

**A Study of Elena Poniatowska's *Amanecer en el
Zócalo*: The Contemporary Mexican *Crónica* in
Translation**

Susan Leah Cruess

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the PhD degree in Modern Languages and Literatures

Spanish, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
University of Ottawa

© Susan Leah Cruess, Ottawa, Canada, 2011.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Dedication	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Context of the Source Text: The Elections	12
The Following Crisis:	14
Why the Crónica?	16
CHAPTER ONE.....	18
Situating <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i> in the Mexican Literary Polysystem	18
The Contemporary Crónica	21
Elena Poniatowska as a Cronista	29
How <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i> Complies Specifically with the Definition of the Crónica	49
The Theories of Systems in Culture and Literature	68
What do “Innovatory” and “Conservatory” Mean in the Context of Mexican Literature?	88
CHAPTER TWO	99
Examining the Latin American Political <i>Crónica</i> in Translation: A case study of three <i>crónicas</i> in comparison to <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i>	99
The Translator’s “Authority to Intervene”: How Authors’ and Translators’ Roles Overlap in <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i> and <i>La noche de Tlatelolco</i>:	105
Prefaces:	114
Footnotes and Other Expansions	121
<i>Massacre in Mexico</i>	121
<i>Nothing, Nobody</i> and <i>Born to Die in Medellín</i>	122

CHAPTER THREE	127
A Brief Overview of Select Contemporary Translation Theories and Their Application to the Translation of <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i>	127
Contemporary Translation Studies: An overview of the 60s and 70s	128
Target-Oriented Translation Studies	142
The Target Text’s “Type” and the Source Text’s “After-life”	145
Text Type and Reception	148
CHAPTER FOUR	168
An Application of Antoine Berman’s “Trials of the Foreign” to the Translation of <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i>	168
1. Rationalization	169
2. Clarification	172
3. Expansion	173
4. Ennoblement	176
5. Qualitative Impoverishment	181
6. Quantitative Impoverishment	182
7. The destruction of rhythms	184
8. The destruction of underlying networks of signification	185
9. The destruction of linguistic patternings	188
10. The destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization	189
11. The destruction of expressions and idioms	198
12. The effacement of the superimposition of languages	203
CHAPTER FIVE	206
Specific Lexical, Discursive and Contextual Challenges of the Translation of <i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i>	206
<i>Amanecer en el Zócalo</i> (México: Planeta, 2007) pp. 77-80.	216
Translation Draft	220

Translation Analysis	224
CONCLUSIONS	255
 Conclusions Drawn	263
Appendix #1: Chronological List of Poniatowska's major works	269
Appendix #2 - Translation Excerpt Final Draft.....	272
Appendix #3: Glossary of Acronyms.....	277
Works Cited	282

ABSTRACT

This dissertation addresses the challenges of translating the Contemporary Mexican *crónica* from Spanish into English. The *crónica*, being a type of nonfiction literature and possessing unique features particularly with regards to its ability to be read like a novel, presents distinctive challenges in translation. This dissertation looks closely at the particularities of translating Elena Poniatowska's *Amanecer en el Zócalo* (Mexico: Planeta, 2007), a *crónica* based on the 2006 federal election in Mexico and the subsequent civil resistance movement inspired by the outcome.

This dissertation addresses questions surrounding the translation of the *crónica*: What challenges are unique in translating this genre and why? Why are there so few *crónicas* translated into English? What decisions can the translator make in order to resolve these particular difficulties?

In order to attempt to answer these questions, I first looked into the genre of the *crónica* and attempted to situate it within the Mexican system of literature and culture. The result found was that, based on some recent theories of systems in culture and translation, the *crónica*, as a genre of literature that always seeks to address current issues in society and foster positive social development, is in itself a vehicle for social change. I then looked at other *crónicas* that have been translated into English and compared other translators' decisions to the ones I made – or have yet to make – within my own translation of Poniatowska's text. Finally, in observing the ways in which the translator of the *crónica* tends to alter the genre of the text in translation, I showed how the text, in English, loses some of the defining characteristics of the *crónica* and serves a different purpose in the target culture – it educates the reader on past (and present) social issues in other cultures, and it appeals to a different type of audience in the target culture – it attracts readers interested in studying another culture rather than readers who feel an intimate connection with the *crónica*'s context.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my Thesis Director, Dr. Rodney Williamson, for his constant encouragement, his guidance, and for his invaluable advice and wisdom. I appreciate your direction and friendship more than I properly know how to express, and I feel so fortunate to have had the chance to work with you. Without you there would be no thesis to read, and your words and ideas pepper this dissertation.

I would also like to give my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Luise Von Flotow and Dr. Clara Foz for their dedication and outstanding support. They both went above and beyond their charge as committee members, and I deeply value their suggestions and comprehensive, constructive feedback. And clearly, to my friends, colleagues and professors from the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, and from the School of Translation and Interpretation, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude. Thank you for the motivation, discourse and sense of community.

My experience with this translation and commentary would not have been the same without a group of people who are truly the most inspirational and creative personalities I have ever met. To my dear friends, authors and translators from the Banff International Literary Translation Center 2008, I am deeply grateful for your generosity of spirit and your ongoing camaraderie. Learning and sharing creative energy with you has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life.

Of course, I would not be here at all without the unconditional love and support of my family. Mom, Dad, Gord, Steph, Billy, and Graeme, you are, by a landslide, the greatest family anyone could ask for and I thank you from the bottom of my heart for getting me here.

Finally, to my loving fiancé and my best friend, Rob, you make everything worth anything. I can't thank you enough for your support and unfailing encouragement. I can't wait to get started on the rest of our lives.

This dissertation is dedicated to my Grandfather, William Hayhurst, who was a thoughtful, dedicated and inspiring scholar.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this doctoral dissertation will be to examine and discuss the translation of Elena Poniatowska's *Amanecer en el Zócalo* (2007), a political *crónica*¹ based on the 2006 Mexican Presidential Elections and the civil resistance and political crisis that followed in the months after. In performing a commented translation as a thesis, I will have the opportunity to examine the process of translation from beginning to end – that is, from the moment the translator first considers a source text for translation to the publication of the translated text. At this early juncture in my dissertation it should be noted that my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, which I have entitled *Daybreak in the Zócalo Square* for the time being, has not yet been selected for publication, for reasons I will discuss later. And although I have included the translation as an annex to this dissertation, the changes and “interventions” that I allude to in this thesis may or may not be included in the translated text if and when it is published, depending on the publisher's wishes.

The one factor that will weigh heavily upon this examination will be that the source text and the target text occupy different spaces within their respective

¹ The term “*crónica*” can be described initially as a work of nonfiction written in the form and style of a novel. In Chapter One we will discuss the extended defining characteristics of the Latin American *crónica*.

literary systems, or, perhaps said more simply, they will fall into different genre categories. My research will also be driven by two objectives that are interrelated. First, with this commented translation as one of the first of its kind to become a doctoral dissertation, I wish to help bring literary translation into the spotlight as a practice that deserves academic acknowledgement; translation has too often been cast aside as a secondary and derivative art form, but translation scholars in recent years have been attempting to change that stigma. Second, I wish to highlight the educational merits of translation. The issue with this field of research recently, as Susan Bassnett explains (1998), is that the study of translation does not seem to have a current “home” in any academic field; it is so interdisciplinary that the field lacks the focus it deserves:

The new discipline, or preferably interdiscipline of translation studies has battled for space between literary studies, linguistics, and the social sciences, and in the course of the struggles it has undergone many changes. From a phase in which it was fighting for recognition, translation studies is now at a point where it has a chameleon quality, able to change its colour and shape, to translate itself into many different things (26).

The indefinable position occupied by translation studies in academia reflects the position of the Mexican *crónica* in translation. Although translation is as present in academic writing as published original-language texts, it tends not to be spoken of often in the context of literary criticism. Similarly, while the *crónica* is a widely practiced form of writing in Mexico and in other Latin American countries, it is

barely written about in either Latin America (or by Spanish-speaking theorists living in North America) or North America. Interestingly, there is significantly more written about the *crónica* in the English-speaking United States and Canada, which is evidenced in this dissertation by the number of North American references cited compared to those coming from Latin America. This also becomes interesting in the discussion of the *crónica* in translation; it becomes clear, right from the beginning of this dissertation, that the *crónica* holds some interest in the field of critical literary theory and the study of Latin American literature in North America. This, of course, brings me to my thesis questions.

The central research questions, which I will attempt to answer over the course of each chapter in this study, are:

1) How is the Mexican *crónica* characterized and where does it “fit” in the Mexican literary system?

2) Based on a study of previous *crónicas* in translation, what type of audience can we expect to read the translation of *Amanecer en el Zocalo*? What methods have the translators of other *crónicas* used in the past in order to reach their target audiences (for example, have they used prefaces, footnotes and other paratexts)?

3) In looking at an overview of a few select contemporary translation theories, which ones can the translator of the contemporary Mexican *crónica* use to help justify the decisions made in this type of work?

4) Is it necessary to make modifications to *Amanecer en el Zocalo* in translation and could altering the text be considered a positive practice?

5) Finally, all previous questions considered, what are the general and specific challenges of translating *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, given its local Mexican theme, its political and cultural content, the fact that it is a work offering a very different perspective on a well-known demonstration of social activism and above all, its nature as a contemporary Mexican *crónica*? How are these problems resolved in the translator's decision-making process? How can I solve these problems in translation by adapting the text to speak to my intended target audience? What choices did I make in the translation of this work that end up modifying the type or genre of the text, and how could these decisions affect the readers' reception of the work in the culture of translation?

The translator of a work such as this faces a huge number of dilemmas and decision-making processes that stem from the translator's consideration that the translation will speak to a very different audience in a new way, in a new culture. The end results of the translator's decisions culminate in the overall reception of the work in a new language and culture.

The particularities of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* are multiple. First, the work has to be considered as a hybrid genre that treats a sociopolitical event and combines

various types of discourse in a text comprised of testimonies from journalists, important political and artistic figures, as well as Poniatowska's own narrative. The translator must bear in mind that the task here is relatable to journalism in itself, and fact-checking comes heavily into play. In this work, the translator faces the challenge that the subject and historical and cultural context of the source text are not immediately important to the potential readers of the target text; in translation, the target readers' needs must be addressed. The original Spanish version of the text was written for the Mexican people, not only for the supporters of the social movement, but also as a testimony of the cause behind the movement. It was written for all Mexicans, whether or not they support that cause. Cultural and geographical details within the text that may be familiar to the original Mexican audience must be clarified for a North American audience, meaning that the translator must have significant input in the English text, by way of footnotes or inserted explanations of certain historical events or characters' significance.

While the translator of the *crónica* obviously faces general difficulties at the linguistic and cultural levels similar to the challenges faced in all types of literary translation, my hypothesis is that the specific difficulties in translating a contemporary Mexican *crónica* such as *Amanecer en el Zócalo* stem from the political and ideological nature of the text and the different types of discourses found within it. In translation, the text must speak to a new audience whose politics and ideology differ from the source culture: an audience that may or may not be familiar with the

political and social circumstances from which the work was inspired in its original language. The problems encountered in the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* stem primarily from the fact that the Mexican *crónica* constantly challenges traditional forms of literary expression in an attempt to illuminate the complexities of the world. Rosanna Reguillo (2002) explains that it is the multiplicity of discourses within the *crónica* that make the genre indefinable and at the same time, make it uniquely capable of bridging cultures:

While traditional discourses look to reduce the complexity of the world by subjecting intrusive languages to a normalized classification, the *crónica* looks to open up this complexity, with the result that its growing importance generates jealousy and suspicion in the journalistic, academic, and literary routines, whose task has generally been that of domesticating the unknown by subjecting it to familiar frames of reference. If, as I believe, every crisis is also an opportunity, the *crónica* ought to be viewed as more than a limited, defined, and definable genre. It ought to be regarded as a language of encounter, a place from which communication, that primary vehicle of our sociability, can extend a bridge between worlds. (58)

This research will take the indefinable and unique characteristics of the *crónica* outlined by Reguillo into consideration as we explore how the translator's choices and decisions with regards to the translation of Poniatowska's *Amanecer en el Zócalo* affect the overall reception of the work in the target culture. I want to establish that, as the translator of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, I act not only as a translator, but also as a journalist and an editor to a certain extent, and that the challenges I

faced during the background research, the translation process, and throughout the course of editing and attempting to publish the work in the English language stem primarily from the fact that my primary objective to “bridge worlds.” It also originates from the fact that I have a specific type of reader in mind during the translation process. My final hypothesis regarding the translation’s position within the target culture’s literary system is that the source text in translation will become a text whose purpose is to educate a readership unfamiliar with its context, one that serves to incite debate and study surrounding Mexico’s current and historical political situations. In order to show how I adapt the text for this specific audience, I will explore the translator’s significant power over a text, seeing that he or she must make decisions and have the freedom to make necessary modifications with regards to the language within it and the literary space it might occupy in the target culture.

The theoretical framework of my research will stem from two fields. From the field of translation studies, I will examine theories that deal with power and authority in translation and the translator’s influence over a given text, as well as theories of systems, and most importantly I will examine the difference between source text-oriented and target text-oriented translation studies. From the field of Latin American contemporary literature, I will particularly discuss testimonial and nonfiction works, and specifically literary critiques of the work of Elena Poniatowska and other *cronistas*.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. The first is an examination of the source text, *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, and the genre of the *crónica* in general. I discuss the *crónica* in the history of Mexico and describe its characteristics as an ever-evolving, hybrid form of writing, which is distinctive to Latin America. Then, I look at Elena Poniatowska, her career as a writer, her identity as a naturalized Mexican woman and her success as a *cronista*. We then turn to *Amanecer en el Zócalo* and look at how, considering Esperança Bielsa's in depth, seven-point description of the genre², the source text complies with the characteristics of the *crónica*. And finally, after discussing theories of systems in culture and literature, I attempt to situate *Amanecer en el Zócalo* within the Mexican literary system. This first chapter, in conjunction with Chapter Two, is an attempt to establish the norms and behaviours of the field of literature with which I am working. As Dirk Delabastita (1990) points out, this is fundamental to the study and practice of translation:

The researcher in the field of [...] translation should, of course, first delimit the target system corpus s/he intends to work with. S/he should then proceed to establish the principles governing the very presence/absence of imported and translated [...] material in the cultural system under discussion. In Gideon Toury's terminology, s/he should try first to establish the *preliminary norms* governing translation in the target system. (100)

² Bielsa, Esperança. *The Latin American Urban Crónica: Between literature and mass culture*. USA: Lexington Books, 2006.

In the second chapter, I look at three other *crónicas* in translation: *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Elena Poniatowska, 1971; *Massacre in Mexico*, 1975), *Nada, nadie: las voces del temblor* (Poniatowska, 1988; *Nothing, Nobody: The voices of the Mexico City Earthquake*, 1995), and *No nacimos pa' semillas* (Alonso Sálazar, 1990; *Born to Die in Medellín*, 1992). The purpose of this chapter will be to look at certain decisions that the translators of these works made, and certain expansions included in the translations that allowed the target text to reach the same type of audience to which I am directing my own translation. The factors I will focus on primarily in this second chapter will be the use and function of prefaces, the inclusion of footnotes and other paratexts, and the publishing groups that have selected these works for publication in translation. I will show how all of these factors, and the translators' inputs and interventions, lead the *crónicas* to reach audiences for educational purposes.

In the third chapter I will focus on contemporary translation theories and how they could apply to translating a Mexican *crónica*. Specifically, I will highlight the important shift in translation studies from the traditionally formal theories for the practice on translation that value the source, to the newer functionalist, target text-oriented theories that celebrate change and adaptation in translation, and that look at the reception of the work in the target culture as a major factor in the practice of translation. I will focus on why this shift from source text focus to target text focus is significant particularly in the translation of genres such as the *crónica*,

where change and adaptation is absolutely fundamental if translations of these works are to exist and be successful.

Chapter four acts as somewhat of a segue between the third chapter and the fifth. In this section I deal with Antoine Berman's theory of "deforming tendencies" in translation (1985) and apply them to my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. These "deforming tendencies," or translators' habits of making changes in translation to serve the purposes of the target text, exist in every translation according to Berman, and they are listed as follows: rationalization; clarification; expansion; ennoblement and popularization; qualitative impoverishment; quantitative impoverishment; the destruction of rhythms; the destruction of underlying networks of signification; the destruction of linguistic patternings; the destruction of vernacular networks and their exoticization; the destruction of expressions of idioms; and the effacement of the superimposition of languages (Berman 280). Although the word "deformation" often comes with negative connotations, it should be noted here that this dissertation does not consider change and adaptation in a translation to be negative. Indeed, Berman looks at "deformations" as translators' often unavoidable habits, whereas I look at "deformations" here as a phenomenon in translation that should be celebrated.

In the fifth and final chapter, I diverge from the theoretical and discuss the practical difficulties of translating *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. I will present a textual analysis of my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, beginning with a consideration

of the lexical, discursive and stylistic aspects of the original text, and then looking at the specific challenges I face in the translation process and my solutions for the particular problems of the work. For the purposes of this chapter I will select for analysis a short passage of the text that showcases a cross-section of the types of difficulties encountered in the rest of the translation. The translation draft has not yet been selected for publication, so some of the “solutions” I refer to throughout this thesis have yet to be included (such as a preface, for example, which will most likely be extracted directly from parts of this dissertation). Simply put, until the translation finds a publisher, there may always be revisions and additions pending.

This five-chapter structure is based on my idea that my dissertation should mimic the translation process itself. First, as the translator I read the source text and familiarize myself with the social and historical context of the work. I attempt to situate the work within the culture of origin and investigate the societal, political and literary influences that lead to the original’s creation and are the ultimate causes for the idiosyncrasies and challenges of the text. Second, I consider other works like this one in translation and attempt to determine the readership to which I will direct my translation. Then, I consider the ways in which I will have to adapt the text in translation in order to create a work that reaches the audience I foresee for this translation. In this consideration, I look at possible methods of translation, and attempt to determine the types of problems I will face in the translation process. Finally, I perform the translation itself, putting into practice the different

types of adaptations and methods of translation I have previously considered, and discovering new challenges that I had not been able to predict until the translation process began. Finally, I consider the final product's potential position within the target culture's literary system in order to attempt to find an appropriate or interested publisher, and I make any necessary adaptations or alterations to the translation to fulfill the reader's needs, such as adding a glossary, footnotes, an introduction, and other expansions.

THE CONTEXT OF THE SOURCE TEXT: THE ELECTIONS

In this introduction to my research, I will first outline the context from which the original work emerged, explaining the various sources of circumstantial doubt surrounding the Mexican elections and causing the social uprising that followed. Next, I will provide a brief biography of the author, Elena Poniatowska, in order to set the stage for my forthcoming arguments.

On July 2, 2006, 42 249 541³ Mexican citizens cast their ballots in the Mexican presidential elections, representing the largest voter turnout in Mexican history. The presidential candidates were Felipe Calderón, of the conservative National Action Party (PAN), Andrés Manuel López Obrador, of the left-wing⁴

³ According to Enrique Krauze, *Reforma* newspaper, in *Amanecer en el Zócalo* (2007): 26

⁴ For the purposes of this dissertation, when I refer to the political “left” and supporters of “left-wing politics” I will use the Encyclopædia Britannica definition of “left”: “Left, in

Democratic Revolution Party (PRD), Roberto Madrazo, of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), Patricia Mercado, of the Social Democratic Alternative Party, and Roberto Campo, of the New Alliance Party (PANAL).

In the final polls prior to Election Day, the two leading candidates were Felipe Calderón and Andrés Manuel López Obrador (herein referred to as “AMLO”⁵) in what was said to be a “very tight race.”⁶ The results of the final counts on July 2, which were computed in 130 477 polling stations across the nation, showed that Felipe Calderón defeated Andrés Manuel López Obrador by a margin of 0.57 per cent, or just 240 822 votes. On the day of the elections 500 Deputies were also elected to serve three-year terms in the Cámara de Diputados (Chamber of Deputies), and votes were also cast to elect 128 members of the Senate to serve six-

politics, the portion of the political spectrum associated in general with egalitarianism and popular or state control of the major institutions of political and economic life. The term dates from the 1790s, when in the French revolutionary parliament the socialist representatives sat to the presiding officer’s left. Leftists tend to be hostile to the interests of traditional elites, including the wealthy and members of the aristocracy, and to favour the interests of the working class. They tend to regard social welfare as the most important goal of government.”

left. *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica, 2011. Web. 12 Jul. 2011.
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1380891/left>>.

⁵ A nickname / acronym for Andrés Manuel López Obrador.

⁶ See <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/5124934.stm>

year terms. Of these, 127 Deputies and 29 Senators were elected from López Obrador's PRD party.

THE FOLLOWING CRISIS:

The outcome of the elections was surprising to a vast number of Mexicans, and particularly to López Obrador, and the tiny percentage of votes by which he lost should have constituted, in his opinion, a recount of the votes. The Federal Electoral Tribunal received the PRD's complaints and proceeded to a partial recount, which did not meet with the approval of López Obrador's party.

A second source of doubt in the outcome of the elections stemmed from the electoral processes from which the final results emerged: Vicente Fox, Mexico's former President, had invested large amounts of money in Calderón's campaign to allegedly smear López Obrador's image, the main slogan of this campaign calling López Obrador a "danger to Mexico,"⁷ and accusing the PRD candidate of having a close relationship with and comparing him personally to Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez, Bolivian President Evo Morales, and Cuban President Fidel Castro,

⁷ Discussed in an article written by Carlos Monsiváis in the newspaper *El Universal*: <http://www.el-universal.com.mx/editoriales/34459.html>

all of whom have gained contentious reputations internationally for their controversial extreme-leftist policies and governing strategies.⁸

The political crisis that followed the election resulted in Mexico's largest-ever demonstration of peaceful civil resistance. On July 22, 2006,⁹ López Obrador personally asked Elena Poniatowska, a prolific Mexican journalist and author, to aid him in his post-election campaign to demand a recount and to form a part of his government nominated in protest against what was seen as Calderón's illegitimate government. Poniatowska actively participated in a "sit-in" or "vigil"¹⁰ in which millions of citizens occupied Mexico City's main plaza, the Zócalo, and set up forty-seven camps representing all thirty-one states of Mexico, as well as each of the sixteen delegations of the Federal District, along an eight-and-a-half kilometer corridor from the Zócalo, down to the main street of the Historical Center, the Paseo de la Reforma. Poniatowska's *crónica*, *Amanecer en el Zócalo* (2007), offers a perspective of the fifty days of peaceful protest, in which a significant number of citizens weathered torrential rainstorms, violent hail, scarce resources and menacing threats from indignant citizens opposing the vigil, to express their

⁸ According to Allan Wall. <http://mexidata.info/id900.html>.

⁹ According to Poniatowska, in *Amanecer en el Zócalo*: 16.

¹⁰ In the source text, Poniatowska refers to this "sit-in" or "vigil" with the term *plantón*, which translated to "a long wait" or a "sit-in." I am still toying with these two terms for the translation. My reason for provisionally deciding on "vigil" is that I wanted to portray the notion that the *plantón* was active and alive, whereas the term "sit-in," to me, implies a less lively setting.

demands for their constitutional rights to be met and their votes to count: in short, their demands for democracy.

WHY THE CRÓNICA?

Dante Medina (1990) explains that the *crónica* in Mexico is a “point of departure” for other artistic ventures:

The *crónica* illuminates with a different light than that of fiction: it puts its faith equally in reality and in textuality. The *crónica* believes that the Word can go behind the scenes of real life and give a true testimony. Although at times it may sing – answering to the demands of accuracy – the *crónica* has such a close kinship to what can be touched, what happens, what can be documented, that it is convinced of being, among other praiseworthy things, the point of departure for a poem, a story, a novel, a play. (47)

In other words, from the multitude of voices that come together to form a *crónica*, comes a more easily believable version of the truth in historical events. While Medina claims that novels, poems, stories and plays can arise from these voices, I would also like to add that so do studies, essays, dissertations and oral histories. The Mexican *crónica* provides a unique platform for the study of Mexican culture and history, and translation opens a door for a whole new audience to gain access to the invaluable information the *crónica* can divulge.

Crónicas are rarely translated, and therefore rarely studied in the English language. But every field of study begins somewhere. After all, there was a time when translations were rarely the basis for major studies. There is still work to be done in order to give literary translation the credit it deserves in academia, and I hope this is a step in the right direction. Clearly there is also room for the study of Mexican *crónicas* to grow in North America, and I hope this dissertation helps with that development as well. As a student in a multidisciplinary field of study (because, as we have seen, translation itself is multidisciplinary – p.2), I find myself in a situation that is both difficult and advantageous. My predicament is challenging because there is so little written about the genre of the *crónica*, and surprisingly little written about Elena Poniatowska. Secondly, translations – and commentaries of them – are rarely performed as doctoral theses, and so there is little precedent on which I can base this study; there are few models to follow. What is advantageous is that I am given the opportunity to set a precedent. I am given the opportunity to do something new and something original. I hope this study achieves just that.

CHAPTER ONE

SITUATING *AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO* IN THE MEXICAN LITERARY POLYSYSTEM

Since its original publication in Mexico in 2007, Elena Poniatowska's *Amanecer en el Zócalo* has had widespread success in Mexico because of the genre's position within the Mexican system of literature, and because it was written for a general Mexican public about the Mexican circumstance. However, as in the case of all translated literature, success in the country of origin does not necessarily guarantee the book will have the same success in its translated form in other countries such as Canada or the United States. I use the term "success" here not only to refer to the number of copies printed in the Spanish compared to the number that might be sold in the English version. Success also refers to the type of readers this work may have in both cultures, be it a vast general public, readers interested in education, or perhaps a select few with an interest in Mexican politics. For example, a work may be considered successful if it is read by a wide audience, translated into several languages almost simultaneously with the release of the original, and/or proves to be lucrative to the author or the publishing house (such as Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* or J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series). But a work may also be considered successful if it is acclaimed by a select or exclusive group of

individuals (as in the case of academic articles published in journals, or small town newspaper columns that have limited but devoted readerships). As the translator of this text, I am responsible for gauging the type of audience to which I will direct the translation so that I can make the necessary adaptations of the work to speak to a certain readership. At times in translation this task is done without difficulty: more often than not, a publishing house will approach the translator with a project, and based on what type of publishing house it is – large or small press, university press, etc. – the translator can gauge the type of readership at which the work will inevitably be directed. My translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* is a different story: I asked the author and her publisher permission to translate the work and the task of finding a publisher in the English language lies with me. It is, in some ways, guess work, which is why I have chosen my audience: a readership with some prior knowledge of Mexican history and culture, and who wish to be educated on the contemporary Mexican circumstance.

