

3. When discussing cultural identification, Anzaldúa uses the term “copping out” three times in paragraph 38. Then, in paragraph 40, she shifts to “not copping out.” What does she mean by “copping out” and “not copping out”? Who is copping out and of what? What arguments regarding language and cultural identity does she make in paragraphs 38–40?

Reflection and Response

4. Why does Anzaldúa think that Chicanos need a “secret language” (par. 13)? And what does she mean when she says that “language is a homeland closer than the Southwest” (par. 13)? Use textual evidence from the essay to support your answer.
5. Anzaldúa writes, “So, if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity — I am my language” (par. 27). Do you agree? Explain why or why not. Consider your own relationship with language as well as Anzaldúa’s reasoning.
6. Look at several of the passages containing Spanish and English, and note where Anzaldúa explains the Spanish in English and where she does not. How do you react to these passages? Do they pose a barrier to understanding her meaning? Why do you think Anzaldúa leaves the Spanish untranslated?

Making Connections

7. In paragraph 14, Anzaldúa describes all her languages, including her “‘home’ tongues.” Amy Tan writes about her “mother tongue” (p. 163), and Kristen Hawley Turner refers to “home discourse” and “home literacy” (p. 199). Read Tan’s and Turner’s essays and explore this idea of a home language or home literacy by putting these writers in conversation with each other. In other words, explain where their ideas intersect with each other’s and with Anzaldúa’s. Where do all three writers diverge? What does each writer add to the concept of a home language that can help you explain it? Make sure to add your own ideas on home languages to theirs.
8. Anzaldúa writes, “Chicanos did not know we were a people until 1965 when Cesar Chavez and the farmworkers united and *I Am Joaquín* was published and *la Raza Unida* party was formed in Texas . . . — we became aware of our reality and acquired a name and a language” (par. 41). Research the history of the Chicano movement, focusing on the importance of borders, borderlands, and language in the creation of the movement. Using your research and examples from Anzaldúa’s essay, explain the significance of those three aspects in the Chicano movement.

Leave Your Name at the Border

Manuel Muñoz

A novelist and short story writer, Manuel Muñoz currently teaches creative writing at the University of Arizona, Tucson. He has published a novel, *What You See in the Dark* (2011), and two short

story collections, *The Faith Healer of Olive Avenue* (2007) and *Zigzagger* (2003). His work has appeared in the *New York Times*, *Glimmer Train*, *Epoch*, *Eleven Eleven*, and *Boston Review*.

In “Leave Your Name at the Border,” which first appeared in the *New York Times* in 2007, Muñoz considers the personal and collective consequences of Anglicized pronunciations of Mexican names. Pay attention to how he places his personal experiences within a wider cultural context in order to emphasize the complexity of language’s place in our lives.

At the Fresno airport, as I made my way to the gate, I heard a name over the intercom. The way the name was pronounced by the gate agent made me want to see what she looked like. That is, I wanted to see whether she was Mexican. Around Fresno, identity politics rarely deepen into exacting terms, so to say “Mexican” means, essentially, “not white.” The slivered self-identifications Chicano, Hispanic, Mexican-American and Latino are not part of everyday life in the Valley. You’re either Mexican or you’re not. If someone wants to know if you were born in Mexico, they’ll ask. Then you’re From Over There—de allá. And leave it at that.

The gate agent, it turned out, was Mexican. Well-coiffed, in her 30s, she wore foundation that was several shades lighter than the rest of her skin. It was the kind of makeup job I’ve learned to silently identify at the mall when I’m with my mother, who will say nothing about it until we’re back in the car. Then she’ll stretch her neck like an ostrich and point to the darkness of her own skin, wondering aloud why women try to camouflage who they are.

I watched the Mexican gate agent busy herself at the counter, professional and studied. Once again, she picked up the microphone and, with authority, announced the name of the missing customer: “Eugenio Reyes, please come to the front desk.”

You can probably guess how she said it. Her Anglicized pronunciation wouldn’t be unusual in a place like California’s Central Valley. I didn’t have a Mexican name there either: I was an instruction guide.

When people ask me where I’m from, I say Fresno because I don’t expect them to know little Dinuba. Fresno is a booming city of nearly

500,000 these days, with a diversity—white, Mexican, African-American, Armenian, Hmong and Middle Eastern people are all well represented—that shouldn't surprise anyone. It's in the small towns like Dinuba that surround Fresno that the awareness of cultural difference is stripped down to the interactions between the only two groups that tend to live there: whites and Mexicans. When you hear a Mexican name spoken in these towns, regardless of the speaker's background, it's no wonder that there's an "English way of pronouncing it."

