patterns of native speakers, and not overprotecting monolingual readers from the realities of unfamiliar linguistic territory—there are drawbacks, too. Perhaps chief among them is Díaz's solution to the struggle of the monolingual reader—to simply have them look up unfamiliar terms. While Díaz argues that the same demands are made of readers encountering jargon in English, this advice disregards the fact that many of the unique terms used in his work aren't ones that would likely be found in a dictionary. A heavy use of slang and hybrid languages like Spanglish ensure the unfamiliar reader little hope in discovering the meaning of a word through traditional outlets. Readers arguably benefit from a callout of a foreign term, and a formatting change, such as the use of italics, is one of the less obtrusive ways to keep readers from stumbling.

Another disadvantage of not using italics for foreign words, Torres warns, is the risk of cultural appropriation. "Foreign words can be used in ways that support mainstream culture, just

---

[17] Jennifer De Leon, "To italicize or not to italicize? Authors speak up on the use of 'foreign' words in prose (Part II)," *Ploughshares* (blog), September 3, 2012 (10:39 a.m.), http://blog.pshares.org/index.php/to-italicize-or-not-to-italicize-authors-speak-up-on-the-use-of-foreign-words-in-prose-pt-ii/.

as English words can be used in ways that resist standard usage and connotations,"[18] she says. Using predictable or expected foreign words can reinforce tropes, while wordplay and figures of speech are only the simplest ways writers can appropriate a majority language for their own purposes. Referencing Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, postcolonial theorists and the authors of *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practices in Post-Colonial Literatures*, she continues: "untranslated words in a text seem to have a special power to signify a culture and an identity, but it is important not to be carried away by the romantic notion that they always operate in ways that empower a minority culture."[19] One way in which this problem manifests itself is in relying solely on terms already commonly associated with minorities (food and place terms, for example), potentially reinforcing stereotypes, or contributing to a shallow, pandering tone in a narrative. While these terms would likely not be italicized in text because of their assimilation into the English language, their use is not introducing more than a surface understanding of another culture.

Finally, not italicizing words can lead authors and editors to employ alternative, more distracting signals for otherness. Foreign terms immediately followed by in-text definitions disrupt narrative flow, and glossaries at the end of a text, usually signaled with an endnote reference, quite literally pull the reader out of an experience by dictating that they flip ahead. Quotation marks, which are used in AP style, have a delegitimizing effect when considered alongside their use for irony. With these setbacks in mind, we turn to authors who actually prefer italics for foreign words.

Sandra Cisneros is perhaps the most famous name in this camp, and her reasons for italicizing foreign words are more artistic than political: Working primarily as a poet, her

---

[18] Torres, "In the Contact Zone," 82.
[19] Ibid.

performance of a piece relies on cues like accents and italics to guide pronunciation. After attending VONA, De Leon went to Macondo, a workshop founded by Cisneros, where Cisneros explained that "A poet on the stage needs to know if she should say "mole" as in a mole on someone's face, or "mole" as in a Mexican sauce."[20] Many words require some explanatory formatting to ensure their correct stress.

Some authors resist the call to arms against italics for more nuanced, aesthetic reasons than the logic of pronunciation. Novelist Angie Chau states her preference for using italics as a way to "ground the story further in place and give the story more color."[21] In saying this, Chau makes clear her desire to emphasize the otherness of her narratives, to remind readers that the world they are in is likely one beyond their everyday understanding and that they should keep alert; the ability for the reader to simply skim over unfamiliar text is lessened by the use of alternative formatting.

Even Tenorio admits to the merit of using italics in certain situations: "I believe italics can be useful, and at times necessary. If readers are willing to invest their precious time into reading your work, it may help them to know that a particular word is in a non-English language, so that they're not stumbling or re-reading to make sure they haven't tripped up. That can pull readers out of the narrative too."[22] Tenorio's statement is a practical one, conceding to a perceived audience of monolinguals, and it speaks to issues of inclusiveness not just for the minority, but for the likely majority reader who may struggle—perhaps unnecessarily—with a codeswitching text.