It should be noted, from the very beginning of this thesis, that while my discussion of the translation of Poniatowska's *crónica* is heavily based upon theories that help me to determine where the book "fits into" North American society (and thus it will be inevitable that I will use systems theories to support my argumentation), Pierre Bourdieu's sociology is important to this thesis. The reason for this is that some of the systems theories I will look at (Luhmann, Even-Zohar) neglect to mention or ignore entirely the personal factor in translating literature. In

some polysystems theories, the role of the translator as a conscious actor in the process of adapting the foreign work to the target culture is subordinated to the “needs” of the target culture and the norms and limitations thus put upon the translator. In other words, it seems as if the translator has no choices, no decisions to make, but rather acts simply according to what society demands. H  l  ne Buzelin (2005) explains that some traditional polysystems theories tend to presume that translations are only done in order to satisfy a cultural need, which in turn means that there exists a predetermined audience for any translation selected to satisfy that need:

Hence, the polysystem model assumes that foreign texts are selected or picked up for their ability to satisfy a need, which implies that a space for their reception already exists. From that perspective, translation appears to be a rather smooth process. (206)

As I have demonstrated in my translation of *Amanecer en el Z  calo*, however, translation is not necessarily a smooth process. The reason for this is that there is a personalization attached to this translation, meaning that I consciously chose this work for translation based on my personal interest in Poniatowska’s work, and my curiosity surrounding *cr  nicas* in translation. This aspect of personalization in systems theories is described best by Bourdieu’s sociology.

Moira Inghilleri (2005) explains that translation scholars have been turning to Bourdieu's work primarily because his sociology allows us to examine translation from the standpoint of ethnography, or cultural anthropology:

[The] interest in Bourdieu's work [in relation to translation and interpretation studies] is part of a shift within translation studies away from a predominant concern with translated textual products and toward a view of translation and interpreting as social, cultural and political acts intrinsically connected to local and global relations of power and control. (Inghilleri 125)

This means that the actual text is not necessarily the most important factor in translation, but rather the translator's purpose for doing the translation. Bourdieu's theory will come into play later on in this discussion, when we begin to delve into the specific elements of the "systems" we will explore.

THE CONTEMPORARY CRÓNICA

"The Spanish and Portuguese conquest of the New World marked, among other things, the beginning of Latin American intellectuals' efforts to think clearly about problems of cultural autonomy, whether for a specific country or regionwide."

The *crónica* has taken on distinguishing characteristics in the twentieth century, beginning with the Mexican Revolution in 1910 and continuing until the

present. Although the *crónica* is a centuries-old practice and is a “widely practiced and constantly evolving genre, conceived on the battlefields and in the streets, in the plazas and at the theaters, [and it] is a hybrid form of writing that crosses multiple discursive boundaries” (Monsivaís, “On the Chronicle” 1), contemporary *cronistas* take the practice to a more socio-political level, using it as a vehicle for discussions on social advancement, political corruption, everyday life and class conflict.

The *crónica*, being a genre of literature that tends to emphasize the life of the marginalized and their struggles with social inequality, has a long and distinguished history in Latin America. Naomi Lindstrom (1998) claims: “Since the Independence Era, unequal cultural relations have regularly been examined.” (20). This question of “unequal cultural relations” that Lindstrom alludes to is the central point of departure for *crónicas* and other testimonial literature, and has fascinated the literary world since the colonial period. When the “new world” was colonized, Lindstrom claims that the goal was to find Paradise – a perfect society that superseded the corrupt and violent European society. It was apparently often thought that the Indigenous societies in Latin America could be present an example of this Utopian society; they were a hard-working, peaceful society that welcomed Christopher Columbus and other explorers. That being said, there was clearly a power struggle between the colonizers and the colonized; between the “civilized” Europeans and the Indigenous peoples. Some of the first texts that might resemble

crónicas that we know of are Bernal Díaz de Castillo's accounts of the conquest of Mexico, or Columbus's famous letters, or Bartolomé de la Casas's *Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indies*, which offers abridged quotations from Columbus's letter to the King and Queen of Spain and hasn't survived in its original form. But there are also El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's accounts of the conquest of Peru, *Comentarios Reales de los Incas* (1609), which tend to contradict those texts written by the famous European explorers and was banned from publication due to its "violent" nature. It told the violent story of the Conquest from the Indigenous perspective. This brings up an interesting discussion about representation in the *crónica*, and actually leads to the question of difference between *crónicas* and *testimonios*, or testimonial literature. The primary difference between *crónicas* and testimonial literature is the issue of representation, or misrepresentation.

In Columbus's letter¹¹ announcing his discovery of the New World to Luis de Sant Angel (1493) he describes the native people as "ingenious" and "cowardly" and calls them generous, explaining that they never refused anything they were asked for, and offered great sums of gold in exchange for worthless items from the ship. He speaks very highly of them, possibly because they truly believe that he has "come from heaven" and he enjoys the stature he's given. While written from a

¹¹ While Columbus's letters to the King and Queen of Spain, Isabel and Ferdinand, and to Sant Angel do not exist in their original published form, they can be widely found on the internet. See for example <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/columbus2.html> (Consulted June 10, 2011).

clear-cut position of power, these letters do, in a way, attempt to represent the marginalized classes of society, although while they may attempt to shed a positive and realistic light on the people they portray, these letters cannot fairly be called “accurate histories” because of how one-sided they are.

According to Gugelberger and Kearney (...), this phenomenon of writing from a position of power was fairly ubiquitous in colonial writing:

In colonial situations major authors tend to write not only from a position of class superiority but also from the centers of empires. Writing from this skewed “subject position” within the global context, some authors presume to represent – to write about and to write for – subaltern peoples who are relatively powerless to represent themselves either symbolically or by immediate political means [...] “Such literature [...] is better seen not as representation, but as an epistemological and political misrepresentation.” (3)

To explain in other words, while authors such as Columbus and Bartolomé de las Casas may have been giving “voice to the voiceless” in a certain sense, their works still have to be considered a misrepresentation of the marginalized people about whom they spoke. Poniatowska’s text is not so different from Columbus’s letters to the Spanish monarchs. She tells a story on the behalf of those she feels “need their story told,” doing so from a position of power and status. But from a different perspective, she also considers herself to belong to the marginalized of Mexico, being an immigrant, a woman and politically left wing, meaning that it could be

suggested that she feels she is writing from the direct point of view of the marginalized.

Testimonial literature, on the other hand, in Latin America is a “corrective representation” of official histories, and first began to take shape in narratives emerging in 1960s Cuba. Gugelberger and Kearney claim that “Slave narratives, ethnographic life histories, and holocaust literature are each in certain ways documentary literature that amplify official histories of subaltern peoples.” (G&K, 5)

If we look at Poniatowska’s *crónica* and other contemporary works of the same nature, we can see that the *crónicas* of today are somewhat of a hybrid genre of traditional, colonial *crónica* and *testimonio*, because while the author possesses powerful social status, she also identifies with the “voiceless” of whom she writes. So while it could be perceived that she misrepresents her subjects, she also attempts to regain the authority to represent them by claiming to be no different from them. Later in this chapter, we will look at certain characteristics of the contemporary *crónica* that set it apart in this particular moment of Latin American and Mexican literary history.

Many of the well-known *cronistas*’ works vary enormously and treat very different issues. The late Carlos Monsiváis, for example, one of Mexico’s foremost *cronistas*, wrote *crónicas* about social movements and political events, such as *Días de guardar* (1971), on the Tlatelolco massacre of 1968; *Entrada libre, crónica de la sociedad*

que se organiza (1987), which includes, among others, one *crónica* on the 1985 earthquakes in Mexico City, another on the tragic gas explosion of San Juanico on November 19, 1984, and another still on Mexico's continuing efforts to achieve true democracy. He has also, however, written *crónicas* about important figures in film, theater and music who have contributed to shaping Mexican culture, such as *Amor perdido* (1976) and *Escenas de pudor y liviandad* (1988). Because of the broad variation between both themes and forms of the *crónica*, Ignacio Corona and Beth Jörgensen argue that the genre can be further subdivided into four blurry subgenres, but that there are two distinguishing characteristics of the contemporary *crónica*:

[The] discourse of the *crónica* is contiguous to four subgenres, with which clear-cut borders do not exist: in journalism with reportage and human interest pieces; and in literature with the short story and the essay. These are closely related and permeable genres. Structurally speaking, critics would agree that the most widely accepted distinctive feature or rule that governs the *crónica* is, of course, that of registering time (*chronos*) and establishing a temporal order to events. Equally characteristic of the *crónica's* structure is the alternation in point of view between the authority of a first-person narrator-witness and the mediating distance of an omnipresent narrator. (4)

With this idea from Corona and Jörgensen we can assume a few notions about the *crónica* from which to start our discussion. First, the form of the genre is blurry, because it includes reportage, human-interest (op-ed) texts, short stories, essays and even longer documentaries such as the text in question. Second, although the form of the *crónica* may be difficult to pin down, there are particular qualities that

characterize a *crónica*, including (but not limited to) an element of time and a first-person (subjective and personal) narrator.

Monsiváis (2002) describes the contemporary *crónica* as something between literature and journalism (25), and explains that, although this style of writing has existed as long as there have been writers in Mexico, events from the later twentieth century “revitalize and diversify the *crónica*” (33). Twentieth century *cronistas* in Mexico are drawn to write about social movements and for those whose voices go unheard:

“Giving voice to those who do not have it” is, without doubt, the stimulus that draws the *cronistas* nearer to popular movements, strikes, and lifestyles. And in marginalized sectors, an interest in writing their history and chronicling their own development arises. (34)

Corona and Jörgensen go further to argue that the term “*crónica*” is so loosely used in Mexico that true *crónicas* could be lumped together by some critics in the same “genre” as “bad fiction,” but also that the looseness of the term serves the objectives of the genre well, because it implies opportunity for growth and expansion with regards to what we perceive the *crónica* to be. Mexican newspapers also use the term “*crónica*” to describe a journalistic genre that is “broader” than the news:

In practice there is an enormous variation in the ways of realizing [the] fundamental features [of the *crónica*], including variations in the referential function of the texts that range from the careful and explicit annotation of time and physical location of events, to an elliptical or

quasi-fictional account. In such a case, genre theory governing rules may be understood only as approximate patterns that *cronistas* will break time and again, following what Vicente Leñero calls the “personality of the event” or individual literary or aesthetic impulses. Like the novel, the *crónica* is not exempt from formal variations that may even question its own definition. A case in point is the editorial looseness in the current application of the term in Mexico, where *crónica* has become a somewhat imprecise, or stretched concept. Some critics even point out that given its popular appeal and its flexible interpretation, “bad” fiction is masked as *crónica* by some practitioners. Certainly most would agree that the extratextual reality with artful fictional touches. If form implies closure, that very referential vagueness may suggest openness. In fact, the *crónica* is once more assuming new shapes to serve different expressive needs [...]. (5)

What this means is that the *crónica* is always evolving, always changing to serve new purposes.

Another characteristic of the contemporary *crónica* and other testimonial literature, which is important here, is explained by Juan Bruce-Novoa: “Even when the testimony comes directly from the oppressed, the language and forms through which they express themselves often derive from the dominant sector” (1990: 116). In other words, even though the language within *crónicas* tends to speak of a marginalized sector of society, that language is often brought to life by authors who have the social, political and economic means to do so. Poniatowksa, who hails from an upper-class family of European aristocrats, certainly comes from a privileged background, but in her *crónicas* she often speaks to and about a more general, marginalized majority of Mexican people.

ELENA PONIATOWSKA AS A CRONISTA

Poniatowska's personal and professional trajectory as a *cronista* in Mexico is perhaps even more significant to this discussion than the history of the genre itself, given that the *crónica* ranges so widely in themes and topics, and given the difficulty in pinpointing the exact relationship between one *crónica* and another. Poniatowska's writing, on the other hand, seems to have a common thread in its themes of marginality, politics and feminism in Mexico, and her career as a *cronista* is fairly simple to track. In this way, the development and maturation of her written work could be argued to lead directly to the production of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*¹².

Poniatowska's career began definitively in 1953, through her work for the Mexican newspaper *Excélsior*: "during my first year at [...] *Excélsior*, the 365 interviews that I conducted led me directly to the *crónica*" (Poniatowska, qtd. in Corona and Jörgensen 37). Her start was as an interviewer for the society pages of the paper, which would have been considered appropriate for a young woman from an upper-class family. As Beth Jörgensen explains, there was a small niche for women writers at that time, which was dependant on topics deemed suitable for the "fairer sex":

¹² See Appendix #1, a table of the major literary works of Elena Poniatowska in chronological order.

Most [women] were active in the following, familiarly feminine areas: society news, the women's page of newspapers, women's magazines dedicated to domestic life and moral issues, and socially conscious investigative reporting or editorializing on the problems of children, education, and the role of women in society. Female journalists apparently had little involvement in the reporting of politics, finance, military affairs, foreign policy, or crime, suggesting that journalism offered both opportunities and obstacles to women's entry into public discourse. (Jørgensen 3)

But Poniatowska's curiosity and natural temptation to look for the whole story led her away from society news towards front-page interviews with important public figures, and after about ten years, these same qualities brought her to an interest in all of Mexican society, not just the upper classes.

As her journalistic career began to mature, so did her skills as a writer of fiction. Her first book of short stories, *Lilus Kikus* was published in 1954, and she has continued over the course of her career to write short fiction and novels as well as testimonies, *crónicas*, essays and other journalistic work. Her talents as a fiction writer would come in handy later, as her journalistic content would be enriched by literary style for her *crónicas*. Her first major *crónica* was published ten years after she began working for *Excelsior*, in 1963, and was called *Todo empezó el domingo* (It all began on Sunday). In this work, she compiles "eighty *crónicas* with their accompanying sketches by Alberto Beltrán [that] encompass the Sunday pastimes and customs of the poorest Mexicans." (Jørgensen 37) This was a topic far removed from her privileged upbringing, but it awoke in her a desire to write about events

and situations that seemed unjust to her. In 1968, she began collecting interviews and testimonies from the victims of the Tlatelolco massacre, which were “a product of [her] outrage and of the natural sympathy [she has] always felt towards young people.” (39) *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1972: *Massacre in Mexico*), as the author explains in an interview for Tate Britain, represented a great step toward speaking out against injustice in Mexico.¹³ She goes on in the same interview to claim that the *crónica* changed the attitudes of her readers towards government injustice and inspired many Mexicans to speak out and express their own indignation.

As Poniatowska explains, testimonial literature and *crónicas* are often products of the author’s or the people’s indignation over historical events (qtd in Jørgensen 40). It is also a way for her to find her own identity through her portrayal of the thousands of Mexican identities she has discovered: “Whenever I questioned my place in the world, Mexico gave me the answer...I am who I am because of the thousands of voices that I have listened to. I am formed out of the many installments inscribed by those who have entrusted me with their stories” (43-45). The combination of indignation and the search for identity is important to Poniatowska’s *crónicas*: it seems that the author learns more about herself every

¹³ In an interview with Lynn Hershman Leeson and Tilda Swinton, Poniatowska says of *La noche*: “It had a great effect and still has a great affect, yes, because it was the only thing published on that killing in 1968”:

http://www.tate.org.uk/intermediaart/elena_poniatowska.shtm

time she becomes involved in a social movement, such as the Tlatelolco massacre of 1968, the Mexico City earthquakes of 1985 or the Zócalo protest, all of which resulted in *crónicas* within Poniatowska's production (respectively: *La noche de Tlatelolco*, 1971; *Nada, nadie; las voces del temblor*, 1988; and *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, 2007). Cynthia Steele points out that "Poniatowska points to Tlatelolco as a turning point in her own political development" (11), and this turning point becomes important in the discussion of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, a *crónica* that the author has claimed pays homage to *La noche de Tlatelolco*.¹⁴ Poniatowska uses Mexico's history, politics, tragedies and social uprisings to better understand where she herself belongs, and in doing so she creates a text that her readers can identify with and use as a tool for their own search for self-awareness:

Ever since the 1950s I have felt, as a journalist, the need to document my country. Because I didn't know anything about Mexico and I belonged on my mother's side to a family that was, in a certain sense, nomadic and foreign, a Porfirian family who chose to live in Europe after losing their lands in the Mexican Revolution and later in the agrarian reform and the expropriations ordered by President Lázaro

¹⁴ Poniatowska elaborated on the relationship between these two *crónicas* while presenting *Amanecer en el Zócalo* at the Feria Internacional de Libro, in Guadalajara, Mexico (November, 2007). I will expand on this relationship further later in this chapter, but to paraphrase her presentation at the FIL, Poniatowska said that since the former work was called *La noche de Tlatelolco* ("The Night of Tlatelolco") the latter work was appropriately named "*Daybreak in the Zócalo*" since it paid homage to *La noche*. She wanted her readers to see the connection between these two *crónicas* simply by reading their titles.

Cárdenas, I wanted to know the country that had given me refuge in 1942 [...] Whenever I questioned my place in the world, Mexico gave me the answer. (qtd in Corona and Jörgensen 43-4)

At the most superficial level we can observe one similarity between *La noche de Tlatelolco* and *Amanecer en el Zócalo* in the titles of these two *crónicas*: although the official translated title of the first work (chronologically) is *Massacre in Mexico*, the literal translation would be “The Night of Tlatelolco (Plaza)”; while the second work’s title could be translated as “Daybreak (or Dawn) in the Zócalo (Plaza).” Beneath the surface, both works are *crónicas* that respond to actions of the Mexican government: *La noche de Tlatelolco* responds to the order given to the Mexican army by President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz to occupy the Tlatelolco square while the students from Mexico’s National Autonomous University protested against government corruption. *Amanecer en el Zócalo* responds to the alleged fraud and corruption behind the presidential elections of 2006. Secondly, both are dedicated to giving the entire story behind a civil movement: *La noche* tells the story of the students’ movement to garner international attention about governmental corruption, political prisoners incarcerated unfairly, corrupt police forces, and an antidemocratic law stating that any meeting of three or more people could result in incarceration. *Amanecer* tells the story of the peaceful civil resistance movement that called for a recount of the votes in the 2006 presidential election. Thirdly, both civil movements represent milestones on Mexico’s road to achieving true democracy: *La*

noche and *Amanecer* both represent moments in which Mexican citizens speak out for freedom of expression, basic human rights and the liberty to have a say in the way their country is run. Finally in both works we find one of Mexico City's *plazas* as the setting and "protagonist." Carlos Monsiváis claims that "the city is, as never before, the greatest protagonist of the [contemporary] *crónica*" (2002: 35), at once the setting, backdrop and principal character that is influenced, advanced and sometimes brought to a halt by the people living within it. Poniatowska, in both *crónicas* we are discussing here, does not use or describe the city and its *plazas* as simple physical settings, but rather as moving and living entities that constantly affect and are affected by the other human "characters" within the works. In the following passages, Poniatowska describes her first impression of the Zócalo *plaza's* "character" at the start of the 2006 civil movement, and next describes the qualities she sees lying below the concrete surface of the *plaza*:

¡Qué bello es el Zócalo, Dios mío! El clima de entusiasmo cautiva.
¡Qué gran sonrisa la de la plaza! (*Amanecer en el Zócalo* 19)

My God, the Zócalo is magnificent! The air of enthusiasm is captivating. A great smile flashes across the plaza!

El Zócalo, centro de las movilizaciones, es tierra de AMLO¹⁵, es suyo, es el sitio de México que mejor conoce. Es su matriz, su abrazo paterno y materno, su espacio político, su piedra de sacrificio, su comedia y su tragedia, el eje de sus pasiones y el de su desencanto, el de su condena y su rendición. Si él dijera que se sabe de memoria cada una de sus piedras, cada uno de los vidrios de las ventanas de sus palacios yo le creería a pie juntillas. Si dijera que cada una de las piedras podría repetir las palabras allí escuchadas, siempre radicales, siempre políticas en una perpetua confrontación con el poder, yo le daría la razón. Si dijera que las voces de protesta aún rezumban en sus oídos estaría en lo cierto. Allí palpitan todavía las palabras del desafuero y sus buenas razones para luchar contra el atropello. Allí también resuenan las protestas contra el fraude, la voz de Jesusa dándole indicaciones a la multitud para levantarse contra el estado y descalificar el proceso electoral. Allí se levanta el sacrificio de los que permanecieron en la plaza cuarenta y ocho días con sus noches. (392-3)

The Zócalo, the centre of civil movement, is Amlo's land. It is his. It is the place he knows best in Mexico. It is his matrix, his paternal and maternal embrace, his political space, his sacrificial stone, his comedy and his tragedy, the axis of his passion and his disenchantment, the axis of his condemnation and his rendition. If he told me he knew every one of its stones by heart, every one of the windows of its palaces, I would believe him without a shadow of a doubt. If he had told me that every one of its stones could repeat each word heard there, ever radical, ever political in a perpetual confrontation with power, I would say he was right. If he said that all the voices of protest still echo in the plaza's ears, I would know it was true. The words of the desafuero and all his good reasons for fighting against his defeat still resound there. So do the protests against fraud, and Jesusa's voice telling the masses to rise up against deception and to disqualify the electoral process.

¹⁵ "AMLO" is the familiar acronym used by many Mexican citizens to refer to Andrés Manuel López Obrador. In Chapter Three I will discuss the significance of this nickname and explain my decision to change its written form to "Amlo" in the English translation.

There rises up the sacrifice of those who stayed in the plaza for forty-eight days and nights. [My translation].

As we can see in the above excerpts from *Amanecer*, the author writes about the Zócalo as though it has human-like senses, a soul, sentiments, as though it has the power to listen and embrace and smile. It is more than a backdrop in her *crónica*; it is as much a character as she is herself. The mood of the crowd – enthusiasm, disappointment – affects the Zócalo as much as the mood of the Zócalo – light, weather – affects the crowd.

The significance of this last similarity, in my opinion, goes beyond the clear observation that *Amanecer*, like *La noche*, fits into Monsiváis's characterization of the contemporary *crónica*. Since the "protagonist" of the story is at once the geographical setting of the story, one could observe that this highlights the author's search for her own "belonging," not only within her physical surroundings but also within the Mexican culture. She assigns human-like qualities to stones and buildings that represent significant moments in Mexico's history; the Zócalo, which has played host to countless protests, speeches, and important events of the political and cultural history of the nation, is the capital city's largest *plaza*. It seems as though the better the author can "become acquainted" with the *plaza* (as though she were becoming acquainted with another person) the better she will know the country she lives in and loves.

This personal aspect of Poniatowska's *crónicas* and her ongoing search for identity influence her career as a *cronista* in an interesting way, because while other *cronistas* seek to showcase only the voices of the marginalized,¹⁶ Poniatowska constantly inserts her own self-reflection into her examination of others.

Poniatowska feels a "need" to write about the events and moments in history that shape her country and elicit a very strong personal reaction in herself. In 1999 (when the author was sixty-five years old, and seven years before the civil movement that inspired *Amanecer en el Zócalo*) she wrote, "Now in 1999 after forty-six years in journalism, I am trying to dedicate myself to writing novels, short stories, and poetry. I hope I'm allowed to do so. Mexican reality is demanding. [...] To say 'no' is impossible for me." (qtd in Corona and Jörgensen 44-5). Evidently, at sixty-five years of age Poniatowska felt that she had satisfied her commitment to the *crónica*, and that she had deservedly moved on to a new era in her life in which she could retire from political non-fiction and settle down with fictional literature. However, it seems that her commitment to the *crónica* is not something she can control or put an end to, as long as the country in which she lives continues to change culturally and politically, and as long as it has something to teach her about her own identity and that of her compatriots. Thus, nearly a decade after declaring herself a retired *cronista*, she found herself unable to turn away from an historical

¹⁶ See Chapter Two.

event that caused her indignation and forced her to question Mexico, its politics, its people and herself.

Since *Amanecer en el Zócalo* is, for the moment at least, the latest work in Elena Poniatowska's overall production, it is interesting to observe how this *crónica* compares to *La noche de Tlatelolco*, not necessarily at the level of the writing, but more at the level of production and the social contexts behind the two works. We have seen, in some detail, the similarities between *Amanecer* and *La noche*, but more than simply sharing the characteristics of the contemporary Mexican *crónica* as described by theorists such as Monsiváis, a comparison can be made between the "positions" that Elena Poniatowska herself occupied within society as a writer at the time of each work's production. Poniatowska's role as a writer is intimately connected to her search for identity as well, given that her role as a writer has been largely shaped by her identity as a woman, her social status and her personality (her drive, perseverance, curiosity). Elizabeth Starcevic (1983) defines Poniatowska as a writer belonging to a group of writers committed to producing texts dealing with issues of equality, freedom and other political concerns:

Elena Poniatowska [...] belongs to a loose grouping of writers from Latin America that came into prominence in the late 1960s and 1970s. Over the last fifteen years the works of the principal authors of this literary 'boom' – Carlos Fuentes, Julio Cortázar, Guillermo Cabrera Infante, and Gabriel García Márquez – have finally reached the shelves of North American libraries. Unified originally in their support of the Cuban Revolution, these writers have subsequently

parted political ways while remaining committed to the ideals of a free and egalitarian society (72).

Interestingly enough, Starcevic points out that when we examine this loose grouping of writers and their works, our attention is drawn to a second group of writers to which Poniatowska also belongs – that characterized by the author's gender: "In fact, a brief look at literary anthologies and works of criticism that pretend to describe the "boom" period reveals an almost total absence of works by women." (72). She goes on to explain that this by no means indicates that women did not write, but rather that their works were not widely accepted or taken seriously, thus not published or translated often.

There is a widely agreed-upon theory that testimonial literature and feminist criticism go hand in hand. As María Elena de Valdés (1998) explains, women's issues in Mexico are unique to Mexico for various reasons:

The situation in Mexico is unique in that Mexican society and its economy belong to both the first and third worlds, and Mexico has a heritage of institutionalized sexism. This unique combination has forced feminism into a radical reexamination of the premises held in the United States and Europe. [...] In the third world, the struggle for social justice and basic human rights is so fundamental that a feminist is a social critic who forces the debate into a single basic claim: a social system based on the exploitation of gender is a system where all, men and women, are victims. [...] Most Mexican women are as oppressed economically and socially as most women in the rest of the third world, but in addition they suffer a particular kind of sociopsychological loss of identity as persons because of Mexico's

proximity to the dominant first world, consumer-driven culture of the United States. (13-14)

Poniatowska, living as a woman in Mexico for most of her life, has inevitably experienced the unique challenge faced by all women in Mexico. And since she comes from a well-to-do family, her career has also been affected in a unique way. As explained earlier by Bruce-Novoa, the voices of the marginalized in Mexico are often revealed in the writing of authors from the upper classes, so Poniatowska was, in fact, one of the privileged few that was able to write. However, her writing was limited because of her sex.