I was born in 1972, part of a generation that learned both English and Spanish. Many of my cousins and siblings are bilingual, serving as translators for those in the family whose English is barely functional. Others have no way of following the Spanish banter at family gatherings. You can tell who falls into which group: Estella, Eric, Delia, Dubina, Melanie.

It's intriguing to watch "American" names begin to dominate among my nieces and nephews and second cousins, as well as with the children of my hometown friends. I am not surprised to meet 5-year-old Brandon or Kaitlyn. Hardly anyone questions the incongruity of matching these names with last names like Trujillo or Zepeda. The English-only way of life partly explains the quiet erasure of cultural difference that assimilation has attempted to accomplish. A name like Kaitlyn Zepeda doesn't completely obscure her ethnicity, but the half-step of her name, as a gesture, is almost understandable.

Spanish was and still is viewed with suspicion: always the language of the vilified illegal immigrant, it segregated schoolchildren into English-only and bilingual programs; it defined you, above all else, as part of a lower class. Learning English, though, brought its own complications with identity. It was simultaneously the language of the white population and a path toward the richer, expansive identity of "American." But it took getting out of the Valley for me to understand that "white" and "American" were two very different things.

Something as simple as saying our names "in English" was our unwittingly complicit gesture of trying to blend in. Pronouncing Mexican names correctly was never encouraged. Names like Daniel, Olivia and Marco slipped right into the mutability of the English language.

I remember a school ceremony at which the mathematics teacher, a 10 white man, announced the names of Mexican students correctly and caused some confusion, if not embarrassment. Years later we recognized that he spoke in deference to our Spanish-speaking parents in the audience, caring teacher that he was.

These were difficult names for a non-Spanish speaker: Araceli, Nadira, Luis (a beautiful name when you glide the *u* and the *i* as you're supposed to). We had been accustomed to having our birth names altered for

convenience. Concepción was Connie. Ramón was Raymond. My cousin Esperanza was Hope—but her name was pronounced "Hopie" because any Spanish speaker would automatically pronounce the *e* at the end.

Ours, then, were names that stood as barriers to a complete embrace of an American identity, simply because their pronunciations required a slip into Spanish, the otherness that assimilation was supposed to erase. What to do with names like Amado, Lucio or Élide? There are no English "equivalents," no answer when white teachers asked, "What does your name mean?" when what they really wanted to know was "What's the English one?" So what you heard was a name butchered beyond recognition, a pronunciation that pointed the finger at the Spanish language as the source of clunky sound and ugly rhythm.

My stepfather, from Ojos de Agua, Mexico, jokes when I ask him about the names of Mexicans born here. He deliberately stumbles over pronunciations, imitating our elders who have difficulty with Bradley and Madelyn. "Ashley Sánchez. ¿Tú crees?" He wonders aloud what has happened to the "nombres del rancho"—traditional Mexican names that are hardly given anymore to children born in the States: Heraclio, Madaleno, Otilia, Dominga.

My stepfather's experience with the Anglicization of his name—Antonio to Tony—ties into something bigger than learning English. For him, the erasure of his name was about deference and subservience. Becoming Tony gave him a measure of access as he struggled to learn English and get more fieldwork.

This isn't to say that my stepfather welcomed the change, only that he 15 could not put up much resistance. Not changing put him at risk of being passed over for work. English was a world of power and decisions, of smooth, uninterrupted negotiation. There was no time to search for the right word while a shop clerk waited for him to come up with the English name of the correct part needed out in the field. Clear communication meant you could go unsupervised, or that you were even able to read instructions directly off a piece of paper. Every gesture made toward convincing an employer that English was on its way to being mastered had the potential to make a season of fieldwork profitable.

It's curious that many of us growing up in Dinuba adhered to the same rules. Although as children of farm workers we worked in the fields at an early age, we'd also had the opportunity to stay in one town long enough to finish school. Most of us had learned English early and splintered off into a dual existence of English at school, Spanish at home. But instead of recognizing the need for fluency in both languages, we turned it into a peculiar kind of battle. English was for public display. Spanish was for privacy—and privacy quickly turned to shame.

The corrosive effect of assimilation is the displacement of one culture over another, the inability to sustain more than one way of being. It isn't a code word for racial and ethnic acculturation only. It applies to needing and wanting to belong, of seeing from the outside and wondering

how to get in and then, once inside, realizing there are always those still on the fringe.

When I went to college on the East Coast, I was confronted for the first time by people who said my name correctly without prompting; if they stumbled, there was a quick apology and an honest plea to help with the pronunciation.

But introducing myself was painful: already

shy, I avoided meeting people because I didn't want to say my name, felt burdened by my own history. I knew that my small-town upbringing and its limitations on Spanish would not have been tolerated by any of the students of color who had grown up in large cities, in places where the sheer force of their native languages made them dominant in their neighborhoods.