---

[20] De Leon, "The Borderlands of Language."
[21] De Leon, "To italicize or not to italicize."
[22] Ibid.

To pit those who are opposed to italicization against those who prefer the convention, however, disregards a wide range of alternative formatting that provides varying levels of inclusiveness. These alternatives are outlined in Torres's article, and include anything from using only words that have been officially assimilated into the English lexicon (for example, in a dictionary), to radical bilingualism (works with "sustained code-switching . . . [that] can only be read by a bilingual audience"[23]). Each of these options presents a range of advantages and disadvantages to the majority and minority reader, with some obviously tailored to favoring one or the other. When efforts are made to ensure readability by the majority, the minority may feel understimulated by redundant text; when efforts are made to embrace the minority language and culture, the majority may feel excluded and may even be unable to read a work.

The most modest—and common, in American trade publishing—of options for embedding foreign terms within a predominantly English narrative is to only use words that are included in a standard English dictionary and are easily recognizable to a monolingual reader. Food items such taco or mango, places terms like casa or hacienda, and items of the like are easily assimilated into an English text. Using this approach as a means of introducing culture and language, however, rings rather hollow, as readers are not challenged by these terms in the least. Because of their long-standing position in everyday conversations, these terms aren't pushing for greater inclusiveness, and italicizing them would be unquestionably awkward, much less an informative mechanism.[24]

Perhaps the next step along the plane of options for multilingual authors is the use of Spanish followed immediately by an English translation. (A variation on this approach is to

---

[23] Torres, "In the Contact Zone," 86.

[24] In the first part of De Leon's *Ploughshares* blog, she recounts an experience she participated in a writing workshop early on in her career: "I italicized words like: *por favor*, *bueno*, *Señora*. I'm embarrassed to admit that I even italicized *taco*. I know."

include a glossary at the end of a text.) This tactic is similarly navigable for monolingual readers, presenting unfamiliar terms in an approachable, undemanding way. Sadly, in addition to being easy to digest and benefitting the monolingual reader, these two strategies also reinforce age-old power dynamics on the page, "serv[ing] to perpetuate mainstream expectations of the . . . text in that they allow the reader to believe that s/he is interacting with and appropriating the linguistic Other . . . The monolingual is catered to and the bilingual reader must endure redundant references."[25] Put in harsher (but not inaccurate) terms, these tactics can be seen as a manifestation of colonialism, in which the monolingual reader gains a false sense of enlightenment from minimal exposure.

On the other side of the spectrum are alternatives to italics that cater to the bilingual reader. While the method employed by writers like Díaz and Anzaldua—letting foreign words appear "with no translation, and the terms are not italicized, or marked as foreign in any way"[26] can be explored from many angles, it's important to note that their approach is actually considered quite moderate, "paving the way for writers who want to attempt more daring linguistic experiments."[27] Among these more adventurous techniques is the use of calques, or "creative English renditions of [foreign] words and phrases translated literally or figuratively."[28] Examples of this include character names in Cisneros's *Caramelo*: Cisneros uses rough approximations of Spanish terms to create awkward-sounding English names including Aunty Light-Skin. To the bilingual reader, this easily translates to Titi Blanca, granting them access to another level of meaning within the text, and Torres notes, "probably read[s] oddly to the

---

[25] Torres, "In the Contact Zone," 78.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid., 87.
[28] Ibid., 78.

monolingual reader, but amuse[s] the bilingual one."[29] Rather than being truly redundant, as in the use of explanatory apparatuses like in-text definitions and glossaries, the hidden meaning gratifies the bilingual reader, whose ability to codeswitch allows them to grasp more from the text.

Even more striking is a tactic employed by Lois-Ann Yamanaka in her novel *Wild Meat and the Bully Burgers*: Yamanaka italicizes English dialogue while leaving pidgin in roman, othering the majority readership and emphasizing how strange and exotic American English sounds to the protagonist. By reversing standard formatting, Yamanaka inverts the power dynamics inherent in that formatting: the perceived benefit goes to the minority or bilingual reader, and the discomfort typically felt by the minority is instead foisted upon the majority. This is not a question so much of Yamanaka's intended audience (which, with publication by major imprint Farrar Strauss, is fairly large and diverse), but of what she wants her audience to feel— the same isolation and otherness her protagonist, a young Japanese girl wrestling with issues of identity, feels.