Although Poniatowska had already established herself as a political writer prior to writing *La noche*, it was still the early 1970s when the *crónica* was published, so it can be determined that while she was a respected writer *despite* her sex, she was still female, and her writing would not receive the same acknowledgements that a man's might at that time. Considering that in the 1960s and 70s, when women's writing was seldom published and, when it was, was often not taken as seriously as that of men, it could be assumed that her femininity could have been taken farther into account in the criticism of *La noche*. For example, since women mainly wrote articles for the society pages of newspapers, and since their work was often based on "frivolities" of society such as parties and debutante balls, some critics may have wondered about the level of sentimentality in Poniatowska's work and questioned its dependability as a nonfiction political text. In other words,

Poniatowska's work in 1971 was an anomaly coming from a woman writer, and could potentially have been judged as such. Thus, she still had some way to go before she could prove herself.

By way of contrast, in 2007, after a fifty-plus year career in journalism and as an author, Ponaitowska's *Amanecer en el Zócalo* was no longer seen first and foremost as a book written by a woman, but rather as the work of a well-respected author who has dedicated her career to making the voice of Mexico heard. The following is a segment of one of countless positive reviews of the work, written by Javier Aranda Luna in *La Jornada* on June 27, 2007:

Amanecer en el Zócalo es un magnífico diario escrito por quien Monsiváis ha considerado como "la mejor, más intensa cronista de la múltiple realidad mexicana," por la escritora que ha vuelto indecisas las fronteras entre lo cotidiano y lo insólito según Octavio Paz, por la escritora cuya militancia por las buenas causas le viene de José Revueltas, por la escritora a quien poco importan los géneros literarios sino contar historias que lo mismo las arma con personajes ficticios o de carne y hueso, con nombres de otros o con el suyo propio.¹⁷

Amanecer en el Zócalo is a magnificent diary written by the author who Monsiváis considers to be "the best, most intense cronista of the diverse reality of Mexico," the author who has blurred the borders between daily life and the unheard-of, as stated by Octavio Paz, the author whose militancy for good causes she learned from José Revueltas, the writer who cares little about literary genres and more about telling stories fortified by fictitious characters

¹⁷ <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2007/06/27/index.php?section=cultura&article=a07a1cul>

as well as in-the-flesh ones, with others' names or with her own. [My translation].

As we can see, Poniatowska's femininity has nothing to do with the accolades she received in 2007, and she is considered by her fellow (male) writers to be on the same level as any other political writer. Furthermore, this is evidence of considerable progress in the development of feminism in Mexico, as a woman's writing is no longer considered to be beyond the norm. It is, of course, necessary to mention the boom of women writers in Mexico since the 1980s. Many factors have contributed to the growing number of women writers across Latin America, but two particular factors, the economic crisis of 1982 and the subsequent fragmentation of the Mexican political parties, are explained by Nuala Finnegan (2007), and pertain to the discussion of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*:

The [economic crisis generated by the oil scare and the subsequent devaluation of the *peso* in 1982] precipitated a tremendous change in work practices for women, leading to the creation of a body of female consumers eager to read fiction, for the first time in Mexico's history. Furthermore, the fragmented and diverse *boom femenino* forms part of a wider and much documented fragmentation of the Mexican political system including the ascendancy of the political parties, Partido Revolucionario Democrático (PRD) and the Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN) in the 1990s, *zapatismo* and the new social movements, and culminating in 2000 with the toppling of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) which had been in power since the 1920s. Indeed, it could be argued that the current body politic in Mexico is more splintered than ever in the aftermath of the infamous 2006 election which caused widespread civil unrest amid

accusations of electoral fraud and appeals to the Federal Electoral Tribunal (TRIFE). The fragmentation of form, content and authorial position with regard to fiction produced by women since 1980 is registered, therefore, in almost all areas of cultural production during this time. (11)

Thus, there is a great difference between Poniatowska's position as a writer at the respective times of publication of the two works. I do not mean to imply, however, that *La noche* lacked the popularity of *Amanecer*; only that it was more difficult to publish at the time of its creation and Poniatowska's gender was taken more into account as a factor in its reception. In fact, *La noche*, which was first published in 1971 by Ediciones Era in Mexico, had been published in the Spanish language in forty-eight editions and had sold nearly 250,000 copies by 1994, according to Beth Jörgensen (*Engaging Dialogues* 76). Newer editions have been released since that time, proving that there is still broad interest in the *crónica*, and that it is still pertinent, even if only in academic circles. Moreover, the work has been translated into English, Polish and Czech. Since *Amanecer en el Zócalo* was only published in 2007, and since, to the best of my knowledge, mine is the first translation of the work into any language, it is too early to predict whether *Amanecer* will be printed in multiple editions as its predecessor was, nor can we predict whether it will be published in languages other than Spanish. But if it follows the pattern of *La noche*, there could very well be continued interest in the

sociopolitical content of the *crónica* for decades to come as the politics and societies of Central and North American shift and develop.

Debra Castillo, an expert in feminist theory of Latin America, supports this theory that women's writing is one aspect of a larger project for social change:

Women in Latin America are consciously involved in a practice that has long been recognized in their male counterparts. To play on a famous structuralist formulation, to write in Latin America is for them more than a verb, transitive or intransitive – it is a revolutionary act. (20)

This revolutionary act is one part of a larger-scale social reconstruction happening in Mexico. Poniatowska not only joined in on this feminist revolution in the literary world but by writing *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, she helped to cultivate this idea that women's writing is one factor in a much broader revolution for human rights.

Another major difference between *La noche* and *Amanecer*, and evidence of social advancement, can be seen in the efforts made to publish each work. Claire Brewster explains that after 1968, while Poniatowska was writing *La noche de Tlatlelolco*, the government attempted to prevent its publication because the *crónica* clearly spoke out against government actions:

There were considerable efforts to prevent [*La noche de Tlatlelolco's*] publication. The publishing house, Ediciones Era, was the target of bomb threats, but its owner refused to be intimidated, and the book

was launched in 1971. Poniatowska was kept under government surveillance, but her response was disarming. (51)

President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz's authoritarian rule, however, was also a key factor in pushing the agenda for a more democratic Mexico:

A series of political crises from the late 1960s through the early 1990s played a crucial role in initiating and then driving forward Mexico's slow, uneven liberalizing process. These crises were somewhat different in character; some broadly challenged the legitimacy of postrevolutionary authoritarian rule (the 1968 student-popular movement and the 1994 Zapatista rebellion), while others more directly accentuated divisions within the governing elite (the 1986-1988 split within the PRI and the assassination of the PRI's designated candidate in 1994). Taken together, however, these events increased the scale of political opposition and enlarged opposition forces' room for maneuver.

President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz's (1964-1970) violent repression of the 1968 student-popular movement – particularly the Tlatelolco massacre, in which army troops killed or wounded several hundred demonstrators at Tlatelolco Plaza in Mexico City – was a key early catalyst in this regard. The resulting public outcry especially undercut the regime's legitimacy among the urban middle-class groups that constituted the ruling elite's most politically articulate constituency. Moreover, the events of 1968 gave rise both to a generation of political leaders committed to democratizing Mexican politics and society and to several new leftist parties that operated outside the officially recognized party system [and expanded] these parties' access to the mass media. (Middlebrook 15)

So although it would remain evident that a *crónica* such as *La noche de Tlatelolco*, which clearly speaks out against Díaz Ordaz' government would possibly be

discouraged by the federal government, it is also interesting that *La noche* played a key role in the rebellion to which the President's authoritarian regime gave rise. Perhaps Poniatowska's position as an elite member of society saved her from government retribution, but from any perspective she took a great risk by writing such a text.

In contrast, the fact that *Amanecer en el Zócalo* was released approximately one year following the end of the Zócalo protest, by one of the country's largest media groups (Planeta) speaks volumes about the progress in freedom of expression in Mexico. True, the author herself received personal death threats and extreme harassment for her involvement in the resistance, but considering how passionately the protesters felt about their cause, there was equal ardor on the opposite side. It remains unclear whether Poniatowska's harasser was affiliated with or paid by Calderón's National Action Party, and since the author herself suspects this to a certain degree, we have to assume that freedom of expression in Mexico is not without its limitations, though some significant progress is evident.

That being said, the progress seems to be evident mainly in that the fragmentation of society mentioned by Nuala Finnegan earlier has given way to partisan publishing groups and newspapers that may not have existed in earlier decades due to the widespread government control of these institutions. José Joaquín Blanco, another Mexican *cronista* and one of Poniatowska's peers, explains that censorship still exists, especially in newspapers, because different newspapers

are controlled by different political parties, so there may in fact be even more “taboo” topics in journalism than ever before, and publishing one’s opinion depends entirely on finding a specific venue in which to do so. This is why *crónicas*, which can obviously be published in book form and widely distributed, are increasingly important vehicles for subversive discourse in Mexico, because they can be more easily accessed by wider audiences, and because they have a longer “shelf life” than daily newspapers:

Today there exists a kind of censorship that was previously unknown, because journalists have aligned themselves according to partisan interests. I have been writing for newspapers regularly since 1970, and I was only censured and expelled from a newspaper or magazine in 1996. This occurred in *La Jornada*, a newspaper for which I am part owner and co-founder, due to my unfavorable opinions on the *Partido de la Revolución Democrática* (PRD, Party of the Democratic Revolution), Subcomandante Marcos, and the guerilla-bishop Samuel Ruiz. Before, when there were no strong opposition parties, and in consequence the *cronista’s* criticisms or satires didn’t offend powerful interests, only open denunciations or ad hominem attacks on the following four topics were censured: 1) the Virgin of Guadalupe; 2) the president of the Republic; 3) the army; and 4) the major commercial sponsors of the publication in question. (62)

Another *cronista* currently writing in Mexico is Juan Villoro, who supports my argument that while magazines and newspapers continue to be censored heavily, publishing houses experience this less. In his opinion, one of the primary

reasons for the lack of censorship faced by publishing houses is that books are less threatening to politicians than the news:

The *crónica* in Mexico can be seen from many perspectives. In the first place, it has served to disclose things that can't be said in any other form. For seventy years Mexico had the same party in power, and one of the ways of perpetuating the Mexican political system has been the control of information. This has assumed such diverse strategies as direct pressure coming from the secretary of state, the murder of journalists, or the creation of the paper distribution system "PIPSA" during the Lázaro Cárdenas regime, which extended credit to the principal newspapers and controlled them through the simple threat of claiming payment of the outstanding invoices. [...] The government has had official newspapers (*El Nacional*) and satellite newspapers (*El Día*, today's *Unomásuno*, and today's *Excélsior*). In this environment of controlled information, books of *crónicas* have served to give dissenting news accounts. In contrast to what goes on in the mass media, publishing houses have experienced very little censorship. No politician feels his blood pressure rising if someone reads a revealing book about his actions. (64)

Of course, although politicians may not fear a tarnished reputation from a book in publication as much as from a news article, this does not mean that *crónicas* are not effective. The reason why a politician may feel his "blood pressure rising" when newspapers print stories about negative actions is that newspapers are available on the street, for every passer-by to see, and provocative headlines, updated daily, are readily available for everyone to read. We could assume that even those who do not read an entire newspaper article, or even those who never purchase a newspaper

still have access to these headlines, which continue to reveal scandals and actions day after day. Books, on the other hand, need to be purchased and read, which means that far fewer people will be aware of the contents. That being said, when newspapers are censored more and books are censored less, more and more people could potentially be drawn to books.

HOW AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO COMPLIES SPECIFICALLY WITH THE DEFINITION OF THE CRÓNICA

Poniatowska's *Amanecer en el Zócalo* clearly follows the patterns observed in *crónica* writing outlined by Monsiváis, Corona and Jörgensen. Its non-fiction story describes Mexico's largest-ever popular movement following a political crisis. It is written in a style that combines journalism with literary imagery and dialogue that would normally be found in the novel. And Poniatowska's transcription of hundreds of different voices throughout the work is a clear marker that the text is written to give voice to those whose voices might otherwise be ignored.

Because the *crónica* has covered such a wide variety of topics and themes over the past century and emerged primarily through news media (Jörgensen, 2002:1), it is difficult to pinpoint the characteristic that defines it as a *literary* genre as opposed to a *journalistic* one. However, Vicente Leñero and Carlo Marín (1986) offer a valuable definition in *Manual de periodismo*:

[La *crónica*] es la exposición, la narración de un acontecimiento, en el orden en que fue desarrollándose. Se categoriza por transmitir, además de información, las impresiones del cronista. Más que retratar la realidad este género se emplea para recrear la atmósfera en que se produce un determinado suceso." (43)

The crónica is the recounting, the narration of an event, in the order in which it progressed. It is categorized by the fact that it transmits the impressions of the cronista in addition to information. More than simply illustrating reality, this genre is used to recreate the atmosphere in which a certain event occurs. (My translation).

This definition, which is corroborated by Carlos Monsiváis (2002), emphasizes the significance of the fact that the *cronista reports* on an event and also injects his or her own impressions and judgments on the situation, and most importantly, that the *cronista narrates* the event in a literary style. When writing similar to this genre is published in a Canadian or American newspaper or magazine, it might be considered an op-ed piece, or a letter to the editor, or simply a human-interest story. When these kinds of stories are collected into book manuscripts in North America, the final product might be lumped into the enormous literary category of "non-fiction novel." So how can we differentiate the Mexican *crónica* from standard newspaper articles or non-fiction, as its own species of writing? Esperança Bielsa gives, in my opinion, a very comprehensive and concise general overview of the contemporary *crónica's* distinguishing characteristics:

Despite its inherent diversity and changeability, it is possible to point to various general features, often interrelated, that allow for a basic characterization of contemporary *crónicas*, while not attempting to seek out unifying marks of a genre that cannot be reduced to a strict formal norm:

- (i) The *crónica* deals with real events and characters that have a certain quality of immediacy and presentness (it also possesses, however, a space for the creation of fictional characters and events, usually related to an identifiable reality).

- (ii) The *crónica* often offers a recreation of the atmosphere and characters related to the event it narrates; it has a descriptive intention.

- (iii) The *crónica* narrativizes and fictionalizes in various degrees the real events it portrays, producing an ambiguity between reality and fiction, or between the perceived opposition of information and imagination. Some *crónicas* can be read, thanks to the literary techniques they use to reconstruct actions and scenes, as fiction. At the same time, these techniques allow the author to reconstruct, imagine and recreate the empty spaces that exist in the story that is being narrated to transmit it to the readers in all its integrity.

- (iv) The author – the *cronista* – occupies a central position in his or her writing. *Crónicas* are often narrations of the experiences of the *cronista* written as first person accounts. In other cases, and more generally, the *crónica* is a subjective narration of events, often from a character's point of view.

(v) The *crónica* possesses a style. It is a text with stylistic singularity through which the *cronista* addresses the reader with his or her own recognizable voice.

(vi) There is a strong presence of orality in the *crónica*, both when it reproduces in a direct way the language of the street in the words of its characters, and in the narrator's own language, which is a non-literary language, close to spoken language. It can be argued that the *crónica* is, generally, a highly dialogized form, in which the narrator's voice is constantly being eroded by the voices of its characters.

(vii) *Crónicas* finish but have no end. They portray a reality that continues existing when the *crónica* has come to an end and have, as a consequence of this fact, a certain character of indeterminacy. (38-9)

I would now like to give an overview of how *Amanecer en el Zócalo* specifically conforms to these seven characteristics:

1. Poniatowska's text deals with the real event of the 2006 Mexican federal election, and is written as a sort of diary, treating the occurrences of the Zócalo protest in chronological order. Although the book was published one year after the event, the diary-like format reveals that it was written simultaneously with the protest. Poniatowska divides the story into "chapters" defined by the fifty days of protest, and narrates the story in present tense, evoking the feeling of urgency of her storytelling. The message of her text also conveys a sense of immediacy; she aims to draw attention to the political circumstance of Mexico in as timely a manner

as possible. This can be observed clearly from the very beginning of the text. Within Poniatowska's first utterances, she portrays the sense that this story is told in the present tense, she introduces both the personal "unknown" principle characters as well as Andrés Manuel López Obrador, the very public and recognizable figure around whom the story revolves, and she sets the scene at a real address in Mexico City that would be familiar to her readers. Furthermore, in the very first paragraph of the *crónica* she puts forth the primary motivation behind the protest (and thus the motivation behind the *crónica*). With these devices, the author immediately conveys the idea that this story is real and its message is immediate:

Sábado 29 de julio de 2006: Vamos Jesusa, Paula y yo a la casa de campaña en San Luis Potosí núm. 64, esquina con Córdoba. Curiosamente no veo a tantos esperando en la calle. Andrés Manuel López Obrador nos recibe de inmediato: "Ya lo pensé bien, nos vamos a quedar. Vamos a instalarnos en campamentos sobre Reforma, Juárez, Madero y el Zócalo, hasta que el Tribunal Electoral del Poder Judicial de la Federación (TEPJF) ordene volver a contra los votos en todas las casillas." (*Amanecer* 15)

Jesusa, Paula and I go to the campaign office at 64 San Luis Potosí, at the corner of Córdoba. It's strange, I don't see a crowd gathered outside. Andrés Manuel López Obrador, "Amlo" welcomes us immediately: "I've already thought this through. We're going to camp there. We'll set up tents on Reforma, Juárez, Madero and in the Zócalo, until the Electoral Court of the Federal Judiciary (Tribunal Electoral del Poder Judicial de la Federación,

TEPJF)¹⁸ orders a recount of all the votes from each polling station” (My translation).

Although the story does not contain any fictional characters, the combination of actual quotes from newspapers and well-known political and artistic personalities with testimonies from unknown “real” people creates a sense of blending real-life current events with the unknown; stories that the general public would not have the chance to read in a newspaper. The following segment from *Amanecer* is an example of the beginning of one of these unknown stories, and the character within reappears intermittently throughout the *crónica*:

María de la Luz Mendoza de Chapela tiene ochenta y siete años, once hijos y veinticinco nietos que le parecen pocos porque si cada uno tuviera tres serían treinta y tres, el número ideal. (“Claro que me sé el nombre de los veinticinco nietos, si cada uno es cada uno, ¿cómo no los voy a reconocer si son muy distintos?”) [...] Con su pelo blanco, su bastón y su dinamismo, todos en el campamento quieren a Luchita, como llaman a María de la Luz. Le va bien llamarse Luz porque es luminosa y alegre. Dan ganas de comérsela. “Yo a usted me la como, Doña Luchita, me la como,” y ella ríe con una risa tan joven como su voz. (31-2)

María de la Luz Mendoza de Chapela is eighty-seven years old, she has eleven children and twenty-five grandchildren, which seems like a small number to her, because if all of her children had three children, she would have had

¹⁸ It can be observed here that in my translation, I decided to leave the acronym “TEPJF” in its Spanish form for various reasons that I will explain in Chapter Three, when I discuss some of the particular challenges I faced and solutions I found for the translation.

thirty-three grandchildren, which would have been the ideal number. ("Of course I know all of their names. They have such different personalities, so how could I not recognize them? They are all so different!") [...]With her white hair, her walking stick and her dynamic personality, everyone in the tent loves "Luchita" (as they call María de la Luz). The name Luz suits her, because it means "light," and she is joyfully luminous. She makes everyone just want to eat her up. "I could just eat you up, Doña Luchita, I could just eat you up," and she laughs; her laugh is as girlish as her voice. (My translation).

Although these stories are not fictional, there is no real way for the reader to verify their reality, as could be done with the newspaper citations. So, for Poniatowska, the opportunity to fictionalize characters and events does exist.

2. The author gives a literary quality to her journalistic narrative, and makes the characters and events within her *crónica* come together to form various subplots, as opposed to accessories to the facts she is attempting to convey. For example, subplots starring characters who give Poniatowska a particularly interesting point of view or whose stories are particularly compelling pull the readers in and make them relate to the story as one might in the case of a remarkably heartwarming fictional character (such as the story of María de la Luz in the previous example). The reader can relate to the identifiable, everyday stories Poniatowska tells in addition to reading a potentially dry, informative nonfiction text.

3. Bielsa's third characteristic brings together the first two. As we have seen, Poniatowska combines the narration of an actual event with literary devices that fictionalize, to a certain extent, many of the characters and occurrences within the story. This creates a certain degree of ambiguity between reality and fiction, allowing the reader to read the book as one might read fiction. One of these devices, following Bielsa's description, is the creation of "interludes" (or, perhaps better said, the recreation of "empty spaces" between the days (or "chapters") of *Amanecer*. What I mean to say here is that she combines true storylines that would be recognizable or familiar to the Mexican reader, because they cover public events and occurrences mentioned in news media at the time, with personal stories of her own life or the lives of others that the average reader would have never heard otherwise. These latter stories constitute "empty spaces" because they do not necessarily relate directly to the primary story, but rather interrupt it and enrich it with an element of personality and emotive narrative not normally found in political nonfiction. A very good example of this is Poniatowska's description of her home life, which juxtaposes life in the Zócalo protest and which she primarily describes either at the end of a chapter or at the very beginning, before moving to the political, social and cultural events of the protest. In one of Poniatowska's home life subplots, she describes the threatening and offensive prank calls that she receives in the middle of the night on several occasions.

Anoche, cuando estaba bien dormida sonó el teléfono: “Pinche puta pendeja, nos tienes hasta el gorro y vamos a acabar contigo. Hija de la chingada, te vamos a matar.” La voz es masculina. Otra vez me pregunto de dónde viene. Le cuento a Jesu y me dice que cambie mi número. “Sólo tú estás en el directorio. ¿A quién se le ocurre?” Tengo que encontrar una solución. (189)

Last night, while I was asleep, the phone rang: “Damn stupid bitch, we’ve had it with you and we’re coming for you. You’re a horrible bitch, and we’re going to kill you.” It is a man’s voice. I wonder again where it comes from. I tell Jesu about it and she tells me to change my number. “You’re the only one in the phone book. Why would you list your number?” I have to find a solution to this problem. [My translation]

These descriptions of harassment add a new dimension to the story in various ways: first, they evoke a sense of tension and apprehension in the reader that is otherwise not present in the relatively unsuspenseful narration of events. I use the term “unsuspenseful” because, since the *crónica* was inevitably released after the real events that it narrates, most readers (who are familiar with the historical background behind the text) would already know the outcome of the primary plotline. Poniatowska’s additional subplots that take place outside of the known reality, however, create a sense of suspense and anticipation.

Suspense and tension are literary techniques we expect to find in fictional texts insofar as they are products of the author’s imagination as well as the reader’s. The example provides a way to blend Poniatowska, a real-life witness to this event and the authority figure telling the story, into the story as a character. Characters

are as fictional as suspense, since they are also created by the imagination. The author constructs herself as a character within her own story by blending both journalistic and personal discourses, but the readers also construct her character because we imagine how she must be feeling, we sympathize with the problems she faces and we identify with her as a witness. By using techniques such as creating this personal insight into her mind and imagined emotions in addition to the chronological journalistic-diary format of her narrative, Poniatowska is able to reconstruct the events to suit the purpose of creating a nonfiction text that can be read like a fiction novel, and to allow the opposition of information and imagination to materialize in the text. Regina Reguillo, in Beth Jörgensen and Ignacio Corona's work *Contemporary Mexican Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre* explains that this blending of discourses and the blurred lines between reality and fiction are significant because they allow every reader to challenge the traditional norms of journalism and to identify with a biased account of a crisis or event in a way that "straight" journalism does not allow. She explains that the *crónica*, therefore, has the capacity to significantly change the way a large portion of society reads and trusts journalism:

The *crónica* is not an innocent genre, a neutral writing, in so far as it aspires to represent the unrepresented and the unrepresentable within the concert of multiple accounts of the world. The weakening of the strict separation between journalism and literature, between reality and fiction, between oral and written culture, between authorized subject and represented subject, will imply an important

challenge for the “new” journalism of the future as a discourse that cuts across all other forms of discourse, in so far as it takes its place at the center of the public sphere. If the proscribed, the stigmatized, the invisible, the other are to emerge forcefully enough to open the possibility of rethinking the modernizing project and its will to dominate large segments of society through silence, it will depend to a large extent on the *crónica*'s capacity to take on the task of transforming storytelling, sensibilities, and means of communication by the other. (58).

4. Because *Amanecer en el Zócalo* is written like a diary and in the first person, Poniatowska definitely occupies the central position within the text and the writing is clearly subjective in terms of her offering and attempting to transmit her personal point of view surrounding the 2006 elections to her readers. She certainly takes a side in the political debates, and although she does offer points of view from the right-wing side of the debates (for example, by citing right-wing newspaper articles), she highlights her personal opinions. In the following example, Poniatowska speaks about the rumors that some of the well-known public figures supporting the movement (such as herself) are paid by the PRD to take part in the movement. In her response to the allegations, she clearly expresses her own left-wing opinions:

“¿Cuánto les pagan?” me grita Sandy Celorio. Nadie nos paga por defender el voto. ¿Cuántas manos de mexicanos dispuestas a ayudar al país están en el Zócalo? Por enésima vez me doy cuenta de que la agresiva es la riqueza; la pobreza es la que aguanta. (119)

“How much are they paying you?” Sandy Celorio shouts at me. Nobody is paying us to defend the vote. How many Mexican hands willing to work for their country are here in the Zócalo? For the umpteenth time, I realize that wealth is the problem, and poverty puts up with it. (My translation).