It didn't take long for me to assert the power of code-switching in public, the transferring of words from one language to another, regardless of who might be listening. I was learning that the English language composed new meanings when its constrictions were ignored, crossed over or crossed out. Language is all about manipulation, or not listening to the rules.

When I come back to Dinuba, I have a hard time hearing my name said incorrectly, but I have an even harder time beginning a conversation with others about why the pronunciation of our names matters. Leaving a small town requires an embrace of a larger point of view, but a town like Dinuba remains forever embedded in an either/or way of life. My stepfather still answers to Tony and, as the United States-born children grow older, their Anglicized names begin to signify who does and who does not "belong"—who was born here and who is *de allá*.

My name is Manuel. To this day, most people cannot say it correctly, the way it was intended to be said. But I can live with that because I love the alliteration of my full name. It wasn't the name my mother, Esmeralda, was going to give me. At the last minute, my father named me after an uncle I would never meet. My name was to have been Ricardo. Growing up in Dinuba, I'm certain I would have become Ricky or even Richard, and the journey toward the discovery of the English language's extra-

"The corrosive effect of assimilation is the displacement of one culture over another, the inability to sustain more than one way of being."

ordinary power in even the most ordinary of circumstances would probably have gone unlearned.

I count on a collective sense of cultural loss to once again swing the names back to our native language. The Mexican gate agent announced Eugenio Reyes, but I never got a chance to see who appeared. I pictured an older man, cowboy hat in hand, but I made the assumption on his name alone, the clash of privileges I imagined between someone *de allá* and a Mexican woman with a good job in the United States. Would she speak to him in Spanish? Or would she raise her voice to him as if he were hard of hearing?

But who was I to imagine this man being from anywhere, based on his name alone? At a place of arrivals and departures, it sank into me that the currency of our names is a stroke of luck: because mine was not an easy name, it forced me to consider how language would rule me if I allowed it. Yet I discovered that only by leaving. My stepfather must live in the Valley, a place that does not allow that choice, every day. And Eugenio Reyes—I do not know if he was coming or going.

Understanding the Text

1. Why, according to Muñoz, do many in California's Central Valley, "regardless of the speaker's background" (par. 5), Anglicize the pronunciation of Mexican names? In answering this question, consider his explanations regarding the demographics of the small towns in the region and the prevailing perceptions of Spanish.
2. Muñoz claims that the Anglicization of his stepfather's name "ties into something bigger than learning English" (par. 14). Explain that "something bigger." How does this relate to the arguments Muñoz develops in paragraphs 14–17?
3. What does Muñoz learn by leaving Dinuba? How do this knowledge and his experience outside Dinuba influence his return to, and understanding of, his hometown?

Reflection and Response

4. In paragraph 9, what does Muñoz realize about what it means to be "white" and "American"? Why is this realization significant?
5. In paragraph 8, Muñoz mentions the stigma associated with speaking Spanish, saying that "Spanish was and still is viewed with suspicion." Do you agree that there is a stigma with speaking Spanish in the United States? Why or why not?
6. In paragraph 21, Muñoz describes his experiences as a "journey toward the discovery of the English language's extraordinary power." At the end of his journey, what conclusion does Muñoz reach about the pronunciation of his

ENGL 1020 – RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

A **rhetorical analysis** analyzes how the components of an argument work together to persuade or move an audience. In your analysis, you will identify strategies used by an author to represent their position.

Select one of the following articles as the subject of your rhetorical analysis:

- Alexander C. Diener and Joshua Hagen, “A Very Bordered World”
- Norma Cantú, “Living on the Border: A Wound That Will Not Heal”
- Manuel Muñoz, “Leave Your Name at the Border”
- Amy Tan, “Mother Tongue”
- Bill Moyers and Sherman Alexie, “Sherman Alexie on Living outside Cultural Borders”

Developing your argument: Consider each of the following

- How does the author construct his or her **ethos** as credible to the audience?
- How does the author appeal to the audience’s emotions, values or experiences (**pathos**)?
- What evidence and claims does the author make, and how do they contribute to the soundness of the argument (**logos**)?

Although you should consider the above questions, they are intended to get you started, not to be taken as an outline for your paper.

Audience: You should envision the reader of your analysis as someone who has read the article you are analyzing but who you are trying to persuade of your opinion of the author’s argument.

Format: 3-4 pages. Type-written. One-inch margins. Double spaced. Times New Roman. 12-point font.