With all of the points of contention around something as seemingly simple as slanted font, one might wonder where to begin in developing a working code for the use of italics to set off foreign words. The best place to look first might be to the consideration of authorial intent: Julie M. Rodriguez, a freelance editor and contributor to *The Renegade Word*, believes that "Ultimately . . . this is a choice that's best left up to the author to decide. We've had it hammered into our heads for so long by the literature we read that there's only one way to format foreign words in text, even if we're using a language that we speak in our day-to-day lives without even thinking about it. So start thinking: about what you're trying to really say, and about the audience

---

[29] Ibid., 84.

you're writing for."[30] In this advice, Rodriguez isn't advocating for any particular formatting choice for foreign words; rather, she invites her readers to question the standards, and to use or dismiss them in line with their own intentions. DongWon Song expands on this advice, noting that there's room for deviation on the formatting of foreign words: "If your intention is to create a more fully integrative experience—say a novel that embeds the reader in a multicultural family, then ital[ics are] probably inappropriate given the already fluid language and cultural barriers. If your story is a thriller where a foreigner is kidnapped in another country and you want a mood of isolation and menace, then ital[ics] make a bit more sense."[31] An author's intent in one piece is almost certainly different from their intent in their next piece, and their choice of formatting should be consistent with their aims within a piece rather than within their works as a whole.

The other issue one must contend with in developing a code for formatting foreign words is the author's intended audience. For Junot Díaz, his personally designated audience is almost always his "six best friends and the rest of the world,"[32] and his choice to not use italics for foreign words is consistent with that, as his six best friends likely share much of their language with him. For other writers, most of whom write for an audience larger than six people intimately familiar with their language and culture, the issue becomes more complex and worthy of increased critical attention. To apply an absolute rule for the formatting of foreign words, be it to italicize or to not italicize them, likely proves too simplified an approach.

Preliminary research on this topic began with the inkling that it is perhaps time to do away with italics completely as a convention for foreign words in literary works, to use them

---

[30] Julie M. Rodriguez, "Should You Italicize Foreign Words In Your Writing?" *The Renegade Word* (blog), August 14, 2014, https://www.renegadeword.com/how-to-write/italicize-foreign-words-writing.
[31] Song, "Interview Questions."
[32] De Leon, "The Borderlands of Language."

only for emphasis and to illustrate key terms (much like in a foreign language textbook). As I

dove deeper into research, however, I was surprised to find the issue far more nuanced than I

originally thought, with support on both sides; additionally, a spectrum of alternatives arose, with

varying levels of inclusive or exclusive formatting proposed for a wide range of reasons. This is

only natural when uncovering more lenses through which to view an issue: Not only is this an

issue with political undertones, it's also one of access and power dynamics, of the potential

performance of a piece, and of intended audience. De Leon's advice that one should "Consider

your intended audience first; italicize second"[33] seems a good starting point for authors, but

editors and publishers need to be invested in this issue as well. As the gatekeepers to an

audience, both editors and publishers wield a tremendous amount of power over authors, and

using that power to best represent an author's intentions and to honor an audience's best interests

is crucial. While it might seem simple enough to have a conversation with authors about their

preferences, scholarly editors remind us of the complexities of navigating certain power

constructs and the perceived barriers to authors writing from minority backgrounds. In "Editing

'Minority' Texts," William L. Andrews recounts his experience as a hungry assistant professor

asking Alex Haley about *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, which Haley had an ambiguous role

in producing. When his question about a lost manuscript was met with an "utterly impassive"[34]

look and no answer, Andrews was forced to reconsider his and Haley's respective positions in

the publishing industry. It is from this reevaluation that Andrews proposes the following

approach to editing the work of minority writers:

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] William L. Andrews, "Editing 'Minority' Texts,' in *The Margins of the Text*, ed. D.C. Greetham, 45–56. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 46.