The author also deliberately selects the characters whose testimonies she includes in the text in order to support her own motives. In the following example, Poniatowska tells the story of a local student who actively participates in the protest by bringing the bare necessities to those who camp out in the Zócalo every night. Not only is Poniatowska providing a story here to which other young Mexicans could relate, she also supports her own left-wing motives in two ways: First, she provides a testimony that agrees with her own opinions and reactions towards the allegations that participants of the protest are remunerated by the PRD, and second she creates the possibility for the reader to empathize with the character and her situation, thereby supporting her own motives by using the “humanity” and emotions of the reader to her advantage:

En la carpa de Jesusa entrevisto a Julia Arnaud que viene todas las mañanas a ocuparse de los artistas y se queda a dormir en la noche. Cuando no presenta cantantes y bailarines, les consigue agua, kleenex, aspirinas, lo que pidan. Muchacha bonita de veintitrés años, estudió actuación en la UNAM y mientras termina su tesis decidió comprometerse con su país. Me apabulla la entrega de la gente joven. [...] “Entré al movimiento porque creo que no es justo que el voto no sea respetado.” A la pregunta de si le pagan, Julia se indigna: “Claro que no. Al contrario, estoy en bancarrota. Coordino a los artistas pero hago un poco de todo. La gente que trabaja aquí es voluntaria. Nadie habla de dinero, haz de cuenta que no existe.” (238)

In Jesusa's tent, I interview Julia Arnaud, who comes every morning to take care of the artists and stays to sleep every night. When she isn't presenting singers and dancers, she brings them water, Kleenex, aspirin, whatever they ask for. She is a pretty young woman, twenty-three years old, she studied performing arts at UNAM and while finishing her thesis, she decided to commit herself to her country. I am bewildered by the generosity of youth. [...] "I joined the movement because I believe it is unjust that the vote is not respected." At the question about whether she is paid to be here, Julia is angered: "Of course not. In fact, I'm broke. I coordinate the artists but I do a little bit of everything. Everyone who works here is a volunteer. No one talks about money, you have to realize it doesn't exist [...]." [My translation]

5. Poniatowska's style of writing is always recognizable throughout the text, especially in the way she pieces together her chapters, or days. Now, although this is not an exact formula, the following pattern is clearly visible in the majority of the *crónica's* chapters:

First, Poniatowska will address her readers personally, opening the chapter with a first-hand account of what she is doing that day, or what she did the day before, and with whom she did it. This is an interesting way of reminding her readers at the beginning of each new chapter that this writing is personal, and that since it could be assumed that as a diary, the author is writing to herself, she is including her readers in her own personal thoughts, making the relationship between reader and text all the more intimate and making the reader feel more involved.

Next, the author will often write one or two anecdotes about people she meets during the day, whether they are an “unknown” character such as the ones I spoke of earlier, or a well-known political or artistic figure. These stories take the *crónica* to the more literary level of which I also spoke earlier, and provide the space for fiction-like characters, as well as creating space for the readers to relate to the story in other ways than simply through the personal thoughts of the author. Again, the readers may be more able to see themselves within the story by reading about the many diverse characters within it.

Third, Poniatowska often quotes newspaper and magazine articles as well as radio and television broadcasts, bringing the two previous personal elements to the story into a real-life and real-time level of nonfiction. Again, this allows the readers to relate to the story because they may have read the same articles or watched the same news broadcasts on the same day, and they will inevitably recognize the real names of newspapers and journalists that Poniatowska cites.

Finally, very often Poniatowska will end the day’s diary entry with an abridged transcription of Andrés Manuel López Obrador’s daily address to the public. In this way, she leaves the readers at the end of the chapter with a reminder of the cause for which she is writing, and provides a narrative for the progression of this cause. This also emphasizes that López Obrador is as much a central character in the story as the author herself, and reminds readers that López Obrador, just like

the author herself, is speaking directly to the readers, making them feel included in the cause.

6. The sense of orality in Poniatowska's writing exists in the exclamations and emotive interjections that she inserts in the narrative. Very often, especially during the segments of the book narrated by the author's own voice, *Amanecer en el Zócalo* reads as if Poniatowska is speaking rather than writing a book, per se. For example, at times she opens a segment or discussion with rhetorical questions to herself such as: "¿Por qué estoy en esto? ¿Cómo empezó todo? ¿Por qué sigo en esta parrilla de carbones ardientes?" (139). [*Why am I in all this? How did this all start? Why do I keep walking on burning coals?*" My translation]. In a more general sense, the very fact that the *crónica* is written in the style of a personal diary suggests a certain sense of reality, simply because we assume that most personal diaries are written as if they were meant to be a mental discussion with the author him- or herself. Furthermore, Poniatowska's recreation of countless different voices and conversations, the *dialogues* prevalent in the text, add a very oral feature to the text that is most often not found in nonfiction texts. This is another device used by Poniatowska and other *cronistas* that combines informative and fictional styles, and the following is an example of such a dialogue that is interspersed with an informative explanation of the risk run by local workers who choose to attend the protest instead of going to work:

Platico con un mensajero de tienda de abarrotes, Ramón Solís Herrera:

--Si no va a su trabajo, ¿no corre el riesgo de que lo despidan?

--Claro, pero me importa mucho escuchar a AMLO a las siete y por eso salgo antes de la ferretería. Voy a pedir cambio de turno.

--¿Y su patrón qué dice?

--Dice que AMLO es un imbécil y que yo soy otro.

--¿Y no le contesta?

--Me tengo que aguantar hasta encontrar otro trabajo y no me importa si no lo encuentro fácil, estoy dispuesto a correr hambre. Aquí les traigo tortillas y comida a los de los campamentos más necesitados. ¡No quiero tener más años de PAN, el país no podría aguantarlo, ya ve cómo nos fregó Fox! (132)

I chat with Ramón Solís Herrera, a deliveryman who works at a grocery store:

"If you don't go to work, aren't you risking being fired?"

"Of course, but it's really important to me to listen to Amlo at seven o'clock, so I leave work early. I'm going to ask for a shift change."

"And what does your boss say?"

"That Amlo is an idiot and so am I."

"And you say nothing?"

"I have to grin and bear it until I can find another job, and it doesn't matter to me if it takes time. I'm willing to go hungry. I bring tortillas and food for the camps that need it most. I don't want any more years of PAN, the country couldn't take it, you see how Fox has already screwed us over!" [My translation]

7. *Amanecer en el Zócalo* has a definitive ending, but the story indeed does not end. The very nature of the story that Poniatowska narrates, the political situation in Mexico and the peoples' quest for true democracy, is a continuous issue that was certainly not fully resolved within the pages of this *crónica*, and an issue that will continue to be present in Mexico for as long as there is a government (indefinitely). Poniatowska resolves this lack of finality by choosing a decisive timeline in which to narrate her story (the fifty days of protest), thus forcing herself to "end" the story at a specific point; the last date of her "diary" is September 17, 2006. However, the primary goal of the civil movement – a total recount of all the votes from the July 2 election – was never reached, and the final resolution decided upon by the protesters and the left-wing political groups was to swear in Andrés Manuel López Obrador (unofficially, and without actual political power) as the "Legitimate President of Mexico" on November 20, 2006, or two full months after the *crónica* comes to its end. Furthermore, Poniatowska leaves her *crónica* on a note that suggests that she, personally, has not finished dealing with the emotional repercussions of the civil movement, and that the country has certainly not dealt with the political repercussions, implying that this story has no end:

Sigo leyendo periódicos como desaforada como para no perder la emoción de los días en el Zócalo. ¿Cómo fortalecer la legitimidad democrática en México? La gente de buena fe – que hay mucha – sabrá afianzarla. El 20 de noviembre de 2006, el 35.51 por ciento del electorado, o sea 14 756 350 de hombres y mujeres que votamos por AMLO lo haremos presidente legítimo en el mismo Zócalo en el que

protestamos. Finalmente, he sido testigo – como diría Adolfo Sánchez Rebolledo – del “mayor movimiento social y electoral encabezado por la izquierda desde el cardenismo.” [...] Espero que este movimiento deposite en mí únicamente lo esencial. Ahora sé que para AMLO están los que son sus amigos y luego los que son útiles en determinado momento. No me hago ilusiones. Jesusa y yo somos útiles, ella mucho más que yo puesto que es una activista y yo me inclino por la soledad aunque me cale. Aprendí más en esa multitud sobre el amor y la compasión, el desinterés y la entrega que todo lo aprendido en el mundo de las apariencias. (393-4)

I keep reading newspapers incessantly, so I don't lose the emotion from the days of the Zócalo. How can we strengthen democratic legitimacy in Mexico? People of good faith – and they are many – will know how. On November the 20th, 2006, 35.31 per cent of voters, or 14,756,350 women and men who voted for Amlo will make him legitimate President in the same Zócalo in which we protested. Finally I have been witness – as Adolfo Sánchez Rebolledo would say – to the “largest social and electoral movement led by the Left since Cárdenas.” [...] I hope that this movement implants only the essential in me. Now I know that Amlo has his friends on the one hand, and then on the other there are those who will be useful to him in any given moment. I'm not fooling myself. Jesusa and I are useful, she much more than I, as she is an activist and I tend towards solitude even though it weighs on me. I learned more from this movement about love and compassion, about disinterest and devotion, than from anything else I have experienced in the world of appearances. [My translation]

Keeping Bielsa's preceding definition(s) in mind, it is important to note that these characterizations refer primarily and specifically to the Mexican *crónica* of roughly the past century. In the article “On the *Crónica* in Mexico” (in Corona and Jörgensen 25-35), Carlos Monsiváis gives a detailed history of the *crónica*, emphasizing how it has changed in form and function over the centuries since the

Spaniards first settled in the “New World.” As Monsiváis explains, the most recognized *cronistas* from the sixteenth century are soldiers such as Hernán Cortés, Bernal Díaz de Castillo and Alvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, but “the ones most widely read are the friars who – with holy water in hand – praise the Creator, enumerate blasphemies and prodigies, and deal with the character of the native and the displacement of religions” (26). The *crónica*’s first existence was seen as “‘raw material’ of national history, of ecclesiastic history, of the victory of civilization over barbarism. But history is also literature, and a high-quality literature at that.” (26)

Later, in the nineteenth century, the *crónica* shifted to a literary device of the liberal Reform, in which the authors saw “the opportunity to combine in one single text political statement, national memory, a message to friends, and a great memorial. The nation exists because there was someone to describe it and interpret its realities by naming them.” (26-7). In this time, according to Monsiváis, the best-known *cronistas* are figures such as Guillermo Prieto, Manuel Ignacio Altamirano and José Tomás de Cuéllar, all of whom strive to “[explore] literary styles that appeal to class and regional interests” and focus on “the primordial task of constructing the society that will become the nation.” (28)

THE THEORIES OF SYSTEMS IN CULTURE AND LITERATURE

Now that we have discussed *Amanecer en el Zócalo*'s place in the canon of the contemporary Mexican *crónica*, I can attempt to situate the work within the Mexican literary system. Karen de Wet, in her article "Dialogues Generated by Pivotal Figures in Literary Systems: A Systemic Approach to the Study of Literature" (1997) explains the significance of literary systems with regards to historiography, or cultural memory. She states: "the state or position of a system contains information on both the history thereof and its current situation of change." (10). It would stand to reason that if the system itself *contains* information, then the entities of that system are the true cultural artifacts. In other words, texts play a systematic role within a culture and are crucial to cultural identity and cultural memory. To go further into the system theory, de Wet goes on to explain that the relationships between the entities of a system represent a discourse (in this case, literary discourse):

When the "relations between" system entities are regarded as possibly being representatives of a particular discourse, it follows that the existence and effect of these relations can be recorded as a literary discourse [...] it is the "interdependence" between system entities that makes functioning (and therefore also existence) of the system possible at all. Consequently 'discourse' is a useful term when the forces and relations within a literary system are described, because it has points in common with a system structure." (11)

Of course, we could say that these relationships, the interdependence between texts that we use to describe “genres” within a literary system, and therefore texts are cultural artifacts *because* they belong to certain genres: they help to form, develop and change the system itself, and in turn help to write a cultural history.

Systems theories have been developing in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries in all types of disciplines from the sciences to the arts, and it is no small task to apply a theory of systems to a given field of study, in this case literature and translation. Niklas Luhmann, in his work *Social Systems* (1995) explains:

Today “systems theory” is a catchall concept for very different denotations and very different levels of analysis. The word refers to no unambiguous meaning. When one introduces the concept of systems into sociological analyses without further clarification, then an illusory precision arises that lacks any basis. Thus controversies arise in which one can only suppose or infer from the argumentation that the participants have different ideas in mind when they speak of systems. (1)

For the purposes of this study, in order to avoid “agreeing to disagree” on the concept of systems, I believe it is important to discuss the notion of “systems” and the potential trouble this term can cause when we examine a specific genre or “type” of literature. The term “system” – of literature, in this case – implies a certain extent of organization within a network of texts, within a given culture or geographical region. The preliminary problem here is that the geographical regions of which we speak here – Mexico and “North America” (a term I use to refer to the

United States and Canada) – comprise a variety of “cultures” and each culture produces vastly different types of literature. According to the term “system,” all of these types of literature should supposedly be connected to one another to form a comprehensive arrangement. So, to speak of the Mexican literary system or the North American literary system is excessively general. As Luhmann discusses system and environment, he acknowledges the challenges that systems face in complex environments in which many different kinds of systems exist (187).

Luhmann explains that because of the extremely complex relationship between system and environment (for example, literary system and society, or even literary sub-system and literary system), there must exist two different general types of systems: those whose constituents are intimately connected by unifying characteristics and natures, and those whose elements are not intimately connected at all. Furthermore, this same complexity allows for all systems to consist of various subsystems.

Moreover, Luhmann explains an additional problem of systems that particularly applies to a study such as this: “Every systems theory that claims to relate to reality must begin with the fact that nothing remains as it is. There is change. Systems are especially sensitive to changes, and therefore for some systems time exists as an aggregate designation for all change.” (41) It is very difficult, if not impossible, to speak of a Mexican system of literature without acknowledging the fact that the system of which we speak has undergone changes due to time and

environmental (social) changes around it, and will inevitably change even as we speak of it. Thus, when I refer to systems of literature in this dissertation, I will be referring to systems as they exist at the time of production of the original and translated texts, and I consider these systems to consist of elements (texts) that are not intimately related by specific characteristics or nature (since assuming that there are definite observable links between all texts written in a given time period in North America or Mexico is futile). The term “system” then, refers to a grouping of different literary genres produced within a broad cultural and geographical region at a given time.

The “field,” according to Bourdieu in his work *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field* (1996), is a useful concept to describe the literary (or any other cultural or economical) system. The “field” is “the space of relations of force between agents or between institutions having in common the possession of the capital necessary to occupy the dominant positions in different fields” (Bourdieu 215). More simply put, the “field” is very similar to the “system” as a small unit within the larger “polysystem,” or it could be described as a type of cultural genre (231). It is the space where “capital,” which can be described simply as a cultural or social product that has worth, and that can be used in thoughtful and strategic ways to establish one’s place within the field (such as knowledge or, in this case, a text or translation and its message and ideologies), is negotiated, produced and distributed. Bourdieu’s theory draws further comparison with the

“polysystem” theory because he divides his “field” into “subfields.” The first is the “subfield of restricted production, where producers have only other producers for clients (who are also their direct competitors).” (217). The second is “the subfield of large-scale production, which finds itself symbolically excluded and discredited.” (217). These two subfields remind us that systems within a larger system act differently from one another, and that elements within each smaller system are governed by different demands.

In the interest of staying with Bourdieu for a moment, before going back to other theories of systems, I want to point out that because systems are always undergoing change, it is obviously very difficult to pinpoint the position of any given entity within a system (in this case, books within a literary system). This is especially true in Bourdieu’s subfield of large-scale production, and it is a somewhat maleable rule in the subfield of restricted production. In the subfield of large-scale production, Bourdieu says: “the size of the audience (which implies its social quality) undoubtedly constitutes the surest and clearest indicator of the position occupied in the field.[...] It follows that nothing divides cultural producers more clearly than the relationship they maintain with worldly or *commercial success*” (218). The subfield of restricted production behaves differently, however: “It excludes the quest for profit and it guarantees no correspondence of any kind between monetary investments and revenues; it condemns the pursuit of honours and temporal standing.” (Bourdieu 217). In other words, because it is not external

demand and audience that necessarily determines the position of the text within the field – the elements within the field are autonomous from external constraints – their positions can be determined within the subfield by their relative power-relations with other entities within that subfield. It is also important to note that the testimonial novel should really be considered to be a part of this subfield of restricted production, since its aim is never to gain commercial success, but rather to celebrate that which is marginalized and give voice to it. If we keep this in mind throughout our discussion of polysystems and texts' positions within them, it will be easier to wrap our minds around the idea that we can really “predict” or define one *crónica's* position within its own system.

In order to support the idea of system-within-system or field-within-field, for the purposes of the present dissertation, we can turn back in time slightly to the theories of Itamar Even-Zohar (2005), who first began discussing the concept of systems in the studies of “sign-governed human patterns of communication (such as culture, language, literature)” (1) in the 1970s. Even-Zohar describes systems as “networks of relations that can be hypothesized for a certain set of assumed observables (“occurrences”/“phenomena”).” (1). However, he explains that there are two primary types of systems: the static system, which is “conceived of as a static (“synchronic”) net of relations, in which the value of each item is a function of the specific relation into which it enters” (1-2), and the dynamic system, which is seen as more of a “heterogeneous, open structure.” (3). The problem with the first type of

system, as we observed earlier, is that its very definition limits the elements that we can place in that system (for example, it means we cannot place all literature from Mexico into one system, because not all literature is linked by a static net of relations). The advantage, however, to the static system, is that the contents of the system, being functions of the system itself, allow us to look critically at the behaviour of the system; how it changes, why it includes the elements it does, et cetera (2). Even-Zohar presents a solution that allows both types of system to exist simultaneously – and in effect, work together – within a given culture. If all elements within the field of literature, for example, are too heterogeneous to be interconnected within the same static system, there can exist multiple static systems (comprised only of the elements that are interconnected) within a larger, dynamic system. Even-Zohar calls this the theory of “polysystems.” (3-4).

As Even-Zohar explains, the polysystem theory is meant to help critics observe the behaviours of society and culture and at the same time recognize that not every element within a given polysystem can be “linked”: “Its purpose is to make explicit the conception of a system as dynamic and heterogeneous in opposition to the synchronistic approach.” (3). If we conceive of literature as a polysystem – for example, the North American polysystem of literature – then we can consider each different “field” of literature on its own within the grander scheme of literature, without attempting to connect it with another field (let alone

all the other fields)¹⁹. For example, we can even situate one particular author's overall production into separate systems; Poniatowska's fiction may lie in one system (of contemporary Mexican creative writing, perhaps), while her *crónicas* may lie in another system (of contemporary Mexican non-fiction narratives). In the 1970s, translation studies were challenged and stimulated when Itamar Even-Zohar's theory of culture and literature as "polysystems" emerged in several essays published throughout the decade. Translation studies scholars who adopted Even-Zohar's systems approach to translation, such as Gideon Toury and André Lefevere, for example, began to explore the "position" of translated literature in the target culture's literary "polysystem"; a network of smaller systems working together to shape a culture. Edwin Gentzler (2006) describes the polysystem as "the aggregate of literary systems" (106) that comprises every kind of literature in a given society.

According to Even-Zohar (2005), not all systems within a given polysystem are created equal:

These systems are not equal, but hierarchized within the polysystem. It is the permanent tension between the various strata which constitutes the (dynamic) *synchronic* state of the system. It is the prevalence of one set of systemic options over another which constitutes the change on the *diachronic* axis. In this centrifugal vs.

¹⁹ I do not want to confuse "field" in this context with Bourdieu's notion of field. To clarify, here "field" simply means area of study, for example. Bourdieu's "field" rather refers to something similar to a "system."

centripetal motion, systemic options may be driven from a central position to a marginal one while others may be pushed into the center and prevail. However, with a polysystem one must not think in terms of *one* center and *one* periphery, since several such positions are hypothesized. A move may take place, for instance, whereby a certain item (element, function) is transferred from the periphery of one system to the periphery of an adjacent system within the same polysystem, and then may or may not move on to the center of the latter. (5)

In other words, a work of literature can occupy one of two positions (“central” or “peripheral”) in a literary “polysystem,” and can fulfill one of two functions; however these positions are not static and will change along with the environmental changes of the polysystem in question. A text in a central position would fulfill a “primary” or “innovatory” function (“creating new items and models” [Gentzler, 2001: 106]) and a peripheral text would fulfill a “secondary” or “conservatory” function (“reinforcing existing items and models” [ibid. 106]). Even-Zohar (2000) argues that although it would seem enticing to assume that translated literature would almost always occupy a peripheral position within the target culture’s literary polysystem, we cannot automatically draw this conclusion: “Whether translated literature becomes central or peripheral, and whether this position is connected with innovatory...or conservatory...repertoires, depends on the specific constellation of the polysystem under study.” (200). He goes on to explain that not all translated literature within a given target culture will occupy the same position, because “[the] dynamics within the polysystem create turning

points, that is to say, historical moments where established models are no longer tenable for a younger generation.” (201). This argument needs no further elaboration, considering that not all literature translated for a given target culture will be the same type or genre, or serve the same purpose. It is also evident that literary systems evolve over time and through historical periods of change, different types of literature, including translations, will shift from central positions to peripheral ones and vice versa.

This idea that not all systems within polysystems are equally governed brings us back to my brief mention of Bourdieu’s subfields earlier in this section. We recall that there are two: the subfield of restricted production and the subfield of large-scale production. According to Bourdieu, it is in the former subfield that we find truly original literature: texts that refuse to conform to external norms and thus, by definition, play an active role in shaping the way in which fields shapeshift:

In the [subfield of restricted production], whose fundamental faith is independence with respect to external demands, the economy of practices is founded, as in the game of loser takes all, on an inversion of the fundamental principles of the field of power and of the economic field. It excludes the quest for profit and it guarantees no correspondence of any kind between monetary investments and revenues; it condemns the pursuit of honours and temporal standings. (217)

In other words, when a work (such as, perhaps, the Mexican *crónica*, which by definition changes with the advancements and issues of society) refuses to conform to a predetermined notion of what literature “should be” or what society demands of it, it naturally falls into the subfield of restricted production.

Since Even-Zohar’s theory of polysystems began as a study of culture and was later broken down and applied to studies of “sign-governed human patterns of communication” such as literature, it can be assumed that literature is considered to be one element of communication that has the ability to shape culture in certain ways; as if literature is an ingredient in a recipe, and culture is the final product. Thus, using the metaphor of a recipe, any literature that occupies a central position within a polysystem is any type of literature that serves to shape the culture in a way that brings it to a level of newness; it updates the old recipe to create something with inventive flavor or texture. It can also be assumed, then, that any literature occupying a peripheral position is that which can be considered to be “*passé*,” in other words, texts that do not offer new ideas or new trends in literature at the given time that we investigate the polysystem; an ingredient that we are used to, that is basic or that could be considered overused. Critics must, however, be careful with these assumptions. Texts do not always have to deal with the present in order to be “new” and shape culture; historical texts, even though they may at first glance seem “*passé*,” can also offer new ideas about a culture’s history and therefore serve to offer new or different perspectives on that culture. For example,

Poniatowska's work *El tren pasa primero* (Alfaguara, 2006) deals with the railroad workers' strikes of 1958 and 1959 in Mexico, and although it was written nearly fifty years after the time period it deals with, Poniatowska was awarded the Premio Internacional de Novela Rómulo Gallegos for the way in which she brings the historical social movement alive, and also for the way she represents the struggles of women in 1950s Mexico. So, since this work serves as a reminder to Mexicans of the strides that have been taken to liberate women and to establish better equality between social classes, it can still occupy a central position in the literary polystem.

According to Even-Zohar (2000), translations often occupy a secondary and peripheral position within the literary polystem (203), meaning they have "no major influence over the central system and even become[s] a conservative element, preserving conventional forms and conforming to the literary norms of the target system." (Munday, 2008: 109). He goes on, of course, to explain that translated literature is not necessarily confined to a peripheral position, especially in cases where works are "translated from major source literatures." (ibid. 109). I do not wish to delve too far into the position of translated literature until Chapter Four, but for the time being it is important to note whether this work, in its original form, would be considered "major source literature."

Defining a work as major source literature requires analysis on many different levels. We have seen thus far the impact of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* on

Mexican political discourse and we have discussed the major role played by the *crónica* in Mexican literary history. There are, however, other factors that may play into how “major” a work becomes: first, the “success” of the work with regards to its publication (number of copies sold, translations performed, type of readership, etc), and second, the celebrity of the author. I will address the issue of success first. It is well known that Poniatowska’s *crónica* is available at major bookstores across Mexico, and has sold successfully and continuously for the two years that it has been available. Over three hundred people attended its launch in November 2007 at the Feria Internacional de Libro de Guadalajara (Guadalajara International Book Fair), which is the largest Spanish-language book fair in the world, and the event at which Poniatowska introduced and read from the *crónica* was one of the largest of the week-long gathering of publishers and authors.

To speak further to the success of the *crónica*, it is also being sold in its original language at major American bookstores such as Barnes and Noble, and is available for sale on major websites such as Amazon.com. Although this is quite a general observation, it is a clear indication of the perceived importance of the work in both Mexico and the rest of North America, and literature, especially Spanish-language literature, that is not considered to be “major source literature” would most likely not receive the same recognition in an English-speaking market. This also speaks to the celebrity of the author. Although much of her work has not been translated into English (see Appendix 1: of the thirty-one major works included in

this list of her overall production, which does not include numerous other short stories, essays, articles, or other works for which Poniatowska served as co-author, only eight have been translated and published in the English language), her voice as a Mexican author is still considered significant in certain fields of literary criticism. Of course, the issue of the lack of translation of her work will be further discussed in Chapter Four, as this is a significant aspect of my overall examination of the position of the translated work within the North American literary system.

As for the celebrity of the author, Poniatowska is very well known in Mexico. She is intimately tied to journalism, politics, literature and the arts, and her celebrity within her own country is undeniable. Outside of Mexico, however, she is less well known. Although a handful of her works have indeed been translated into English and other languages, the majority of her literary production remains unpublished in North America, and thus the “average person” in Canada or the U.S. would most likely never have heard of her. That being said, in the field of academia, especially in Latin American studies or Modern Languages and Literature, her name is certainly recognizable and her work is considered important. Thus, one could draw the conclusion that she can be considered an author of major source literature in Mexico, but perhaps not yet in the rest of North America.