Date: 2 October 2018

MLA 8th
OWL Purdue

Organization:

Your analysis should begin with 1-2 paragraphs that do the following:

- Briefly place the article in a broader context (i.e., what are the implications of the described situations?)
- Introduce the article by characterizing the author and situation for which the article is intended (i.e., what is the rhetorical situation?)
- Describe the author’s purpose and identify the author’s intended audience
- **Identify your thesis.** Your thesis should say something about the rhetorical strategies that you plan to analyze. Indicate, in general terms, how the author’s rhetorical strategies function in order to promote the author’s purpose in relation to the intended audience. To help develop your thesis, ask yourself:
 - What is the purpose of the argument? Is it accomplished?
 - What aspects of the argument work better than others?
 - How do the rhetorical elements interact?

The remainder of your paper will focus on different rhetorical strategies employed by the author, or you may choose to focus on different parts of one strategy. In either case, be careful of being too predictable, for example by simply repeating key terms or writing a list of examples. Useful strategies for developing paragraphs include:

- Briefly define the rhetorical strategy
- Quote or paraphrase examples to illustrate the author’s use of the strategy (2-3 examples)
- Explain how the example illustrates the strategy and how the strategy contributes to the author’s purpose

Revision due on Tuesday, 10/30

* make appointment at writing center
get a blue slip

Ali 1

Abdullah Ali

(303) 315-7355

Professor M. Tesfalidet

North Building 4014

English 1020-033

75

2 October 2018

Rhetorical Analysis: "Leave Your Name at the Border"

In August of 2007, Manuel Muñoz wrote the article "Leave Your Name at the Border".

His audience are all people who read newspapers. ^{More} specifically, ^{they are people} who read *The New York Times*.

^{tells a} newspaper. In this article, Muñoz ^{tells a} short story about his experiences and the consequences of

anglicized pronunciations. He suffered from people who didn't pronounce his name correctly

because his name is a Mexican name and he lives in a place where most people speak English.

good! But, there's a little more to it than this, try to back your arg. around this

Muñoz made a strong argument using ethos and pathos.

First of all, Muñoz used ethos in this article to make people trust him and believe in what he wrote. He used ethos to show that people must respect foreign cultures like they respect American culture. As he said, "My name is Manuel. To this day, most people cannot say it correctly, the way it was intended to be said" (Muñoz 160). That means his name was

pronounced incorrectly in many situations and he is still suffering from this problem because he

said, "to this day" (Muñoz 160). In addition, Muñoz used ethos to show that people cannot judge

a person just by his name. As he said, "But who was I to imagine this man being from anywhere, ^{*rephrase} when recounting a story about an experience he had the airport

based on his name alone?" (Muñoz 160). Muñoz tried to convince those who read the article to

not judge a person just by his name. ^{By stating} and ^{Muñoz} used the words, "but who am I" (Muñoz 160) to prove

his humility and puts himself in the place of the other person. Hence, these points make people

who do not agree with him to agree with him and trust him. Ethos really helps him to support his ^{more likely} argument.

talks about this in more detail

* make an argument about the text

* try to analyze what Muñoz is saying ^{↳ thesis}

* talk more about the emotional aspect of pathos

Ali 2

to convince them about what?

Finally, Muñoz used pathos to convince readers. For example, when Muñoz was in school and there was ^a white mathematics teacher who pronounces Hispanic names correctly. The students felt uncomfortable when they listened to the teacher who pronounced their names correctly. This ^{reaction} was unexpected ^{by the reader?} because they should be proud of their culture and they should respect the teacher, but they felt uncomfortable. After ^{why did they feel uncomfortable?} period of time, they ^{realized} noticed that the teacher respect ^{Muñoz} them and respect their culture. He used pathos in this story to convince readers by stirring their feelings. Readers should be sad when they read this story because teenagers do not judge people correctly. Also, when ^{Muñoz} he went to ^{the} East Coast to complete his education. The people there apologized when they pronounced his name wrongly. This thing affected his life, and

this sentence is a bit unclear

Muñoz learned what it means to be respectable man. He used word "politely" (Muñoz 161) to show much respect they give him. Pathos was used here to make readers to put themselves in the situation. ^{Ultimately, Muñoz is considerate} Hence, he wants ^{be more considerate to...} from bad people to change their lives to better lives.

To sum up, Muñoz used rhetoric ^{al devices} such as pathos to convince readers and making readers trust him. ^{also} Also, Muñoz used many stories that include pathos to convince readers and stirring ^{of his readers} their feelings. I think he is a good writer and he used ethos and pathos in right places.

Your goal is 3 full pages!

Works Cited

Muñoz, Manuel. "Leave Your Name at the Border." *Border Crossings: A Bedford Spotlight* ✓

Reader, edited by Catherine Cucinella, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016, pp. 157-161