It seems to me that editors of minority texts need more interchange and mutual

consultation on the intellectual, social, and financial politics of the kind of editing they

do. We need a mechanism, such as the Committee for Scholarly Editions, whereby

prospective editors can consult with more experienced editors about everything from

how to propose an edition to a publisher to how to deal with copyeditors over questions

having to do with regularizing spelling and language usage in a given text. We need

forums that will help us consider the larger implications of the choices and decisions we

make with regard to writers and texts that we want to reconstruct.[35]

Though Andrews proposes this "mechanism" from his perspective as a scholarly editor,

compiling critical editions of works by authors who are often deceased, his point is applicable in

the context of trade publishing as well. The key difference between scholarly and trade

publishing, of course, is that relationship dynamics between the author and the publisher are

much more often at work in the latter, as authors are usually alive and available to comment on

their choices. Within the contemporary, mainstream market, considerations about larger

implications still need to be made. Editors need to consider the unintended effects of formatting

with an eye to inclusiveness for both the author—their intentions and their background—and the

audience—their right to clarity and their ability and desire to comprehend complex material.

While several schools of thought, including postcolonial theory, may influence this issue,

especially as more authors producing postcolonial works emerge, trade editors, like their

scholarly counterparts, lack an official committee for oversight on issues such as the treatment of

foreign words; whether one will emerge in the future is a question worth entertaining, perhaps in

another paper. For now, however, more discussion, sensitivity, and questioning of norms when

---

[35] Ibid., 54.

considering italicizing foreign terms—rather than a blanket acceptance of rules put forth by a

range of style guides—is necessary, particularly in the ever-evolving, increasingly diverse

landscape of American publishing.

Bibliography

Andrews, William L. "Editing 'Minority' Texts. In *The Margins of the Text*, edited by D.C. Greetham, 45–56. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Chi'en, Evelyn Nien-Ming. *Weird English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

De Leon, Jennifer. "The Borderlands of Language: Using Italics for 'Foreign' Words (Part 1)." *Ploughshares* (blog), August 27, 2012 (8:00 a.m.), http://blog.pshares.org/index.php/the-borderlands-of-language-using-italics-for-foreign-words-part-i/.

De Leon, Jennifer. "To italicize or not to italicize? Authors speak up on the use of 'foreign' words in prose (Part II)." *Ploughshares* (blog), September 3, 2012 (10:39 a.m.), http://blog.pshares.org/index.php/to-italicize-or-not-to-italicize-authors-speak-up-on-the-use-of-foreign-words-in-prose-pt-ii/.

Green, Allison. "Interview Questions." E-mail message to author, April 22, 2016.

Jacob, Mira. "I Gave a Speech About Race To The Publishing Industry And No One Heard Me." *Buzzfeed Books* (web), September 17, 2015, https://www.buzzfeed.com/mirajacob/you-will-ignore-us-at-your-own-peril?utm_term=.cp9x2WEbx#.bcXZNkYEZ.

Jacob, Mira. *The Sleepwalker's Guide to Dancing*. New York: Random House, 2014. Google Books. https://books.google.com/books?id=KhmBAgAAQBAJ&pg=PT4&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=3#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Lopez, Mark Hugo and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera. "What is the future of Spanish in the United States?" *The Pew Research Center* (web), September 5, 2013, http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/09/05/what-is-the-future-of-spanish-in-the-united-states/.

Older, Daniel José. "Why We Don't Italicize Spanish." YouTube video, August 4, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=24gCI3Ur7FM.

Rodriguez, Julie M. "Should You Italicize Foreign Words In Your Writing?" *The Renegade Word* (blog), August 14, 2014, https://www.renegadeword.com/how-to-write/italicize-foreign-words-writing/.

Ryan, Camille. "Language Use in the United States: 2011." *American Community Survey Reports* (August 2013): https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acs-22.pdf.

Song, DongWon. "Interview Questions." E-mail message to author, April 23, 2016.

Torres, Lourdes. "In the Contact Zone: Code-Switching Strategies by Latino/a Writers." *MELUS* 32 (2007): 75–96. http://www.jstor.org/stable/30029707.