In order to sustain the argument that Poniatowska’s work can be considered major source literature within Mexico, we should examine the Mexican literary polysystem itself. Cynthia Steele makes the argument that all Mexican literature,

fiction or non, is deeply rooted in social criticism and activism: "In Mexico the novel has always been intimately linked with processes of political and social change, particularly the Revolution and its consequences, and with attempts at 'modernization' beginning in the late 1940s." (1)

In a much more general sense, the literary "Boom" in Latin America is worth observing here. John King (2005) speculates on the real "beginning" of the era in which literature, especially socially and politically charged literature, began to emerge in Latin America with a fervor heretofore unseen:

Did the "Boom" of the Latin American novel begin in 1958, when Carlos Fuentes (b.1928) published his innovative, multilayered exploration of Mexico City in the 1940s and 1950s, *La región más transparente* (*Where the Air is Clear*)? Or in 1962, when Mario Vargas Llosa (b. 1936) won the Biblioteca Breve Prize (offered by the Spanish publishers Seix Barral) for his manuscript *Los impostores* ("The Imposters"), that would later be re-titled *La ciudad y los perros* (*Time of the Hero*)? Or in 1963, when Julio Cortázar (1914-84) published *Rayuela* (*Hopscotch*), his extraordinary Baedeker of the new? Or in 1967, when Gabriel García Márquez (b.1928) brought out *Cien años de soledad* (*One Hundred Years of Solitude*), initiating a worldwide interest in magical realism? (59)

Whatever the exact date, it is widely agreed upon that the Latin American "Boom" began in the late fifties or early sixties and evolved into the "Post-Boom" in the late 1970s. King goes on to explain the reasons for the existence of the Boom, which helps detail its social and political nature:

Two different political projects helped to modernize and radicalize the political and cultural climate: the Cuban Revolution and the rhetoric and realities of what economists at the time called “developmentism.” We should not, with over forty years of hindsight and in a very different political climate, underestimate the achievements and also the hope offered by the Cuban Revolution. It was held by most at the time in Latin America to be an exemplary nationalist and anti-imperialist movement that seemed to demand an intellectual and practical commitment and offered the utopian promise of uniting the artistic and political vanguards. (59)

In other words, the Cuban Revolution was the movement that “lit a fire under” the authors and artists in Latin America to take the example of the ideals put forth by the Revolution and use them to write about social and cultural change in their own nations.

Donald Shaw offers a good outline of the characteristics of the Boom from his 1992 work *Nueva narrativa hispanoamericana* in his 1998 book *The Post-Boom in Spanish American Literature*. These characteristics, among others, include the emergence of the metaphysical novel, the tendency towards the production of creative fantasy and the representation of reality, the tendency towards observing the “ambiguous, irrational and mysterious aspects of reality and personality” as a metaphor for human existence, the emergence of rebellion against moral taboos especially religion and sexuality, and the tendency to use multiple voices as opposed to an omniscient narrator (Shaw 4). Although these characteristics refer mainly to fiction, some of the characteristics of the Boom explain the deep

commitment of Latin American writers to exploring the human condition in a way that does not accept the reality and norms of society, but rather seeks a reality rooted in the spirituality and imagination of human beings. Shaw's remarks allow us to observe that the texts emerging from Latin America since the middle of the twentieth Century are deeply rooted in political activism and social change, so it is possible to draw the general conclusion that most of the authors of major source texts (and Poniatowska's peers) can be considered political activists even when writing fiction. In short, the above observations help us to situate Poniatowska's political nonfiction (especially *La noche de Tlatelolco*) among other texts emerging in the same period of time thematically if not by form.

Speaking in terms of form, Shaw interestingly categorizes the *novela testimonial* (specifically *La noche de Tlatelolco*) as being a part of the Post-Boom in Latin America, wherein Boom writers in the 1970s turned away from the formal tendencies listed above and turned towards new approaches to writing similar socially conscious themes:

[...] it seems that [the Post-Boom represents] a definite move back from the "interrogative" novel toward the "declaratory" novel, toward less complicated story lines, reader identification (in contrast to requiring readers to "crack" some Boom novels as if they were puzzles); recognizable, nonsymbolic, local Latin American settings; familiar references to youth culture; and even a measure of social commitment. (23)

Shaw goes on to explain that the testimonial novel emerged from these new trends in writing and, although nonfiction was certainly not the only or even principle type of “major source literature” to surface during the Post-Boom, this style of writing embodies the traits outlined above.

Before moving on to more in-depth observations on polysystems, I do want to clarify that just because *Amanecer en el Zócalo* could be considered to be “major source literature” in Mexico does not mean that it necessarily falls out of the “subfield of restricted production” I was speaking about earlier. Just because a work may *gain* commercial success does not mean that its author or its publisher *went looking* for it, nor does it mean that they welcome it. This is not to say that Poniatowska does not enjoy the success of her career (and it stands to reason that her publishers would rather see sales than not) but the author has stated several times that she writes “for the people,” and “to get the message out.” The *crónica* is written to tell a story that may otherwise be censored in different media. Defining the work as “major source literature” allows us to consider it as holding a central position, perhaps, in its system, while its message, form and nature allow us to see it as belonging to the autonomous subfield of restricted production.

Poniatowska’s status and celebrity are also reminiscent of Bourdieu’s theory of fields, and he should be brought into this discussion. Bourdieu’s sociology consists of four principal concepts: “habitus,” “field,” “capital” and “illusio.” First, it should be noted that translators, in relation to Bourdieu’s sociology, are

considered “social agents,” because they participate in a social and cultural activity. But social agents can come in a variety of different forms: author, publisher, editor, literary agent, etc. All of these figure into the game of using and leveraging cultural capital. “Habitus” can be defined as the behavioural norms of social agents, determined by their knowledge and experience of the world through socialization:

The notion of habitus attempts to account for how regularities of behaviour become established and maintained through what Bourdieu terms *strategies* [...]. Strategies are seen as dependent upon social knowledge acquired through socialization, and it is through the habitus that agents come to “know” the world, not consciously, but in a taken-for-granted sense. The habitus is what enables agents to feel at home in the world as the world is “embodied” in them. (Inghilleri 135)

The fourth key concept, “*illusio*,” is described by Bourdieu as follows:

The struggles for the monopoly of the definition of the mode of legitimate cultural production contribute to a continual reproduction of belief in the game, interest in the game and its stakes, the *illusio* – of which the struggles are also a product. Each field produces its specific form of the *illusion*. (227)

In other words, and in the context of translation, “*illusio*” is what allows translators and other participants in the “game” of translation to continue to believe in its worth and sociocultural value; *illusio* is what makes us believe in the value of capital. Inghilleri explains the essential relationship between Bourdieu’s four key concepts:

It is within the contexts of particular fields and through the habitus (normally “at home” in the field it inhabits), that social agents establish and consolidate their positions of power in a social space, where all have a stake in the acquisition of specific forms of capital. This is in essence the relationship between habitus, field and capital. (135)

Although she makes no mention of *illusio* in the citation above, it can be concluded that social agents establish their power and stake their claim on certain forms of capital because they are driven by *illusio*, or the belief in the capital’s value. In the context of translation and of this dissertation in particular, my belief, as the translator of this *crónica*, in the worth of this text with regards to its potential for knowledge acquisition and distribution, drives me to establish its field and its position within the field, and my social experience in the world determines how the text is translated.

With a basic understanding of Bourdieu’s theory we see how personal his notion of cultural systems is. This will be missed somewhat in the following section since, as I mentioned in the introduction, other polysystem theories tend to leave out the personalization of the translation process. Poniatowska is an important social agent in this discussion, because of her celebrity and social status. According to Bourdieu, a social agent’s “power” (or the amount of cultural capital he or she possesses and can therefore leverage) within the field determines his or her position (dominant or subordinate) within the field. To clarify, Bourdieu says: “The field of

power is the space of relations of force between agents or between institutions having in common the possession of the capital necessary to occupy the dominant positions in different fields (notable economic or cultural)." (Bourdieu 215). Within this "space of relations of force" the social agents, their behaviour and their perception of what is important is entirely fundamental to the behaviour of the field itself. We have to keep this in mind when looking at polysystems as well, and we will explore this a little further when we look at "patrons" in Chapter Three.

WHAT DO "INNOVATORY" AND "CONSERVATORY" MEAN IN THE CONTEXT OF MEXICAN LITERATURE?

Following Even-Zohar's theory that literature that is either "conservatory" or "innovatory" in nature, either supporting a traditional literary style or trend, thereby occupying a peripheral position and playing a "secondary" role in the larger polysystem, or introducing new literary styles or trends, thereby occupying a central position in the development of that system, it would seem at first glance that the Mexican *crónica*, and by extension, *Amanecer en el Zócalo* would be conservatory as opposed to innovatory. Poniatowska's *crónicas* in particular have helped the literary trend to become "mainstream" in Mexico in the last forty years: "Elena Poniatowska and Carlos Monsiváis have been largely responsible for converting the testimonial novel and the social and political *crónica* into the quintessential narrative genre of the seventies and eighties." (Steele 11). There are other factors to

take into account, however, and my contention is that despite this work's similarities to *crónicas* that have come before it, its nature as a *crónica* itself is what saves it from being "peripheral."

Since *crónicas* and testimonial literature tend to be inspired by and brought to life following historical events, their purpose and nature differ vastly from each other. For example, Poniatowska's *crónica La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971) was written for the Mexican people who were affected directly or indirectly by the student movement and massacre of 1968 in Mexico City. The number of people touched personally by *Amanecer* has been much greater, because the indignation behind the text stemmed from the alleged attack against democracy and electoral fraud that affected the entire country. By no means do I presume that one issue is less important than the other. But even though these two works are both categorized as "*crónicas*" or "testimonies" or "social activism literature" the effects that the two works have had on Mexican society are very different. While *La noche* was written to express solidarity with the victims of a tragedy, *Amanecer* was written to educate a readership about the Zócalo movement's side of the story. Its content is political but its language is colloquial; it is meant to reach out to everyone in Mexico, not exclusively the educated public, and it is meant to shed light on the solidarity of millions to inspire change in Mexico's political future. In other words, *Amanecer en el Zócalo* serves to shape the culture of Mexico. Like other *crónicas* such as *La noche*, it was written so that a major historical event would serve as a lesson for the future of

the country. Furthermore, although it is essentially comprised of left-of-center²⁰ ideology because it documents a left-of-center popular movement, Poniatowska does allow her readers to formulate their own opinions with regards to the events and ideologies within the text by including, albeit unevenly, both sides of the story. The fundamental reasoning for writing the text is to allow Mexican citizens to form educated opinions on the circumstances of their country.

It is also interesting here to note the role of the audience in the center-periphery argument, because it is indeed a factor. Even-Zohar (2000) explains, particularly in the context of translations (although I would argue this can extend to all literature) that there are “turning points” at which certain types of literature are no longer useful for contemporary audiences. In short, as the younger generation of readers matures, certain elements of the older generation of literature may now be less important to the younger readers. This leaves room for new literature (and foreign works like translations) to assume a central position in the polysystem, in the holes left by outdated types of literature:

The dynamics within the polysystem create turning points, that is to say, historical moments where established models are no longer

²⁰ By “left-of-center” ideology, I mean that Poniatowska, along with the majority of the movement’s supporters, are followers of Andrés Manuel López Obrador’s Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD), which, in comparison with the more conservative National Action Party (PAN, the party currently in power in Mexico) has more liberal ideals and socialist affiliations at its core.

tenable for a younger generation. At such moments, even in central literatures, translated literature may assume a central position. (201)

Of course the factor of audience in the center-periphery argument is significant to translations in particular, but I think it also applies to the genre of the *crónica*.

Because the genre is constantly evolving, and because the *crónica* addresses particular “turning points” in cultural history, it can always appeal to a younger generation of readers. Basically, as long as the *crónica* continues to change and evolve, it will never constitute an “established model” and thus avoids becoming obsolete.

To categorize the Mexican *crónica* as “conservatory” and consequently “peripheral” within the Mexican literary system would be like calling journalism or education “peripheral,” because the contemporary *crónica* grows out of journalism, and telling an eyewitness story can have a didactic purpose. The *crónica*, at its very core, is a style of literature that is always evolving and evaluating new events and changes within society, and always inspiring its readers to think in new ways or to consider different perspectives on their own societies and identities. Another important factor here is Poniatowska’s use of multiple voices throughout her *crónicas*. Poniatowska does this in part to avoid misrepresentation, which some literary theorists believe to occur more often than not when a work is written for a marginalized people by an elite author:

In colonial situations major authors tend to write not only from positions of class superiority but also from centers of empire. Writing from this skewed “subject position” within the global context, such authors presume to represent – to write about and to write for – subaltern peoples who are relatively powerless to represent themselves either symbolically or by more immediate political means. Such literature, as one of the forms of the cultural construction of difference, is better seen not as representations, but as an epistemological and political misrepresentation. (Gugelberger & Kearney 3)

Juan Bruce-Novoa explains Poniatowska’s use of multiple voices as a mechanism to steer clear of this kind of criticism of her work, and in order to show her dedication to portraying an unbiased truth in her *crónicas*:

Poniatowska endeavours to avoid misrepresenting the voices she documents by making of her writing not the original personal statement so prized in literary circle but rather a reportage-style medium for the promulgation of materials, such as oral history and political opposition, which are normally omitted from social and literary discourse. (115)

Within this context, Poniatowska’s use of multiple voices is significant to the position of her work within the literary system: because it is not always her own voice sending the message, but rather the voices of different identities with each new *crónica*, she is consistently throwing new and different “innovatory” ideas into her literature and out toward her readership. Thus her multi-voiced works can never be called repetitions of anything she has produced before.

This concept harkens back to the argument made by Mikhail Bakhtin in his *Dialogical Imagination* (1982) regarding heteroglossia in the novel, particularly regarding characters. According to Bakhtin, heteroglossia is the result of converging diverse types of speech and voices in a work of literature, and results in turn in the characterization of the work's themes:

The novel characterizes all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types [*raznorecie*] and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. Authorial speech, the speech of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia (*raznornecie*) can enter the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships[...]. These distinctive links and interrelationships between utterances and languages, this movement of the theme through different languages and speech types, its dispersion into the rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia, its dialogization – this is the basic distinguishing feature of the stylistics of the novel. (263)

While, as we observe above, Bakhtin places the importance of heteroglossia in its ability to allow themes to move through different spheres of society (for example, it allows a given theme to move from culture to culture via distinct languages), he also talks about the author's role in the distribution and arrangement of these voices. Bakhtin argues that in novels where the story is told by a narrator, there exists a refraction of the author's voice because the narrator represents a third party's voice as heard (or written) through the author (311). But even when there is

no narrator, heteroglossia (or distinctive discourses and languages) exists in “every novel without exception” (315) through the existence of characters:

The language used by characters in the novel, how they speak, is verbally and semantically autonomous; each character’s speech possesses its own belief system, since each is the speech of another in another’s language; thus it may also refract authorial intentions and consequently may to a certain degree constitute a second language for the author. Moreover, the character speech almost always influences authorial speech (and sometimes powerfully so), sprinkling it with another’s words (that is, the speech of a character perceived as the concealed speech of another) and in this way introducing into it stratification and speech diversity. (315)

What is particularly interesting about applying Bakhtin’s theory of character heteroglossia in the novel to Poniatowska’s work is that whereas Bakhtin refers primarily to fictional characters, Poniatowska’s characters are real. In a work of fiction, the different voices that “refract” the author’s voice and influence the authorial speech are in fact imagined creations of the author. The voices and speech acts are not the author’s alone, but they are the author’s creation since he or she invents and assembles them artistically. In contrast, in Poniatowska’s work, the different voices that comprise her work are truly different voices. Yes, Poniatowska assembles them strategically, but they truly belong to real people who exist in the world as opposed to in the author’s imagination. It could be argued that Poniatowska reconstructs and potentially refracts these voices when she cites them, and since it is impossible to know for certain whether or not the citations are exact,

there surely could exist some of Poniatowska's discursive influence in the languages of others represented in her text. But the varied discourses in the nonfiction text are influenced less by the author than the varied discourses in a fictional text.

An earlier observation from Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia is truly significant to the discussion of the *crónica*. This is the simple fact, according to Bakhtin, that the combination of diverse styles, voices and even languages in a work of literature is precisely what characterizes the novel. According to Bakhtin there are five stylistic "unities" in the novel, all of which work together to form a stylistic "system," and basically create a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts:

We list below the basic types of compositional-stylistic unities into which the novelistic whole usually breaks down:

- (1) Direct authorial literary-artistic narration (in all its diverse variants);
- (2) Stylization of the various forms of oral everyday narration (*skaz*);
- (3) Stylization of the various forms of semiliterary (written) everyday narration (the letter, the diary, etc.);
- (4) Various forms of literary but extra-artistic authorial speech (moral, philosophical or scientific statements, oratory, ethnographic descriptions, memoranda and so forth);
- (5) The stylistically individualized speech of characters.

These heterogenous stylistic unities, upon entering the novel, combine to form a structured artistic system, and are subordinated

to the higher stylistic unity of the work as a whole, a unity that cannot be identified with any single one of the unities subordinated to it. (Bakhtin 262)

All five of the stylistic “unities” mentioned above by Bakhtin exist in Poniatoſka’s *crónica*. First, we have Poniatoſka’s voice as the primary narrator. Second, Poniatoſka clearly artistically presents everyday oral narrative (by recreating conversations that actually happened in the Zócalo, for example). Third, “semiliterary” everyday narration is involved in the transcription of newspaper articles, speeches and the like. Fourth, the inclusion of references to biblical and philosophical works exists within the narrative. Finally and most clearly, Poniatoſka selects and arranges a wide variety of characters’ voices that ultimately make up the bulk of the text.

The two conclusions we can draw from the observations made above are that the *crónica* is a novel according to Bakhtin’s sociology of speech types, and secondly, the *crónica*, being a novel, is more powerful as a whole than the individual voices, including Poniatoſka’s, that make it up. Simply put, the voices working together send a stronger message than they do on their own. While as Sue Vice says, “heteroglossia is a quality of language itself,” (18) and thus exists in every text or speech act, it is the way in which authors make use of this quality of language that determines the genre or role of the text in question. There are moments, in Poniatoſka’s work, when she directly quotes articles from

newspapers and other sources, and wherein she does, clearly, reconstruct the “others’ voices” and include or exclude parts of these speech acts, perhaps in order to serve her own ideological agenda. This is an issue I will discuss in Chapter Five, when I explore the specific challenges of the translation and my choices throughout, because it is significant that she “translates” in a way as well from “journalism language” to “literary language.” But the important factor to consider here is the number of different “real life” voices that the author deliberately includes in her work, knowing that they will influence her own language and vary the ideological discourse of her text, often in a supportive way, and occasionally in a contradictory way. The significance lies in her usage of so many discourses and speakers, allowing the reader to extract from the text a consciousness of the fact that Poniatowska is striving to represent the voices of many, not simply her own.

To sum up, in this chapter I have discussed four major topics in order to draw one major conclusion. First, we explored the concept of the contemporary Mexican *crónica* and how it is significant to Mexican literary tradition. Next, we looked at the life and career of Poniatowska, and how her position as an elite, female member of society along with her constant search for identity has drawn her again and again toward the *crónica*, and we observed the linear similarities between *Amanecer en el Zócalo* and some of her previous work. We then looked at *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, drawing examples from the text in order to concretely categorize it as a contemporary Mexican *crónica*. Finally, we looked at systems theories in culture,

literature and specifically translation, in order to draw conclusions about *Amanecer en el Zócalo*'s position in the Mexican dynamic polysystem at the particular moment of history in which it was written and published. Because of the *crónica*'s nature as a genre of literature that is constantly developing and constantly dealing with new, current and culture-shaping issues, it must inevitably be considered to be a genre that contributes to the development of the system, and so it must be considered to be central and innovatory within the Mexican polysystem of literature. This position will be compared and contrasted to its position in the target culture's literary system as this exploration continues.

CHAPTER TWO

EXAMINING THE LATIN AMERICAN POLITICAL *CRÓNICA* IN TRANSLATION: A CASE STUDY OF THREE *CRÓNICAS* IN COMPARISON TO *AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO*

The second chapter of this dissertation will look at *crónicas* originating from Latin America other than *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, which have been translated into English and published and distributed in The United States and Canada. The purpose of this analysis of different translations will be to look at whether my decisions in the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* correspond with other translators' decisions in similar projects, in order to observe whether or not other *crónica* translators see the same difficulties as I saw in my own translation. I will establish that, whereas the original texts may have been directed towards a more general public, the translations of these works fit into a more specific academic niche in the North American system. Using the observations I make in this chapter, I will be able to demonstrate in later chapters that my decisions in the translation of *Amanecer* reflect problems I found in translating the *crónica* in particular, and that other translators of *crónicas* seemed to encounter similar problems.

Amanecer en el Zócalo in translation will occupy a different position within the target culture's literary system than the source text occupies in the source culture's

literary system, one that hopefully will help introduce thus far unknown or lesser-known aspects of Mexican culture into the target culture. This is an obvious statement for two reasons: first, the *crónica* is not a typical kind of writing in North America; it is a genre that is characteristic of Latin American countries. Second, the text treats a specific cultural circumstance, one that, in translation, might not reach the same kind of audience—in this case, a vast general public—in the target culture as it would in the source culture. In other words, I am aiming this text at an audience who may not consider the subject matter or structure of the *crónica* to be immediately important. In light of this, as a translator of this politically charged work, it is necessary to make appropriate adaptations in the translation to produce a text that fits into the target system:

Whether they produce translations, literary histories or their more compact spin-offs, reference works, anthologies, criticism, or editions, [translators and] rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time (Lefevere, 1992: 8).

What André Lefevere is saying in this statement is that while some translations (or rewrites) of original texts strive to achieve equivalence in every way possible, and while some critics could consider adaptations and interventions by the translator to be “unfaithful” to the source text, in many scenarios these adaptations are not only appropriate but also necessary, and translation is a field of production in which

change should be celebrated for its capacity to bring the unknown into the target readership's realm of understanding. I will expand on translation theories and how the shift has generally been made from "equivalence"-based translation practices to "target-oriented" translation, wherein change is not only accepted, but also expected, in Chapter Three.

Translation is "fundamental to the lives and livelihood" of people everywhere (Gentzler, 2001: 107), especially as cultures and languages continue to converge. The political and diplomatic relations between Mexico, the United States and Canada have allowed for enhanced mutual understanding between these cultures. This understanding has become a more pressing issue in recent years with the creation of NAFTA, migrations of various kinds and the growing number of Latin American Diasporas in the United States and Canada. Román de la Campa, in his article "Latin, Latino, American: Split States and Global Imaginaries" (2001) explains that the identity of the Americas has shifted enormously as a result of "the expansion of the Latino population in the United States, its political and cultural dimensions, as well as its potential for critical thinking about the Americas." (375). This means that what was once thought of as "their" literature versus "our" literature, "their" culture and "our" culture, has recently begun to converge as a result of these nations' close proximities, the intermigration of their populations and the influence of cultural items such as media, art, music and literature:

Most critics concede that globalization and postmodern constructs impact different nations differently, but it seems fair to say that beyond that broad generality few critical paradigms take such complications to heart. Imagining the other's nation as one's own may be an inevitable byproduct of cultural analysis and area studies (De la Campa 375).

In other words, the more "globalized" our world becomes, and the more readily we can retrieve and analyze information from other cultures and learn about them, the more important it becomes to do so and the more we begin to think of those other cultures as a part of ourselves. Specifically in North America, where the influx of Spanish-speaking immigrants from Latin America has created an identity known as "Latino," a term that combines Latin American and Anglo-American, as Román de la Campa explains (376), cross-cultural studies, literature and therefore translation become fundamental inevitabilities of our daily lives. Translation plays an essential role in the coexistence of multiple cultures and languages. André Lefevere (1992) sustains this argument, claiming that change within a literary system – and therefore within a given culture – is a product of the culture's evolution: as culture changes, the aspects that form that culture, such as literature, have to change to remain functional:

Change is a function of the need felt in the environment of a literary system for that system to be or remain functional. In other words, the literary system is supposed to have an impact on the environment by means of the works it produces or the rewritings thereof. (23)

What this means is, quite simply, that by introducing foreign elements (such as translations) into a given literary system, and thereby changing that system fundamentally, we are allowing that system to continue to develop alongside the rest of the world.

The three *crónicas* that I will examine in comparison with *Amanecer en el Zócalo* in this chapter are Elena Poniatowska's *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971) and *Nada, nadie: las voces del temblor* (1988), as well as Alonso Sálazar's *No nacimos pa' semillas* (1990). In translation, these books are entitled *Massacre in Mexico* (1975), *Nothing, Nobody: The Voices of the Mexico City Earthquake* (1995) and *Born to Die in Medellin* (1992), respectively. My reasoning for choosing these three *crónicas* in particular is complex. First, I wanted to showcase *crónicas* coming from Mexico, and to discuss at least one coming from another country (in this case, Colombia). Second, I wanted to choose at least one author other than Elena Poniatowska so as to showcase that the style she uses in her *crónicas* is found in other authors' works. This brings me to my third reason: there are very few *crónicas* translated into English. Some of the most celebrated contemporary *cronistas* from Mexico are Carlos Monsiváis, José Joaquín Blanco, Vicente Leñero, Juan Villoro, Dante Medina, Rossana Reguillo, Manuel Gutiérrez Nájera, Salvador Novo and Cristina Pacheco. Of this list of authors, none of their prominent *crónicas* have been translated into English so far. Poniatowska, therefore, has had notable success in having her *crónicas* translated relative to her

peers. Fourthly, I chose these three works because, together with *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, they cover a large spectrum of social issues. In this list, beginning with *Amanecer*, we have *crónicas* on a massive democratic civil movement, a government-ordered mass killing, an earthquake that devastated Mexico City, and finally drug and gang violence in Colombia. These issues showcase the variety of social inspirations for *crónica* production, and these books represent a cross-section of issues addressed. My final and arguably most influential reason for choosing these four *crónicas* is that they all embody the typical characteristics of the contemporary *crónica* as outlined in Chapter One. Furthermore, in the instances of their respective translations into English, there is clear evidence that the translators of each work strived to make appropriate changes to appeal to a smaller niche audience of readers in Canada and the United States.

The principle arguments I will make in this chapter will point to the different types of “interventions” made by the translator or patron (the publisher, for example) of the separate works that allow for the texts to be read by an audience similar to the one toward which I am aiming my translation. These not only include footnotes, glossaries and prefaces that have been added in translation in order to make the implicit aspects of the source texts explicit in translation, but also interventions that refer to the choices the translator makes in each different translation project, the role he or she plays in the translation process and the requests of the publisher he or she works for/with. I will also refer in part to the

elements that, as in the case of *Amanecer*, make the texts difficult to translate and/or reach a wide audience in the target culture, such as polyphony and “local themes” (i.e. themes that are not immediately important to North American readers, and do not necessarily reach a “world audience”).

THE TRANSLATOR’S “AUTHORITY TO INTERVENE”: HOW AUTHORS’ AND TRANSLATORS’ ROLES OVERLAP IN AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO AND LA NOCHE DE TLATELOLCO:

Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko explain that translation is not simply an act of transmitting communication from one language to another in their introduction to *Translation and Power* (2002). Rather, translators have an immense amount of power in their practice in the way they structure the text in the target culture:

Translation...is not simply an act of faithful reproduction but, rather, a deliberate and conscious act of selection, assemblage, structuration, and fabrication – and even in some cases, falsification, refusal of information, counterfeiting, and the creation of secret codes. In these ways translators, as much as creative writers and politicians, participate in the powerful acts that create knowledge and shape culture. (xxi)

In this chapter I will look at how translators of other *crónicas* have acted, as we see above, almost as I would see journalists acting, asserting their power over a text in order to shape something new. But before going on to discuss the authority of the

translator, it is important in the context of this particular translation to first discuss the power of the author, given that *Amanecer en el Zócalo* and other *crónicas* are works of nonfiction, and supposedly works of literary journalism. It is significant to discuss the relationship between journalism and translation and the blurred lines between journalism and subjective ideology in the case of *crónicas*, since *crónica* writers often act as translators themselves. In other words, if journalism is a process of selection, reportage and assemblage as a means to create a new text for a new audience, *crónica* writing, like journalism, also employs these processes of meticulous selectivity and decision-making. According to the publisher's promotional blurb on the back cover of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, Poniatowska affirms: "No contesto. Sólo escribo." ("I don't answer. I only write.") This affirmation, in my opinion, implies that the author claims objectivity to a certain extent in her work, as though she only professes the truth around her without offering a personal opinion. That being said, in a course on the Boom and Post-boom of Latin American Literature I have experienced first-hand an enlightening discussion on Poniatowska's role as the author of *La noche de Tlatelolco* and other such *crónicas* and testimonial literature. *La noche* is a collection of stories told by others, collected from interviews the author had with people directly or indirectly affected by the Tlatelolco massacre of 1968, and transcribed by the author. Poniatowska only transcribes her own "voice" in a brief introduction and four passages throughout the entire work, essentially implying that she is objectively reporting the opinions

of others, of those “whose voices traditionally go unheard.” At first glance, then, it would appear that the author’s voice in the work is a neutral one.

The problem, of course, is that Poniatowska strategically selects specific material to include in *La noche*, and she orders it in a calculated way. Beth E. Jörgensen, in her article “Framing Questions: The Role of the Editor in Elena Poniatowska’s *La noche de Tlatelolco*” (1991) explains:

On the one hand the speaking subjects of the testimonies are collectively the “authors” of the activities of the student movement and the language of its verbal recreation. On the other hand, a single compiler-writer, Elena Poniatowska, has transcribed, organized, and issued – authored – the history in written form. In tribute to this process Poniatowska casts herself in the text as an editorial figure and employs various strategies to efface her own individual presence. Nevertheless, she cannot wholly abdicate her mediating authority as the editor. The editorial figure is at once accessory and essential to the voices she records, and at once marginal and central to their story. (82)

Jörgensen goes on to contend, however, that although the way she writes does not necessarily allow her to have a neutral political position (i.e. she is not an omniscient narrator, or “editor,” as she is referred to in this article), she does systematically attempt to construct her work so as to not misrepresent the voices within. In other words, her primary goal is to allow the others’ voices to speak without manipulating them and / or “cutting and pasting” that which she feels is necessary to fortify her own agenda:

In addition to [Poniatowska's introductory] paragraphs, four other passages within the text are signed "E.P.," including a newspaper article written by Poniatowska and an introduction to the second half of the book. The significance of her initials is double. On the one hand they are the sign of her presence and of her responsibility for the content of a few, specific fragments. They make the figure of the editor visible to the reader and establish her authority. But on the other hand, by announcing "here I am," "I wrote this," "this is my contribution," they imply that she is absent from the great majority of the document, that she didn't intervene in a hundred other places. The initials are the means of a strategy which erases the editorial presence at the same time that it makes it very concrete, by pretending to limit it to a few appearances. These appearances serve to make the editor's absence more seemingly natural. (84)

La noche de Tlatelolco is divided in two parts, deliberately telling the story of the massacre and its repercussions in such a way that it creates suspense and tension in the reader, much like a work of fiction with an introduction, a crescendo, a climax and a conclusion. Although it may seem as though others are "speaking" through the text, Poniatowska's voice and her ideology is ever-present. Therefore, as much as she may claim neutrality in her writing, her position is still clear:

First, in numbers alone, the selection of voices heavily favors the student movement as opposed to the government point of view. Second the spokespersons for the movement include student leaders, rank-and-file activists, professors, blue-collar workers, citizens who observed from the sidelines, parents and schoolchildren. By portraying the student movement as representative of a broad spectrum of Mexican society, the editor has confirmed from the outset the democratic claims made by the

students, and she has thus already invested the text with meaning, creating an image of democracy in action. (Jørgensen 85)

When these observations can be made about *La noche*, a work written thirty years prior to the text in question, the author's neutrality can be put into question more easily in the context of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, considering that she "interferes" in the reportage considerably more in this later work, narrating between the representations of different voices of others. Furthermore, although Jørgensen wrote the article cited above fifteen years before the publication of *Amanecer*, she makes a very good concluding point about Poniatowska's objective to play a similar narrative / editorial role as she does in *La noche* in the rest of her body of work, and I would argue that this includes *Amanecer*:

If one considers now Elena Poniatowska's other published works, it becomes clear that the figure of the editor as I have described it is emblematic of her stance as a writer in her adopted country. Once an outsider, a foreigner, through a constant and active searching out of the Other she has created for herself a Mexican identity. Mexico has supplied a lack she felt in herself, and in her work she has recuperated for Mexico a part of itself, a part it may consider extra, secondary, or subordinate: the silenced voices, the anonymous faces, the darkened pages of history; all are on society's margins, another kind of framing figure which in fact penetrates to the center of her nation's collective life. (88)

First, it is apparent that in *Amanecer* she is not attempting to efface her presence in the narration, which allows the reader to more directly hear her voice among the

voices of others. Second, while in *La noche* Poniatowska initials her own personal contributions to the text, in *Amanecer* she narrates in first person; her contributions constitute the majority of the work and are dispersed between the voices of others, implying that she takes responsibility for more than her own words. And finally, much like *La noche*, the voices in favor of AMLO's cause far outnumber the select newspaper articles and quotes from those who oppose it, and Poniatowska represents in her writing a huge cross-section of Mexican society, fashioning the same image of democracy in action as she does in her previous *crónica*. I will, however, argue with specific textual examples in Chapter Three against the contention Jörgensen makes concerning *La noche* and Poniatowska's attempt to wholly and objectively represent the others' voices. In *Amanecer*, it is far more evident that the author "cuts and pastes" and does, in fact, include voices that support her cause and exclude those that hinder or weaken her message. As we will see in the next chapter, the author even transcribes newspaper quotes in such a way that her agenda is supported; she does not include entire stories, but rather deliberately selects segments of articles to include in her *crónica*, leaving out parts of a given report that could weaken her own message. In this way, Poniatowska "translates" others' voices in a very subjective way.

Just as authors of *crónicas* act as translators in many ways, translators take on the role of author as well. Lawrence Venuti (1998) explains that the primary reason translation tends to be seen as a second-tier art form is that some critics believe that

the translator does not create something original; rather he or she is simply a mediator between two languages and cultures:

Perhaps the most important factor in the current marginality of translation is its offense against the prevailing concept of authorship. Whereas authorship is generally defined as originality, self-expression in a unique text, translation is derivative, neither self-expression nor unique: it imitates another text. Given the reigning concept of authorship, translation provokes the fear of inauthenticity, distortion, contamination. Yet insofar as the translator must focus on the linguistic and cultural constituents of the foreign text, translation must also provoke the fear that the foreign author is not original, but derivative, fundamentally dependent on pre-existing materials. (31)

In *The Translator's Invisibility* (2008), Venuti addresses the role of the translator as author or as a kind of imitator of the original text, especially in the context of American and British cultures, both from the legal standpoint and the side of creativity. In other words, he considers the rights that the translator holds to make changes to the text in translation. From a legal point of view, the role of the translator is blurred:

The translator is thus subordinated to the author, who decisively controls the publication of the translation during the term of the copyright for the "original" text, currently the author's lifetime plus seventy years. Yet since authorship here is defined as the creation of a form or medium of expression, not an idea, as originality of language, not thought, the British and American law permits translations to be copyrighted in the translator's name, recognizing that the translator uses another language for the foreign text and

therefore can be understood as creating an original work [...]. In copyright law, the translator is and is not an author. (8)

Venuti goes on to explain that the translator is basically forced to intervene in the original text, thus inevitably taking on the role of author of a text that is irreversibly different than the original, simply because of the differences between language and culture. In other words, the translator does not “choose” the role of author; rather it is a role assigned to him or her naturally:

[A] translator is forced not only to eliminate aspects of the signifying chain that constitutes the foreign text, starting with its graphematic and acoustic features, but also to dismantle and disarrange that chain in accordance with the structural differences between languages, so that both the foreign text and its relations to other texts in the foreign culture never remain intact after the translation process. Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text with a text that is intelligible to the translating-language reader. These differences can never be entirely removed, but they necessarily undergo a reduction and exclusion of possibilities – and an exorbitant gain of other possibilities specific to the translating language. Whatever difference the translation conveys is now imprinted by the receiving culture, assimilated to its positions of intelligibility, its canons and taboos, its codes and ideologies. The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the recognizable, the familiar, even the same; and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects where translation serves an appropriation of foreign cultures for agendas in the receiving situation, cultural, economical, political. Translation is not an untroubled communication of a foreign text, but an interpretation that is always limited by its address to specific audiences and by the cultural or institutional situations where the translated text is intended to circulate and function. (14)

These observations reflect an ever-strengthening argument that translation is inherently accompanied by difference, and translators are culture brokers – they have to act as authors and use creative devices to bring unrecognizable foreign aspects into the realm of the familiar.

The argument I will make now is that in cases such as *La noche de Tlatelolco*, *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, and other *crónicas*, when the original author has taken on the role of “translator,” and especially in cases where the translator has aimed the target text at an audience for educational purposes, the translator has more of an obligation to act as “author” than ever before. The reason for this is that when the author cuts and pastes, selects and assembles, reports and structures others’ voices in a deliberate way to create her text, the translator has to interpret the cutting and pasting, has to find the sources from which the author selected and assembled her text, and has to interpret her reasoning for including or excluding certain voices. Then in translation, the translator has to find ways to explain this to her audience in order to foster the education that the readers seek. The translator finds these solutions in the decisions I will discuss when I address expansions and clarifications later.

PREFACES:

The first and foremost expansion that a translator can include in order to convert a *crónica* to an educational text for a niche audience is a preface, some kind of translator's introduction that provides space for explanation without interrupting the text. But adding a preface to a translation carries implications that go further than simple explanation. As Sherry Simon (1990) says:

Since the Middle Ages the preface has spoken a double language – it is at the same time speech and action. Offering information, it also seeks protection from the outrages of power; advancing proprietary disclaimers, it also propels the work towards new markets and audiences. It seeks above all to capture the goodwill of the public, as its Latin name the *captatio benevolentia* emphasized. (111)

This argument refers back to two points I have made so far: first, that the preface allows the translator to claim some form of objectivity in his or her contribution to an ideological work, as it creates the space for textual and contextual explanation, but also personal explanation. Second, it allows a foreign work to remain “foreign” in the target audience; the preface has the capacity to shape or change the way a reader reads a translation all on its own. It sets the reader up with a foundation of background knowledge so that the reader, by the time he or she gets past the preface and onto the main event, can potentially understand the foreign aspects of the text.

Simon argues that prefaces are the primary factors in proving the connection between translations and political aspirations: “At different moments in history, translations have been particularly closely linked to national and political aspirations and prefaces are a revelation of this link” (112). She goes on to explain that prefaces are one of the most revealing aspects of the ideologies that drive literary trends:

Rather than dismissing prefaces for being too closely linked to political imperatives, I would like to suggest that they be read precisely at this level. In addition to revealing the historically shifting relationship between author and translator and foregrounding the foundations of literary values, prefaces are useful precisely because they trace the contours of literary ideology and expose for us the sociopolitical context which commands literary exchanges. (112)

Prefaces, if employed efficiently, have the ability to reveal the sociopolitical context in which translations are produced because, as mentioned earlier, they make explicit that which is implicit within the text without having to alter the integrity of the text’s style and foreignness. They also allow for an explanation behind the decision to translate and publish a work, revealing trends in literary production and ideological values within a given society (or perhaps better said, the ideological values favored by the patrons that drive trends within a given system’s cultural or literary polysystem) by exposing the types of works publishers, institutions and other “patrons” spend their money on. In short, prefaces explain exactly how

literary systems are constructed, and what types of literatures comprise central and peripheral systems within a given polysystem.

In cases where the translator writes this introduction, prefaces also allow the translator or patron to explain to their target audience *why* the work should be read, and also why it should have been translated in the first place. The preface provides a space for the translator to dialogue with the reader. While footnotes allow the translator to speak to the reader, the space for them is limited (as we will see below), while a preface becomes an extended space for the translator's voice to be heard. As the preface allows the translator to justify his or her decisions to the reader before the reader embarks on the work itself, it is interesting to note that when prefaces are present, the translator's presence and authority over the text is noted even before the original author's.

Prefaces also uncover the "will to knowledge" behind translation. By this I mean that when a reader picks up a translated text and reads the preface, it is a clear indication that he or she wants to get the background knowledge of the text in order to best understand it. The preface is evidence that readers of certain translations select such works in order to learn something. Simply put, a preface is evidence that a work is meant to educate, thus it situates the work within the educational field instantly:

Prefaces give us access to the collective dimensions of translatability, the 'will to knowledge' which creates the need for

translations. And in some cases – the Canadian novel is one – they define translation as an activity deeply, and consciously, engaged in the social and political dimensions of literary interchange. (116)

Because of all of these functions of prefaces, the reasons they are included so often in the translation of *crónicas* are rather obvious. But it is interesting to note that a preface does not need to be written by the translator in order to serve the purposes discussed above. In fact, different figures play the role of preface author and similar results are achieved.

Massacre in Mexico was translated by Helen R. Lane, a renowned freelance translator. But Octavio Paz, a celebrated Mexican author and friend of Poniatowska's wrote the introduction to the translated version; while in the original language there was no introduction. By having Paz, whose name is arguably more recognizable to a wide audience of North American readers than Poniatowska's (due, likely, to the facts that many of his works were translated into English, he was a diplomat, and he won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1990), step in to write the introduction in the place of the translator, the book's importance is immediately suggested. By this I mean that a reader, who may be unaware of the importance of the book's subject matter or unfamiliar with the author, could pick up the translation, flip to the introduction and see immediately that a well-respected and accomplished writer and public figure endorses it.

In contrast, in the case of *Nothing, Nobody*, translated by Aurora Camacho de Schmidt and Arthur Schmidt, there were two introductory sections included in the translated text. First, an introduction to the series published at Temple University Press, *Voices of Latin American Life*, was written by Arthur Schmidt, while the following foreword was written by the two translators (who are also husband and wife) in cooperation. The translators, who are both professors in the field of Latin American Studies at Temple University and Swarthmore College, respectively, could certainly be considered to possess similar expertise in the field as Octavio Paz, but their names are perhaps less recognizable than Paz'. But still, there seems to be some strategy in including the types of prefaces they did. First, the "Introduction to the Series" demonstrates immediately to the reader that this work is important because it is related to other works in a series – a series of literature is usually published to showcase the importance of a given genre of literature or a given theme treated by works from varying genres. In other words, the fact that this work is a part of a series demonstrates its worth within its niche. Then, with the Foreword, not only do the translators offer a background of the 1985 Mexico earthquakes (that the *crónica* is written about), but they go on to divide the introduction into five concise sections that contextualize the work's importance not only to 1985 Mexico, but also in the grander scheme of Mexico's history. The first section is "Mexico City, Giant and Home," which showcases how the city is on display, as it is in many other *crónicas*. Next we find "Background to the

Earthquake,” which locates the earthquake among several other “shocks” to Mexico’s history that “jarred the foundations of Mexico in the last three decades” (*Nothing, Nobody* xi). Next, the section “The Earthquake and its Aftermath,” explains in detail the earthquake’s damage to the city and the resulting international aid that was provided, especially by the U.S. and Canada. Next, the section “Elena Poniatowska and Popular Testimony” provides the reader with the author’s brief biography and her significance as a *cronista* and as “the voice of the marginalized,” adding to this preface an element of literary theory and discussion of the genre of testimonial literature. Finally, the translators offer up the concluding section “Ten Years Later,” in which they explain how Poniatowska’s two most influential *crónicas*, *Massacre in Mexico* and *Nothing, Nobody* have given rise to a literary tradition of “giving voice to those whose voices go unheard,” and to a literary movement in which authors strive to disallow that stories of public tragedy be forgotten. In my opinion, the inclusion of these sections of the preface is proof positive that this translation was intended for an audience interested in the educational value of this text; the authors deliberately offer the readers information as to why this book and the subject matter are important to historical and social studies.

Finally we come to *Born to Die in Medellín*, translated by Nick Caistor, a radio journalist for the BBC and an accomplished translator of literature. Once again, the author, translator and publisher of this book have gone a different way from the

previous two works in terms of introduction. The translated version has two: first is the “Author’s Preface,” written by Alonso Sálazar, which offers a personal take on why the book was written, giving the reader insight into the source author’s inspiration; second is the “Introduction.” This second preface is written by Colin Harding, a journalist from the U.K. who has worked for fifteen years in television and radio broadcasting, as well as for several major British newspapers, and who is the author of *Colombia in Focus* (Latin American Bureau, 1996). Once again, as in the case of *Massacre in Mexico*, we observe that the translator chose to employ the voices of experts in the field, rather than his own, in the introduction. This seems, once again, to be a strategic way of leading the reader to believe in the important journalistic and educational value of the text, thereby attracting the intended audience.

In my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, it is inevitable that I (or, perhaps more likely the potential publisher) will choose to include a preface. The choice of whom to ask to prepare such a preface would inevitably be decided in conjunction with the publisher, but as we can see in the preceding examples, whether or not the preface is written by the translator, by a celebrity or by a field specialist, it will serve the same purpose. The preface will provide a space for direct dialogue between the translation’s patrons and the intended audience, and will showcase the educational value of a text that is directed at an academic audience.

FOOTNOTES AND OTHER EXPANSIONS

It is interesting to note what other kinds of “translator interventions” exist in translated *crónicas* like *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, and next I will note how these work together to direct the texts at the same type of audience that I intend to reach with *Daybreak*. Arguably the first “translator intervention” that most readers think about is the use of notes, such as footnotes or endnotes. Footnotes are used in the translations *Massacre in Mexico* and *Born to Die in Medellín* but not in *Nothing, Nobody*; in the latter case the translators decide to use endnotes in their preface and leave the body of the text uninterrupted. Still, in each previous translation the publisher (or perhaps translator) chose to have explanatory notes play a role in the text. It is fairly obvious that the purpose of these notes is educational, and that they are intended to appeal to the target readers.

What is interesting to note about all three translations I am discussing here is that they each include similar types of explanatory expansions, but the translators chose to include them in different ways.

MASSACRE IN MEXICO

Something very interesting about *Massacre in Mexico* is that the translator, Helen R. Lane, chose to intervene in the text as little as possible. Other than the

preface, which is not the translator's contribution, the only expansion included in the text is the use of footnotes. Lane uses these wisely; they serve to explain everything from acronyms, such as "Instituto Politécnico Nacional (The National Polytechnic Institute [IPN], Mexico City)" (5), to specific terms in Mexican Spanish that she decides to leave untranslated in the text, such as *granaderos* (riot police, 5), to explanations of personalities within the text (such as on page 48, where she explains in a note that Barros Sierra is the Regent of the National Autonomous University of Mexico [UNAM]). Lane's interventions as a translator are, in my opinion, mercifully economic, and I would have liked to be able to limit my explanations in *Daybreak in the Zócalo* to scattered and infrequent footnotes. In *Amanecer*, however, Poniatowksa includes a near overwhelming number of acronyms, so I chose to include the explanation of these in one compact, alphabetical list. We will see in Chapter Five how I have followed the lead of Lane and the other translators discussed here in my explanations and clarifications of other difficult aspects of the text.

NOTHING, NOBODY AND BORN TO DIE IN MEDELLÍN

The foremost explanatory expansion in *Nothing, Nobody*, is the inclusion of a map of Mexico City, which, given the nature of the *crónica* that has the "city on display," and given that it is Poniatowska's setting of this text, is very useful for the

reader. This is the same approach I will choose to include in my translation. The map means that every time a street name or city square is mentioned in the text, there is no need to explain its location in a footnote, and even if the reader has not been to whichever city is the “protagonist” of the *crónica*, he or she can gain a mental image of the geographical setting. Nick Caistor goes a different way in *Born to Die*, including maps of Colombia and the province of Antioquia instead of the city Medellín. This decision could reflect the author’s and translator’s desire to convey that the issues dealt with in the text extend beyond the city borders and to the rest of the country, or it could be because Medellín is not the only setting of the *crónica*. But it seems curious that there is no map of Medellín for the English readers to refer to. As the translator of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, I would be wise to follow both of these examples in my inclusion of maps. The reason for this is that, like *Nothing, Nobody* and *Massacre in Mexico*, Poniatowska refers constantly, on nearly every page of the 395-page *crónica*, to the streets of Mexico City and the Zócalo Square’s surroundings. However, she also writes about protestors who come from other Mexican provinces to join in the movement. It would be helpful to readers not only to have an image of what the “city on display” looks like, but also to have an idea of the distance traveled by the citizens who protested in the Zócalo sit-in. Perhaps it would give the readers a general idea of the lengths some Mexican citizens went to for this cause.

Finally, I would like to briefly touch on one more method of expansion employed most notably among these three *crónicas* by Nick Caistor in *Born to Die in Medellín*. Whereas in *Massacre in Mexico*, Lane provided all of her explanations in the preface and her footnotes, and in *Nothing, Nobody*, the Schmidts decided not to interfere with the body of the text at all, by making their explanations in the preface and a glossary, Nick Caistor added expansions directly into the body of the text. Though he did use footnotes to explain more complex issues or to give reference to newspaper reports or articles (and some of these footnotes appear in the source text as well), for the most part Caistor explains Colombian Spanish phrases or culturally implicit aspects of the text by simply adding a small clause to the text itself. For example: “It was around then that ‘El Cojo,’ an old crook, came back to the neighbourhood after a spell in Bellavista.” (90) The explanation “an old crook” is Caistor’s addition to the text in translation. He could have simply translated “El Cojo” for “The Old Crook,” but “El Cojo” reappears within the chapter as a character, and clearly the translator decided that keeping the Colombian Spanish name was important to the text, and a simple explanatory clause would do fine, without interrupting the text.

In this chapter I have attempted to demonstrate how, in the translation of the previous Latin American political *crónicas*, the translators have taken measures similar to those I will discuss in my own work, which all contribute to the works’

reception in North America. Although each *crónica* covers social issues at different points of the cultural spectrum, and although each translator takes slightly different measures in their work to explain the culturally implicit aspects of the texts, the same objective is achieved. To conclude, I would like to look at the publication of these works. While *La Noche de Tlatelolco* was published by Ediciones Era, a major publishing house in Mexico, *Massacre in Mexico* was first published in 1975 by the Viking Press, which is part of a large publishing house, and then later published in 1991 by the University of Missouri Press. Its “shelf-life” in North America was preserved by an academic press. *Nada, nadie* was similarly published in Mexico by Era, and in translation by Temple University Press in 1995. Finally, *No Nacimos Pa’ Semilla* was first published in Spanish by CINEP (The Center for Research and Popular Education), which is, of course, a public education institute, and in translation it was published by the Latin American Bureau (Research and Action) Ltd in 1992). To sum up, all three of these *crónicas* were published in translation clearly for educational purposes; they were adapted for a new audience for whom the source theme was not immediately important, and can now be found in libraries in the sections Education, History of the Americas and Economics/Commerce, respectively.

In the following chapters I hope to show how I have used all of the methods discussed above to address challenges and to adapt the translation of *Amanecer en el*

Zócalo to appeal to an audience similar to that of the very few Latin American *crónicas* that have been translated before it.

CHAPTER THREE

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SELECT CONTEMPORARY TRANSLATION THEORIES AND THEIR APPLICATION TO THE TRANSLATION OF *AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO*

Until this point I have argued how the source text fits into the Mexican literary system in a central way, and how it and other *crónicas* appeal to a mass audience given their ubiquity in Latin America. I have also looked at, apart from *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, three contemporary *crónicas* in translation in order to demonstrate how, in translation, works of this genre tend to be changed in translation to correspond to a different genre in the English language. They are also altered in certain ways by the translator to reach a different type of audience consisting of readers to whom both the subject matter and form of the *crónica* is foreign. The purpose of this chapter will be to explain a select few contemporary translation theories and demonstrate how we can use them to justify the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, taking into consideration the fundamental linguistic differences between Mexican Spanish and North American English, and the differences between the readers in the source culture and the target culture. My goal will be to show how recent trends in thought concerning translation aim

toward supporting change in the practice of translation, as intercultural exchange becomes more significant than “faithfulness” to the source text.

CONTEMPORARY TRANSLATION STUDIES: AN OVERVIEW OF THE 60S AND 70S

To begin this discussion of contemporary translation theories, I would like to start in the early 1960s, when theorists were focusing primarily on notions of equivalence, and how to translate to best serve the purposes of the source text. Eugene Nida’s work provides good examples of this school of thought, as he was part of a group of theorists in the 1960s that focused on traditional source text-oriented theories of equivalence, fidelity and freedom in translation. According to Nida (1964, in Venuti, 2000), there are two different types of equivalence between original text and target text: formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence (156). Formal equivalence, according to the theorist, aims at encouraging the target audience to learn something about the source culture from a translated text that preserves the form of the original, and therefore seems foreign to the target reader:

A... translation of this type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression (156).

This means that the text's foreignness remains intact in the translation so the reader can fully grasp the exotic elements of the source text's culture, and read the text as if he or she were part of that culture. Conversely, dynamic equivalence, which Nida believes to be the more appropriate approach to translation, aims at creating as similar as possible a reaction in the target audience as was felt in the source culture.

Nida says:

In such a translation one is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship, that the relationship between the receptor and the message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message (159).

What this theory presumes is that communication of the source text's message is that which the translator should consider of utmost importance, along with the target reader's relationship to that message.

In the years following these earlier theories of "faithfulness" and "equivalence," a school of thought developed mainly in German-speaking countries that produced theories of translation termed "functionalist" approaches. The functionalists represented two significant moves in translation studies: "(1) the shift from source-text oriented theories to target-text oriented theories and (2) the shift to include cultural factors as well as linguistic elements in the translation training models." (Gentzler, 2001: 70). In his comprehensive historiography of translation

studies, Edwin Gentzler argues that the functionalist theories finally transcended the antiquated and always dominant power struggle between “fidelity and freedom” in translation: “The emergence of a functionalist translation theory marks an important moment in the evolution of translation theory by breaking the two thousand year old chain of theory revolving around the faithful vs. free axis.” (71). In the most basic terms, instead of aiming to translate the text in the most appropriate way for the message and form of the source text to survive in the target language or for the target audience to have a similar reaction to the target text as the source audience had to the source text, functionalism allows the translator to consider the function of the text in translation, and adapt it to serve the most appropriate purpose in the target culture. Edwin Gentzler gives an example: “Some texts such as product descriptions might demand a word-for-word description; other texts such as advertisements might suggest a freer approach. The functionalist approach allows the translator the flexibility to decide which approach would work better in the given situation.” (71)

Katharina Reiss, a theorist from the school of functionalism, discusses the theory of adapting texts for the target culture in her essay “Decision Making in Translation” (1971, in Venuti, 2000). She explains that in order to make decisions in translation, the translator must first analyze the “text type” (171) of the original in order to establish what type of communication is used and should be used in the translation. In her theory there are three forms of communication (171): informative

(based on the expression of content), expressive (based on “artistically organized content”), and operative (based on “content with a persuasive character”). Reiss explains that “if the [source language,] SL text is written to convey contents, these contents should also be conveyed in the [target language,] TL text” (175) but that the translator will make decisions based on the objective of staying true to the content and its meaning(s), so:

[To] this end it may be necessary that what is conveyed implicitly in the SL text should be explicated in the TL and vice versa. This necessity arises, on the one hand, from structural differences in the two languages involved, and, on the other hand, from differences in the collective pragmatics of the two language communities involved/ (175)

Applying this to *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, my argument is that while the original text is an historic account of a political situation and written from a left-wing point of view (thus may be assumed to be an informative text type), the type of communication of the source text is also operational.

This brings us to the argument that Jeremy Munday (2008a: 75) introduces with his description of many business-related texts that use metaphors (e.g. “markets are *bullish* and *bearish*, profits *soar*, *peak*, *dive* and *plummet*, while the credit crunch bites and banks employ a *scorched-earth policy* in the face of *hostile take-over bids*” 75), illustrating the expressive nature of informative English language texts. Can we really differentiate between text types as Reiss suggests? If so, it would be

very difficult to decide how to categorize *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. Its content is clearly of utmost importance (informative type), the left-wing ideology is ever-present (operational type), and much of the writing is as expressive as any novel (expressive type). It has to be argued, then, that this particular work is a true hybrid of all of Reiss's text types, and the translator has to take into account *how* to translate this work keeping its hybrid nature in mind. Munday gives a good overview of how each text type should supposedly be translated according to Reiss:

- (1) The TT [target text] of an informative text should transmit the full referential or conceptual content of the ST [source text]. The translation should be in 'plain prose', without redundancy and with the use of explicitation where required.
- (2) The TT of an expressive text should transmit the aesthetic and artistic form of the ST. The translation should use the 'identifying' method, with the translator adopting the standpoint of the ST author.
- (3) The TT of an operative text should produce the desired response in the TT receiver. The translation should employ the 'adaptive' method, creating an equivalent effect among TT readers.

[2008a: 73-74].

Thankfully, Reiss's theory allows for scenarios that she names "problematic cases" of translation (177), in which two or all three of these text types may exist in one text: "If, for instance, elements of poetic language are used when content is

conveyed (informative type) [...] the translation ought to strive for an analogous poetic form for those elements" (177).

Reiss's theory, of course, is contained within a larger field of study, namely systemic functional linguistics, developed by Michael Halliday in the 1960s, wherein her discussion of "text type" falls under the umbrella of the larger discussions of meaning within language. Halliday theorizes that three simultaneous strands of meaning exist in language (be it textual or other language), even when one type of meaning may be more prominent in a given text or genre. The first type of meaning, or function of language, Halliday calls "experiential" meaning, which has also been called the "representational function." Halliday argues: "If one of the functions of language is to express our experience of the world that is around us and inside us, it is natural that this should be reflected in the linguistic system" (27). The second type Halliday calls an "interpersonal function," which refers to the social aspect of language: the "expression of a desire for knowledge" and the "demand to be given information" (27). Finally, the third type of meaning is "a functional component, provided we accept the notion of an enabling function that is intrinsic to language: that is what we refer to as the function of creating a text. It is this that enables language to be operational; 'text' is language in use" (28). This third function is aptly named the "textual function." Halliday says:

Since these structures are the means of expression of the basic functions of language, they relate to particular functionally defined

areas of meaning. Grammatical structure may be regarded, in fact, as the means whereby the various components of meaning, deriving from the different functions of language, are integrated together. We can see that each component makes its contribution to the total structural complex. The different functions are, quite evidently, simultaneous and compatible (29).

In other words, Reiss's theory of text-types must be seen in context with larger linguistic and literary concepts such as language, speech, and specifically genres, since all texts are organized, processed and filtered in and through genres especially.

The discussion of genres is particularly important when trying to establish the "type" of a work of literature because genres are like subsystems that make up the larger systems described above as "text-types." In short, many different genres could potentially fit into the category of "informative type of text." In Chapter One we discussed the notion and importance of heteroglossia in the novel. To recapitulate, heteroglossia is the union of different speech types, languages and voices within the novel that make its message stronger. Bakhtin argues further that literature itself is "heteroglot" (consisting of distinctive speech types and forms) and that the "unities" that make up literatures are "genres":

Literary language – both spoken and written – although it is unitary not only in its shared, abstract, linguistic markers but also in its forms for conceptualizing these abstract markers, is itself stratified and heteroglot in its aspect as an expressive system, that is, in the forms that carry its meanings.

This stratification is accomplished first of all by the specific organisms called *genres*. Certain features of language (lexicological, semantic, syntactic) will knit together with the intentional aim, and with the overall accentual system inherent in one or another genre: oratorical, publicistic, newspaper and journalistic genres, the genres of low literature [...] or, finally, the various genres of high literatures. Certain features of language take on the specific points of view, specific approaches, forms of thinking, nuances and accents characteristic of the given genre (288-9).

What Bakhtin is observing above is that genres are created by common elements within different works of literature, and the specific combination of these linguistic, stylistic, and thematic elements communicates a given message or meaning to the world. In *The Formal Method of Literary Scholarship* (1928; referenced here in Morris, 1994), Bakhtin explains that genres have two primary “orientations”: the first is toward a public, a readership, or a listener; the second comes from within the work and is an orientation “in life, from within, one might say, by its thematic content.” (176). What this means is that every genre, within every “text-type,” has its own unique way of communicating its meaning in the world, and intentionally communicates this meaning to a specific audience. Bakhtin adds that this means genres are formed by the very fact that they are able to offer a unique conceptualization of the world we live in: “If we approach genre from the point of view of its intrinsic thematic relationship to reality and the generation of reality, we may say that every genre has its methods and means of seeing and conceptualizing reality, which are accessible to it alone.” (178). What I believe we can draw from

Bakhtin here is, first, that in order to discover the characteristics that define a work's genre, we have to look at the text's orientations: the audience or public to which it is directed, and the theme within it and its orientation in reality. Second, once we have established the characteristics of its genre, we can look at the view of the world that is unique to the work. *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, then, is oriented toward a vast general public, and it arrives there through its local, cultural and political theme, which in turn affects the public personally and deeply. The work's view of reality is unique in that, like other works of the same genre, it showcases the reality of the audience's culture by allowing members of the audience speak through it (i.e. their voices are reflected through Poniatowska).

I would like to return to the translation theories of text-type in order to proceed with the discussion of the functionalists. In translation, the target text is often oriented toward a different type of audience, and its themes can be shifted because of the cultural transfer. And in these cases, certain measures must be taken by the translator to allow for the text type and genre to shift. As Jeremy Munday puts it, "an operative election address in one language may be translated for analysts in another country interested in finding out what policies have been presented and how (i.e. as an informative and expressive text)." (2008a: 74). This does not mean that the translator of said election address (such as the many political addresses by Andrés Manuel López Obrador in *Amanecer en el Zócalo*) should change the operational language of the source text in translation, but rather

that even when the translator preserves the operational language of the source text, it is actually the content represented by that operational language that will be taken into account in the target culture, thereby automatically making the target text an informative type.

As an educational text in the target language, it is possible that the translation may no longer be perceived as expressing “content with a persuasive character” because it is meant to educate, not influence its readers to believe in certain ideology. This does not mean, however, that the source text’s ideology and “left-wing” discourse should be “neutralized”²¹ in the target text so that the translation uses “informative” rather than “operational” communication, but that although the source text may be ideologically persuasive, the translator may not necessarily share the same ideology as the author of the source text, and thus may distance him or herself from the ideology of the source text.

Text-type theories are not static and they change across borders and in time. According to Christiane Nord (1991), another theorist of the German functionalist group: “Text-type conventions are not universal, but linked to a certain culture at a certain time.” (19). She explains:

²¹ What I mean here is that although the source text was written from a political left-of-center standpoint in Mexico, the translator should not necessarily take measures to dilute the ideology of the text for the sake of neutrality in the target culture. The readers in the target culture will most likely be aware that the ideology of the source text is a basis for discussion and research.

Not only do text-type norms vary from one culture to another [...], but they are also subject to historical change. Certain text types that are very common today did not exist in former times (e.g. radio news or commercials), whereas others, which were quite commonplace centuries ago (e.g. magic spells or heroic poems), have changed function or become obsolete altogether. (19)

In other words, is it not only possible for text-types to gain or lose ubiquity or relevance over time and across cultural lines, it is also possible for the parameters of text-types to be blurred, as Reiss pointed out and as we will see when we move further along the chronological line of theory and reach André Lefevere.

Poniatowska's source text, then, can be difficult to categorize. Clearly her primary goal is to persuade, given the abundant and obviously partisan ideology within her text. Furthermore, she utilizes her status in society – the education, skills and world knowledge that have given her the status she holds – to mobilize her own ideologies. This behaviour is what Bourdieu would call employing her “cultural capital,” which can be described as means or resources that the owner possesses and that represent “a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word.” (Bourdieu 1986, 51). But she also provides valuable information with regards to current events and the facts and numbers from the 2006 Mexican election. To make matters perhaps more complicated, at times throughout the *crónica* she writes in an obvious attempt to entertain. An example of this is “chapter” August 3, 2006, when Poniatowska diverts the narrative away

from politics and journalism to describe how the protestors have begun to pass the time in one of the city's plazas: an open, perpetual soccer game played by protestors and passers-by alike (91). This type of "side story" adds an element of fun and entertainment to the text. Knowing that the source text fits into each one of Lefevere's text types, however, and which it *mostly* fits into, becomes an important factor in the discussion of which type the translation becomes.

The target text's type is also determined by the factor of reception, and reception determines, of course, where the text will fit and what sort of "after-life" it will enjoy (or, for how long a text will remain relevant in society). And, as Nord points out, the reception of a text is dependent on other factors:

The reception of a text depends on the individual expectations of the recipient, which are determined by the situation in which he receives the text as well as by his social background, his world knowledge, and / or his communicative needs. (16)

This means that reception will never rely alone on the tastes of an audience as a whole. If an individual does not need or understand the work, that individual, quite simply, may not read it.

Poniatowska's source text was received so widely and so well in Mexico because she aimed her text at an audience consisting of individuals with extremely varied social backgrounds, with differing levels of world knowledge, and with diverse communicative needs. In short, she aimed her text at an entire nation,

complete with its incredibly diverse population. And because of the way it touched each citizen individually, it was received and it sold. The case in translation, as I have mentioned, is quite different. The individual appeal is missing. It is no longer a story about “our struggle” or “our nation” or “our solidarity,” it is a story about “their struggle,” et cetera, which means that we are learning about something, not reliving it, as was the source audience’s experience.

When considering the translation of a text, then, the translator relying on functionalist theories can reflect on the question of the purpose the text will serve in the new culture. Why should *Amanecer en el Zócalo* be translated? What type of text do I want to create? Do I want to provide target readers with information about syntax, text structure, or is the “message” (ie sociopolitical, ideological and cultural content) of the text the most important aspect to respect? Or, in fact, is it necessary or even possible to maintain all of the above aspects of the source text?

First, I will address the question of why the text should be translated. To recapitulate: Poniatowska most often writes her *crónicas* for the Mexican people, staying true to her commitment to writing about the Mexican circumstance. Much of the content of her *crónica*—the setting, cultural, political and historical references and characters—are very “specific” to Mexico, so many large publishing houses whose interests lie primarily with publishing works that will be marketable in large numbers have decided not to publish my translation of this work in English. In an email to me, Braulio Peralta, Elena Poniatowka’s Editor at Ediciones Planeta, the

publisher of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, said: “El tema se considera muy mexicano, local, no ven un mundo más allá.” (“*The topic is considered very Mexican, local, and they don’t see beyond that*”) (Thursday April 23, 2009). In this correspondence, Peralta was referring to the help he was attempting to offer me in the publication of this translation. He sent the translated manuscript with literary agents affiliated with Ediciones Planeta to two large book fairs in 2008: Guadalajara’s Feria Internacional de Libro and the Frankfurt Book Fair. Both of these trade shows host large, small and academic publishing houses from around the world (although Guadalajara’s participants are mainly Spanish-language publishers, while Frankfurt’s are multi-lingual) and serve as a marketing event and venue for publishing proposals, interviews and negotiations between writers (or translators) and editors.

Poniatowska’s agent would primarily be interested in showing the translated manuscript to large publishing houses, simply because the larger the publishing house, the higher the distribution of the text, and the higher the visibility and proceeds for the source-text author (while as a translator and a student I would most likely have more success submitting my work to small and academic presses, which I will discuss later). Large publishing houses look mostly for “world” consumption rather than books that would appeal to only an English-speaking world, or part thereof. While the skopos theory seems to consider only one culture tied to one language, and its functionality focuses on target text and target culture, world culture involved looking for culture beyond language, or

multi-language culture, and large publishers focus on target audience, and they strive to deliver texts for world distribution.

Simply put, considering that I attempted to direct this text toward a readership interested in learning about the current state of Mexican culture and politics, Poniatowska's English-speaking readers may tend to constitute a smaller, more "intellectual" group of "expert" readers, while her source-language audience was a large, more general audience consisting of readers from all over the social spectrum. This means that the translation, in the simplest of terms, will inevitably be less profitable than the source text. Basically, the argument that the book is very "local" in its themes is a smokescreen for publishing houses' real criterion: large target audiences. Unfortunately, in these assessments, harlequin romance novels may be deemed far more important than acclaimed Latin American authors. Since we live in a world of electronic media, publishing books is becoming an increasingly expensive option, so sellability is as large a factor, if not larger, than cultural centrality.

TARGET-ORIENTED TRANSLATION STUDIES

The conception of functionalist theories coincided with the beginnings of target-oriented translation studies (see Toury, 1995), some of which I will turn to now. My argument in this chapter is that a translation becomes a text on its own, a

text completely separate from the source text that can and often must fulfill a different function in the target culture. Thus we are charged with evaluating the roles and functions of the target text (and its “worth,” for that matter), separately from the roles and functions of the source text. For this reason, from now on when I speak of the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* in this chapter, I will refer to it using its translated title, *Daybreak in the Zócalo*.

Gideon Toury was one of the first theorists to make the switch in translation studies to target-orientedness (Toury 1977). In his work *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995) Toury sustains the argument that the translation stands as a text in its own right, contending that while it may always be possible for a translation to have an effect on the source text, source culture and target culture, and vice versa, the translated text will always occupy a distinct position in the target culture’s literary system than that of the original text. In fact, the translated text becomes one that no longer bears the form or function of a translation:

There is no way a translation could share the same systemic space with its original; not even when the two are physically present side by side. This is not to say that, having been severed from it, a translation would never be in a position to bear on the source culture again, on occasion even on the source text itself. Texts, and hence the cultural systems which host them, have been known to have been affected by translations of theirs. It is nonetheless significant that any such practice involves a *reversal of roles*, in full accordance with our starting point: while genetically a translation, the affecting entity no longer functions as one. (26)

The idea that a translation is a text in its own right with its own function in the target system has been developing since Walter Benjamin (1923) first argued that translations serve to maintain the survival of a source text, and that they help bring texts to an “in between” linguistic space where all concepts are comprehensible to all cultures. Susan Bassnett (1998) explains the two primary lines of thought surrounding translation: the first being that translation is a “secondary” or lesser art because it constitutes unoriginal writing. This first line of thought sees the translator as a purveyor of the original author’s message, which opposes Lawrence Venuti’s notion in target-oriented approaches to translation studies that the translator should be visible in the art of translation:

The shift of emphasis from original to translation is reflected also in discussions on the visibility of the translator. Lawrence Venuti calls for a translator-centred translation, insisting that the translator should inscribe him/ herself into the text [Venuti, 1995]. (25)

The second and recently more ubiquitous line of thought, according to Bassnett, is that translation is rewriting and original:

One line of thought has traditionally seen the translation as a traducement, a betrayal, an inferior copy of a prioritized original. Another line of thinking focuses instead on the translation, and in recent years we have seen Derrida (and others) rereading Walter Benjamin and celebrating the translation as the ‘after-life’ of the source text, its means of survival, its reincarnation. Indeed, Derrida suggests that effectively the translation *becomes* the original [see Derrida, 1985] (25).

I do not wish to follow this abstract notion that the translation becomes an original work in the target culture too closely, but rather expand upon how *Daybreak in the Zócalo* can represent the “after-life” of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* and function differently in the target culture. Since *Amanecer* was written for a mass audience that had profound experience with the social situation around which the book was written, the Mexican people lived and breathed the electoral crisis of 2006, and the issues saturated every discourse within the country from journalism to casual conversations amongst friends. *Daybreak in the Zócalo*, however, is produced for an audience with much less knowledge of the Mexican circumstance. The translation is meant to educate a North American readership.

THE TARGET TEXT’S “TYPE” AND THE SOURCE TEXT’S “AFTER-LIFE”

Speaking of the translation’s “after-life” brings us to André Lefevere. This theorist updates Reiss’s argument on types of translations. He argues (1998) that there are four (or more) types of translations: (i) those that communicate information (such as user manuals or instruction handbooks); (ii) those that communicate cultural capital; (iii) those that could be categorized as entertainment (such as novels or dubbed movies); and (iv) those that “could be said to try to persuade the reader to adopt some course of action, as opposed to another.” (41)

As André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett state in their preface to *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992), "Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text... Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society." (vii). With regards to *Daybreak in the Zócalo*, this concept of "rewriting" can be looked at in two ways. First, *Daybreak* is a rewriting of *Amanecer* insofar as it allows the source text to live an "after-life" as postulated by Benjamin, simply because it allows Poniatowska's original conception to live on in another language and thus have a larger readership and a longer "shelf life." Second, and also relating to this concept of "after-life," *Daybreak in the Zócalo* could also be described as what André Lefevere (1981) calls a "refracted text." Refractions, according to Lefevere, are "texts that have been processed for a certain audience (children, for example), or adapted to a certain poetics or a certain ideology." (72)

I will argue that the primary reason that a translator must consider the source text's type is that it will affect the nature of the "after-life" it will live in translation. For example, a text that is mainly meant to entertain, not to persuade, may live an after-life that is virtually equal to the text's "original" life in that if translated well, the target text should continue to serve the same purpose as the source text—it will entertain its readers. The same principle applies to texts that are meant to convey information, such as instruction manuals. The only real difference in the "life" the text leads will be the language and culture of the target readership.

Obviously, the cultural differences between the source and target readerships will affect the translation process. In an entertaining text, for example, word-play in one language may not work in another, thus requiring some cultural or linguistic adaptation, or a rhyme may not work, such as the example I give in Chapter Four with the protestor's chants ("Es un honor estar con Obrador" versus "We have pride at Obrador's side," (see Chapter Five, p. 173).

The after-life of a text whose type is persuasive, however, may be quite different from the life the source text leads, and this is directly related to the distinct position the target text may hold in the target culture's literary system. While the source text may try to persuade the source readers to believe in or follow a certain ideology, the target text may aim to take the source text's ideology and convert it into information for the sake of expanding the target readers' knowledge of the source culture's circumstances. Thus the target text may become an informative text-type rather than a persuasive one.

In his essay "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites: The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm," in Theo Herman's anthology, *The Manipulation of Literature* Lefevere points out that translators cannot be completely objective in their ideological approaches to literary criticism, which can be applied to the study of translations. He argues that there is nothing wrong with having one's own partisan views on literature, but that claiming objectivity would be wrong:

Works of literature exist to be made use of in one way or another. There is nothing wrong, or right, about using them in a certain manner, all readers do it all the time. It is simply part of the process by which a work of literature is absorbed into the reader's mental or emotional framework. What *is* wrong, though, or at least very dishonest, is for criticism, any kind of criticism, to pretend to be objective and to try to take on the trappings of the scientific while remaining partisan and subjective. (217-18)

As the translator of Poniatowska's work, I may claim to remain objective with regards to the persuasive character of the source text; in translation my goal is not to persuade North American readers to believe in the causes fought for by Andrés Manuel López Obrador's National Action Party. That being said, the translation does convey a certain ideology: the belief that the ideologies represented in the source text are capable of contributing to a well-rounded learning experience for the target culture readers. In other words, the very fact that I believe that this persuasive work is worth translating is evidence of my subjectivity in the matter and my ideological beliefs.

TEXT TYPE AND RECEPTION

The type of a text (especially that of a source text) will have a significant influence over the reception of the target text in translation. For example, informative texts (such as instruction manuals) are often translated because it is

absolutely essential that they be. Someone who speaks English exclusively would never be able to read a Japanese owner's manual for a Japanese-made car, for example, thus translation is required for a product's marketability. But as Lefevere points out in his essay "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature," a refracted text – one that is translated for a certain audience or "adapted to a certain ideology" – may have more problems being accepted because of the "needs" or limitations put on literature in the target system:

A refraction (whether it is translation, criticism, historiography) which tries to carry a work of literature over from one system into another, represents a compromise between two systems and is, as such, the perfect indicator of the dominant constraints in both systems. The gap between the two hierarchies of constraints explains why certain works do not "take," or enjoy at best and ambiguous position in the system they are imported into. (243)

In the context of my translation, I would like to expand on the concept of refracted texts and their relationship to the concept of literary systems. Lefevere argues that while refractions are written for a certain audience and tend to serve a certain ideology, thereby attempting to cultivate certain progressiveness in a given culture's evolution of thought, the concept of a literary system takes this attempted persuasiveness of refractions and situates it within a grander scheme of texts whose only real objective is to cultivate the evolution of knowledge:

A systems approach does not try to influence the evolution of a given literary system, the way critical refractions and many

translations avowedly written in the service of a certain poetics tend to do. It does not try to influence the reader's concretization of a given text in a certain direction. Instead, it aims at giving the reader the most complete set of materials that can help him or her in the concretization of the text, a set of materials he or she is free to accept or reject. (254)

This means that even if a translation is meant to be persuasive (or inherently *is* a persuasive text, whether or not the translator means it to be), according to the systems approach to literature, its position within the literary system and its relationship to other texts in its system "smooths over" its inherent persuasiveness because the text becomes one element of a much larger mechanism, and the mechanism's overall goal is to provide as much information as possible for the most inclusive base of knowledge possible:

A systems approach to literary studies aims at making literary texts accessible to the reader, by means of description, analysis, historiography, translation, produced not on the basis of a given, transient poetics (which will, of course, take great pains to establish itself as absolute and eternal), but on the basis of that desire to know, which is itself subject to constraints not dissimilar to the ones operating in the literary system, a desire to know not as literature itself knows, but to know the ways in which literature offers its knowledge, which is so important that it should be shared to the greatest possible extent. (254)

Further to this goal of creating a basis for knowledge, Lefevere argues that incorporating refractions into the study of literary systems has the potential to

foster the belief that literature is intellectual creation functioning under the limitations of a given culture:

A systems approach to literature, emphasizing the role played by refractions, or rather, integrating them, revalidates the concept of literature as something that is made, not in the vacuum of unfettered genius, for genius is never unfettered, but out of the tension between genius and the constraints that genius has to operate under, accepting them or subverting them. (254)

In other words, not only can refracted texts serve to broaden the target culture's knowledge on the source text's culture, but they also provide a basis for study of the differences between the limitations placed on literature and the arts in the source and target cultures.

Earlier, when I introduced Lefevere's four different types of translation, we briefly saw that he mentioned texts conveying "cultural capital" as one type.

Cultural capital is different than information:

The difference between information and cultural capital [...] could be succinctly formulated as follows: information is what you need to function on the professional level, whereas cultural capital is what you need to be seen to belong to the 'right circles' in the society in which you live. (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1998: 41).

According to Lefevere, this cultural capital, which is “transmitted, distributed, and regulated by means of translation, among other factors, not only between cultures, but also within one given culture,” (41) can be described as follows:

Cultural capital, then, is the kind of capital intellectuals can still claim to have, and even, if only to some extent, to control, as opposed to economic capital, which most intellectuals do not even claim to have any more. Cultural capital is what makes you acceptable in your society at the end of the socialization process known as education. (42)

In other words, cultural capital can also be described as knowledge: the tangible result of education.

Bassnett and Lefevere argue that cultural capital is the means by which we can prove that translation not only bridges cultures but indeed builds them:

It is in the domain of cultural capital that translation can most clearly be seen to construct cultures. It does so by negotiating the passage of texts between them, or rather, by devising strategies through which texts from one culture can penetrate the textual and conceptual grids of another culture, and function in that other culture. What we call the ‘socialisation process’, of which formal education is a big, though not the only part, leaves us with textual and conceptual grids that regulate most of the writing and the thinking in the culture in which we grow up. [...] The most obvious form of negotiation between textual and conceptual grids is that of analogy; it is also the most superficial one, and the one that leads, inevitably, to the obliteration of differences between cultures and the texts they produce. (7)

This idea expands upon target-oriented translation studies as a whole, because it assumes that translation not only bridges the gap between cultures, but also has the capacity to change and develop cultures in a permanent way. As well as being another piece of evidence that translation cannot be seen as a second-tier art form, this idea is a cornerstone of a greater notion that cultures are constantly shifting and changing, and that at the insertion of new knowledge into one system, say, that system's culture can be altered permanently. Whereas original literature constructs a culture from the ground up, providing a medium from which we can observe certain trends in culture and society and their relevance (because of their sellability, scope on the spectrum of popular trends in literature, et cetera), translation brings these trends in culture and society from one side of the linguistic, cultural, social and temporal border across to another. Translation not only teaches a new culture about the first, it also results in the insertion of the first culture into the second.

Lefevere argues that cultural capital – that component of literature that renders translation necessary in the building of cultures – is “distributed and regulated” by three different forces:

The distribution and regulation of cultural capital by means of translation, then, depends on at least the following three factors [...]: (i) the need, or rather needs, of the audience, or rather audiences [...], (ii) the patron or initiator of the translation, and (iii) the relative prestige of the source and target cultures and their languages. (44)

I would argue that (ii), the patron or initiator of the translation also regulates (i), the need(s) of the audience(s) to a certain degree, while Lawrence Venuti will argue that in certain circles publishers tend to regulate the needs of the audience (see the section on Venuti later in this chapter). This particularly happens in the case of academic texts such as journal articles, theses and manuscripts, when critics analyzing other similar texts pinpoint the need for further research in a given area of study, for example, or when a particular text opens the field for further discourse on the subject. This process is, of course, general, and exists in every area of research in academia.

Audiences' needs are also determined by other factors. To give a few examples in the case of the translation in question, when a new course is developed in a university department, there may suddenly be a need for *Daybreak in the Zócalo* in translation. Perhaps the translation of this work would be unnecessary in a course where the source material can be appropriately read in the original Spanish, but as I have already mentioned, there could be a need for the translation in a political studies course taught in English that deals with recent Mexican politics. Secondly, as the relationship between Mexico and the rest of North America becomes closer and develops, the need for works such as *Daybreak in the Zócalo* grows as well. Conversely, since the source text was published in 2007 and there is a temporal distance growing between the pertinence of the political movement and the publication of the translation, the need for this translation may falter.

I would like to touch briefly on a point I made earlier in this section regarding cultural capital as the tangible result of education. Translating a literary text to become something educational is a concept that Kwame Anthony Appiah (2000) calls “thick translation,” and he argues that this kind of translation, even though it transforms the fundamental nature of the source text, is important to the bridging of cultures: “...such ‘academic’ translation, translation that seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context, is eminently worth doing” (399) because, “What counts as a fine translation of a literary text [...] is that it should preserve for us the features that make it worth teaching.” (398)

What makes a work worth teaching may be its capacity to change culture or add to it, and this, in the case of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, is the background of the text, the genre of the *crónica* itself, the nuances of the language and the use of heteroglossia in Poniatowska’s work. All of these features, which are common in Latin American works but especially in the Mexican *crónica*, deserve extra attention for a North American audience and are worthy of study. But further to these aspects of the text that “make it worth teaching,” Appiah elaborates that this process is in a constant cycle of change, just like culture itself:

A translation aims to produce a new text that matters to one community the way another text matters to another: but it is part of our understanding of why texts matter that this is not a question that convention settles; indeed, it is part of our understanding of

literary judgment, that there can always be new readings, new things that matter about a text, new reasons for caring about new properties. (397)

Simply put, this argument means that the translation of the *crónica* will “matter” in a different way than the original “mattered” to the original audience. Looking at this translation and how it will fit into North American society is also a way of looking at how Mexican politics and literature will be of interest in North America at different times, for different reasons, for different audiences. Currently, this translation will probably matter most to the academic community because of the properties of the text that I mentioned above. We cannot necessarily predict how it will matter in the future; the *crónica* could very well become a ubiquitous genre of literature in Canada and the United States, or it could continue to exist as a genre that is foreign in our literary system and one that will only ever “matter” to the academic community.

In the translation of Poniatowska’s *crónica*, I am creating something that, like the *crónicas* that have been translated before it, will aim to teach the target audience about Mexico’s political and social situation, as well as about the literary production in the Mexican literary system. The *crónica* is not something that North American audiences are used to seeing, so this work in its English translation will be, as Appiah says: “a translation that draws on and creates a sort of understanding,

meets the need to challenge ourselves and our students to go further, to undertake the harder project of a genuinely informed respect for others" (2000: 399).

Considering the rather marginal position of translations within a literary system (or, perhaps more accurately, on the spectrum of a publishing house's priorities), the difficulty in publishing *Daybreak in the Zócalo* is not surprising. Lawrence Venuti comments on this phenomenon in *The Scandals of Translation* (1998), and to put it simply, it all comes down to money:

Among the decisive factors in the current marginality of translation is its tenuous economic value. Quite simply, publishers keep the volume of translations low because such books are financially risky: they are so costly to produce, requiring a significant initial outlay for translation rights, the translator's fee, and marketing, that publishers generally regard them as inevitable losses, possessing only cultural capital, useful as a means "to enhance the variety and appeal of their lists" (Purdy, 1971: 10). Since the 1970s, furthermore, the drive to invest in the bestseller has become so prevalent as to focus the publisher's attention on foreign texts that were commercially successful in their native cultures, allowing the editorial and translating process to be guided by the hope of a similar performance in a different language and culture. And yet translations that reward investment, especially those that become bestsellers, risk the stigma of scholars and critics who possess the cultural authority to shape taste and affect long-term sales. (124)

The problem with Venuti's argument is that he seems to be confusing publishers in general with publishing groups that aspire to academic quality. I say this because he argues that scholars and critics have the power to "affect long-term sales" with

their criticism, but does this really happen in the case of bestsellers? Where an educational text is concerned, there certainly exists the possibility of a great deal of criticism—both negative and constructive—in the academic world, and scholars who are experts in a certain field of study may have the power to launch a young academic’s career with praise for his or her originality, forethought, and contribution to learning, or potentially discredit a work entirely with critiques of sloppy argumentation, lack of proper research, or a wide variety of other factors. Simply put, academia is built upon discourse and debate, a variety of thoughts and arguments that can, at times, play tug of war in order to stimulate a dialogue. That is, after all, how we can define “learning.” That being said, in the case of the bestseller, how do scholars necessarily possess the “cultural authority to shape taste?” Two notable examples of recent bestsellers would be J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter* series, which has sold (as of 2007) over 400 million copies worldwide²² and Stieg Larsson’s *Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* series, which has sold over 27 million copies worldwide, and the first installment of the series was the first ever book to sell over one million e-books²³. It is difficult to believe that these authors (the latter of whom died in 2004 prior to the publication of his trilogy) or their respective U.S. publishers, Scholastic and Random House, would have given much thought to negative scholarly reviews of these works, either in their original language (as in

²² http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Potter

²³ <http://mashable.com/2010/07/27/author-sells-1-million-ebooks/>

the case of Rowling) or the translated version (as in the case of Larsson). As Venuti said himself, money is an extremely important factor in publishing books in general, and translations especially, and when it comes to bestsellers, scholars do not seem to have the power to “shape taste” and determine the fate of a work’s sales.

Interestingly, *Amanecer en el Zócalo* did have financial success in its native country. The reasons for this success may not be transferable to North American culture, and there are factors that contribute to its lack of appeal to larger publishing houses in Canada and the U.S., namely the “local” theme mentioned above, as well as (presumably) the global economic downturn affecting the market as this argument is being made.

This lack of appeal for large publishing houses does not, however, mean a work does not merit translation. It is an obvious statement that Mexican politics has the capacity to affect both the United States and Canada, especially since the North American Free Trade Agreement came into force on January 1 1994. Because of the close relationship between Canadian, U.S. and Mexican politics, the state of democracy in Mexico inevitably affects international relations, security and trade in all three countries. So it would remain clear that any book whose message is aimed at addressing the issue of democracy in Mexico would interest certain readers in the rest of North America. Unlike larger publishing houses, smaller academic presses tend to put funding aside for translation, or they may receive endowments

for specific projects or series. For example, in 2008 Yale Press received a substantial donation “to support a major new publishing series of foreign literatures in translation.²⁴” This clearly opens a large window for literary translators to publish their works. Even when this happens, however, academic presses often have specific criteria for translated works they accept for translation, since there is always a finite number of dollars available for such series.

The structure of the *crónica* is as important as its content if the translator seeks to offer his or her readers information about literary styles in the source culture. Because of the growing political, economic and social proximity of Mexico, the United States and Canada over the past two decades, as well as the growing importance of Spanish as a language²⁵ and of Latin American culture and politics, more and more academic institutions are offering courses and programs in Mexican Studies and Latin American Studies in general. Clearly in many of these academic programs, it would be assumed that the majority of students would be capable of reading the texts covered on the syllabi in Spanish, but there are certainly literature and political science courses wherein the students’ Spanish language skills do not suffice for studying the literature or politics of the culture in question, thereby

²⁴ <http://yaletomorrow.yale.edu/news/margellos.html>

²⁵ According to the U.S. Census Bureau in 2009, the U.S.A. has the world’s second highest population of Spanish speakers.

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/STTable?_lang=en&-_geo_id=01000US&-_ds_name=ACS_2007_3YR_G00_S1601&-_all_geo_types=N

necessitating English translations of the texts to be studied. Interestingly, Lawrence Venuti points out in *The Scandals of Translation* that there is a widespread fear of literary translation among academics who teach foreign languages, because there a concern exists that reading translations could challenge the value of original works of literature:

Translation is also an offense against a still prevailing concept of scholarship that rests on the assumption of original authorship. Whereas this scholarship seeks to ascertain the authorial intention that constitutes originality, translation not only deviates from that intention, but substitutes others: it aims to address a different audience by answering to the constraints of a different language and culture. [...] Under the burden of these fears, translation has long been neglected in the study of literature, even in our current situation, where the influx of poststructuralist thinking has decisively questioned author-oriented literary theory and criticism.
(31)

He explains, however, that translation studies are very much an integral part of literary and cultural studies:

Because the effects of translation are unpredictable and potentially contradictory, determined by many different cultural and social factors, it can be disruptive of scholarly canons and is likely to face repression. Yet this very unpredictability makes translated texts deserving of the scholar's attention as much as the foreign texts they translate. The study of translation is truly a form of historical scholarship because it forces the scholar to confront the issue of historical difference in the changing reception of a foreign text. Translation, with its double allegiance to the foreign text and the domestic culture, is a reminder that no act of interpretation is

always local and contingent, even when housed in social institutions with the apparent rigidity of the academy. (46)

As a student of foreign languages and literatures, and as a literary translator, I cannot help but subscribe to Venuti's theory that foreign language study and translation go hand in hand. I am certainly not advocating the idea that reading the translation of *Amanecer* would render it unnecessary for Spanish speakers, whether they are native or non-native speakers, to read the text in its original language. My argument is that the English text could reach out to readers who hold an interest in Latin American – and specifically Mexican – culture and politics. *Amanecer en el Zócalo* would be an excellent and perhaps even necessary addition to any syllabus for a course concerned with Mexican politics in the last decade and the popular movement of 2006, or any course that studies creative nonfiction and its significance in contemporary Mexico and Latin America.

The observations above are inevitably subjective, since, as the translator, I clearly have decided that the work merits translation and publication. Indeed, it is entirely possible to rationalize the translation of any text, so I will not elaborate any further on the subject. Since I have established, though, that I had ample reason to believe this work should be translated, now I can discuss the "how." Considering that I regard the text's academic merits as the primary reason to translate it into English, I must regard its structure as a *crónica* as well as its message (including the left-wing ideology) as integral aspects of the overall product. Thus, I would want to

find a way to preserve both the structure and the message in the English version for the purposes of creating a text that can be studied. It seems to be impossible to conserve these aspects of the work exactly as they exist in the source text – without a certain degree of explanation of the “local” character of the work. Below, I will explore theories of equivalence, authorship and change in translation, in an attempt to prove how the translator can bridge the differences between source and target cultures.

Putting aside the reasons why *Daybreak in the Zócalo* may be rejected by publishers, I would like to look at the issue of translatability and acceptability.

Palma Zlateva (1990) argues:

[The] acceptability of a translated text in the target language should be considered part of the adequacy of its translation. Any adequately translated literary text becomes a material fact not only in the target language, but in the target literature as well: it exists in both. The fact of its existence and acceptability in the target language does not imply that it is, or will be, immediately accepted in the target literature and culture. This is a different matter altogether. It has to do with the translator’s choice of a particular work at a particular time, with the core and periphery of the target culture and literary tradition at that particular moment, and with several other factors. (29)

Zlateva’s explanation of acceptability provides a good insight into why *Daybreak in the Zócalo* may not have been selected for publication just yet. It also explains my

situation as a translator. We have seen that in the majority of cases of translated literature, the text is selected by the publisher and a translator is hired based on his or her résumé, experience, relationship with the publishing house or relationship with previously translated works by a given author (for example, many well-known authors count on one particular translator for their entire body of work). In the case of this text, I chose to translate the work without first having a publisher, and secondly, Poniatowska's works have been previously translated by several different translators. This harkens back to Bourdieu's theory of subfields: that of large-scale production and that of restricted production. In the subfield of large-scale production, the publisher may very well choose texts to be translated. But in the restricted subfield, it is through networking and contacts.

If Poniatowska had one translator in English who translated all of her works, there would most likely be a better chance that this particular work would be published, however this cannot be proven necessarily. The reason is that, as Zlateva suggests, the translation's acceptance entirely depends on the timing of the translation and the necessity of this translation in the target culture. The "several other factors" that Zlateva alludes to, and which I outlined above in the specific case of this translation, can change over time, as culture itself changes.

Therefore what I am really talking about in this chapter is not actually whether the text will be *accepted*, but whether it possesses an adequate level of *acceptability*. Expansion and clarification will provide acceptability to this work

because of the lack of *crónicas* written/translated, published in North America. It is translated adequately when it resembles other works of non-fiction or historical accounts being produced at the same time as the work, whether they are translations or original language works. The final product should really fit seamlessly into the target literary system.

While I am the initiator/patron for the moment with the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, my position as patron could change if the work is selected by a publisher. Christiane Nord argues that even when patronage is assumed by an institution such as a publishing group, the translator always assumes *responsibility* for the translation. This means that while the initiator/patron may have final say over the publication of a text in translation, the translator must assume responsibility for *how* the text is translated. Even if the decisions (regarding footnotes, prefaces, explication, et cetera) are made by the patron, it is the translator who must ultimately decide whether these decisions are appropriate because it is the translator who will ultimately be critiqued for the work:

It is not the source text as such, or its effect on the [source text] recipient, or the function assigned to it by the author, that operates the translation process, as is postulated by equivalence-based translation theory [...], but the prospective function or skopos of the target text as determined by the initiator's needs. Although the initiator is the one who actually defines the [target text] skopos (even if he may not be able to formulate the translating instructions), the responsibility for the translation will always rest with the translator. He is the one who has the competence to decide whether

the translation which the initiator asks for can actually be produced on the basis of the given source text and, if so, how, i.e. by which procedures and techniques. It is, after all, the translator, and not the initiator, who is the expert on translation. (9)

This argument is the essence of the target-oriented translation theories, which argue precisely that the source text does not define per se the interventions of the translator. The translator makes his or her own decisions, guided by the needs and expectations of the initiator (or publisher), but the final authority on the necessity of the interventions and decisions lie with the translator.

I would argue, however, that despite the translator's authority over the above factors, the initiator (or publisher) actually has final say over the interventions made. For example, all of the "solutions" for the problems faced in this translation (footnotes, expanded text, clarification, glossaries) that I will showcase in Chapter Five can be overruled by the publisher because, after all, the publisher is putting the money into the publication.

In this chapter we have seen the shift from equivalence-based translation theories to target-oriented theories, and noted that, in the particular case of the translation of *Amanecer*, it is the function of the target text, the audience to which the target text will be directed, and the cultural value of the target text that will affect the translation process. We have also seen that despite any idealized theories of translation, when it comes to publishing a work, it all comes down to the patron's

needs and expectations, and even more than that, it all comes down to money, as do the translator's decisions. So I should note here that even though, as the translator, I believe the solutions I found in my translation to be in the best interest of the target audience's reception of the work, if and when this work is published, my translation could take on a very different form. As the translator, however, I must be consigned to the idea that the decisions I may deem most appropriate for the target audience may be rejected upon publication, and also that I still have to claim responsibility for the publisher's decisions. In the following chapter I will look at a theorist who we have not yet discussed, Antoine Berman, and provide examples of how I have applied his theories to my translation and why.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN APPLICATION OF ANTOINE BERMAN'S "TRIALS OF THE FOREIGN" TO THE TRANSLATION OF *AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO*

The purpose of this fourth chapter will be to show how change in a translation is not necessarily negative; in fact, it can at times be necessary and even help the translation. By "change" I mean the translator's interventions – where he or she has stepped in and altered the form or language of the original so that the reader in the target culture can understand or relate better to the work. I will highlight moments in my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* in which change has been necessary, and show that my interventions achieve a text that can appeal to the audience toward which ones I care to direct this translation.

Antoine Berman, in his 1985 essay "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," explains the process of deforming a text in translation with a concept he refers to as the "analytic of translation" (278). Berman theorizes that translators deform a text in twelve ways, and that these deforming qualities can be both detrimental and helpful to a translation, and exist in every translation. The deforming tendencies he speaks of are rationalization; clarification; expansion; ennoblement and popularization; qualitative impoverishment; quantitative impoverishment; the destruction of rhythms; the destruction of underlying networks of signification; the destruction of linguistic patternings; the destruction

of vernacular networks and their exoticization; the destruction of expressions of idioms; and the effacement of the superimposition of languages (280). In the following pages I will provide specific and general examples of how these types of deformation have affected my translation and which I strive to avoid, following the examples I give here below on the twelve types of Berman's "manipulation." I wish to make it clear at the start of this discussion that the "deformations" Berman describes and I refer to should not be seen in a negative light, but rather the translator's tendency to change certain aspects of the source text in translation should indeed be celebrated if these changes help to serve the function of the target text.

1. RATIONALIZATION

Rationalization is, perhaps, the most obvious form of manipulation in the eyes of any linguist or translator, and because of the fundamental necessity for rationalization, it can be the most "deformative" form of manipulation in that, as Berman puts it, "rationalization deforms the original by *reversing* its basic tendency" (281). This translator's intervention is very basically the management of the fundamental differences between languages, both written and oral. It "bears primarily on the syntactical structures of the original, starting with that most meaningful and changeable element in a prose text: punctuation. Rationalization

recomposes sentences and sequences of sentences, rearranging them according to a certain idea of discursive order.” (280). The reason for this type of manipulation is simple and clear: all languages are structured in different ways. The differences between languages may be more easily observed between languages that, say, employ different alphabets (for example, Russian and Japanese), but there are subtle differences between English and Spanish that are well known to anyone who speaks, reads or writes both languages. Spanish written style quite often leans towards longer, more verbose and descriptive sentences, frequently comprised of several clauses, while good English style tends to avoid “run-on sentences” and leans more towards conciseness. The following is an example of Poniatowska’s narrative in *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, wherein the author demonstrates the Spanish language tendency to create lengthy sentences:

Todo en el Zócalo adquiere un sentido nuevo, la libertad, la gente allí suelta y tranquila que oye una conferencia, juega ajedrez, sonríe, se rasca la cabeza, mira hacia el templete, la comida, el agua, no hay que beber mucho para no tener que ir a orinar. (258)

Next, I will demonstrate two possible translations for this sentence. The first is a possible translation that would conserve the structure of the original, thus avoiding rationalization. The second is the actual translation I chose for this passage, in which I break up the sentence to form a series of more concise phrases:

Everything in the Zócalo achieves a new feeling, freedom, the people there liberated and calm who listen to speeches, play chess, smile, scratch their heads, look towards the podium, the food, the water, there is no need to drink too much, that way they don't have to leave to use the toilet.

Everything in the Zócalo achieves a new feeling: freedom. The people are liberated and calm while they listen to speeches, play chess, smile, scratch their heads, look towards the podium. They have food, water. But they don't need to drink too much, that way they don't have to leave to use the toilet.

Both of these possible translations have their benefits and drawbacks. The benefit of the first example would be that the translator is staying physically true to the style and structure of the original – keeping the foreignness of the original text intact, illustrating the “Spanishness” of the work by keeping the entire sentence together. The drawback in this example is that the syntax does not flow as naturally as it could in English; it reads like a run-on sentence. The benefit of the second example is that it reads more naturally, the drawback being that it could be argued that this sentence robs the text of some of the original's literary quality and erases its foreignness. So therein lies a dilemma: what is more important in a translation, that it do justice to the original language and style, or that it read naturally in the target language? My contention is in this case that the latter option is best, as evidenced by my choice of the second translation. It is very easy to criticize literary translation, generalizing that many translations simply sound “foreign” in their target

languages. There is merit to maintaining certain foreign elements within a text, which I will discuss further later in this chapter, but often the translator's most challenging task is achieving a naturalness in the language of the translation. This naturalness, even if it alters the style of the original, does more "justice" to the original text because it allows the original text to be more easily read by the target audience. Very basically, this kind of rationalization (following Berman's explanation) reverses the tendencies of the Spanish language and allows the text to go beyond simply English words; the text adopts the target language's tendencies so as to avoid a word-for-word, "bad" translation.

2. CLARIFICATION

According to Berman, "[clarification] is explicitation [that] aims to render 'clear' that which does not wish to be clear in the original." (281). An example of where clarification has been used in my translation is the following:

Source text: Blanche Petrich escribe en *La Jornada* de unos manifestantes (iba yo a decir peregrinos) que se echaron un viaje de veintidós horas en autobus desde Chihuahua "porque allá en el norte no hay información." (22)

Translation: Mexico City reporter Blanche Petrich writes in the daily newspaper *La Jornada* about some of the protestors (I was going to call

them pilgrims) who came twenty-two hours on the bus all the way from Chihuahua “because up north there’s no information.”

Although I have made explicit here that which is implicit in the original text, explaining who Blanche Petrich was and clarifying that *La Jornada* was a daily newspaper, this clarification is necessary to readers who are meant to be educated by the translation, especially considering that the reporter and the newspapers may be household names in Mexico but would not be in North America. Even though it is a small change to the text, it could be considered that I have interfered with the fluidity of the source text by adding an explanation of something that had no need for explanation there. But as Berman says, “clarification is inherent in translation, to the extent that every translation comprises some degree of explicitation.” (281). I would argue that clarification and the next type of deformation used by translators, expansion, are especially inherent in translations that transform the original text to a didactic one, because for educational purposes the explanation of implicit aspects of the text is necessary.

3. EXPANSION

Expansion, according to Berman, is related to clarification in that it is “an *unfolding* of what, in the original, is ‘folded.’” (282). Earlier I mentioned the titles of two of Poniatowska’s previously translated *crónicas*, examples which perfectly

demonstrate the translators' use of clarification. Translating the title of *Amanecer en el Zócalo: los 50 días que confrontaron a México* will require the same kind of consideration. The title, in English, could be translated directly as *Daybreak in the Zócalo: The 50 Days of Confrontation in Mexico*. The problem with this title is that I want the translation's title to tell its readers what they will learn about immediately upon reading it, and I would argue that the majority of English-speakers in North America would have no idea what kind of book they were picking up to read with a title like this, not knowing that "the Zócalo" is Mexico City's main plaza. A more appropriate title, along the lines of *Massacre in Mexico*, for example, would be *Rally in Mexico City: 50 Days of Protest Over Mexico's 2006 Political Crisis*. This title is a mouthful, and I have not yet decided on it. But it does what it should do, which is to tell its Anglophone audience that they are reading an historical account of recent Mexican politics. Or at least it should convey that they are reading my adaptation as the translator of the *crónica* to the somewhat different genre of historical documentary, or creative nonfiction. The title must be changed to reflect major changes in the translation, however a changed title could be criticized for various reasons: among them, that it does not reflect the ideological slant of the original title ("Amanecer" as a new hope); and second, on aesthetic grounds (it does not have the "ring" and alliteration of the original). Unfortunately with titles, a word-for-word translation simply does not convey the change in genre from original to translation.

The examples above of clarification and expansion are only two of hundreds within this particular text, which demonstrates how deforming these tendencies in translation can be. As I mentioned earlier, clarification and expansion are arguably more necessary in a translation such as this one. In a fiction novel, certain cultural aspects and details of the story can remain implicit even if the translation of the novel crosses a cultural barrier. The reason for this is that by leaving certain things to the imagination of the foreign reader, the translator can preserve the sense of illusion within the fiction prose; not everything needs to be explained, or else it would detract from the flow of the novel and therefore the storyline, which, in fiction, is indispensable. For example, we can imagine a novel written in the Northwest Territories of Canada. Many Canadians are relatively familiar with the culture of Northern Canada even if they have never personally visited or lived there; the history, culture and geography of that area of the country are a part of our Canadian heritage and elementary education. If this novel included stories of the Inuit people, descriptions of ice fields and tundra and summer nights when the sun never sets, most Canadians would not need further explanation in order to understand the significance of the story. Now we can imagine if this text were translated into Spanish and published in Central America and Europe. Would the translation benefit from making explicit that which is implicit in the text? Would it benefit the translation to include footnotes explaining to foreign readers that the Inuit language has several different words for snow, or explaining what tundra is

and describing the landscape of the North in more detail than it may already be described in the original text? My contention is that the “foreignness” of a text such as this should be preserved in translation by avoiding such deforming tendencies as clarification and expansion, because it protects the cultural significance of a text and teaches readers about a foreign culture by stimulating the imagination.

In non-fiction, however, clarification and expansion are unavoidable, even in a *crónica* that reads like a novel. The reasoning for this is simple: in her political non-fiction text, Poniatowska describes real events and includes discourse between real people who cannot be left to the imagination. The reality of the text must be more significant than the imaginative narration or flow of the storyline. This is precisely why it is unavoidable for the translator to clarify and explain the real events to the reader, and precisely why it is unavoidable to fundamentally deform the text in translation. Those events, places, cultural aspects and personalities that are implicit (familiar, recognizable) in the source culture must be made explicit for the target culture, and thus it may be more difficult for the target text readers to read the translation “like a novel.”

4. ENNOBLEMENT

Ennoblement is a deforming tendency that can be very difficult to explain or detect because of how subtle the translator’s manipulation can be. It is also the first of these deforming tendencies that, in my opinion, would be detrimental to this

particular translation rather than helpful to it. In Berman's own words, ennoblement can refer either to poetry or prose:

In poetry, it is "poetization." In prose, it is rather "rhetorization." [...] Rhetorization consists in producing "elegant" sentences, which utilizing the source text, so to speak, as *raw material*. Thus the ennoblement is only a rewriting, a "stylistic exercise" based on – and at the expense of – the original. This procedure is active in the literary field, but also in the human sciences, where it produces texts that are "readable," "brilliant," rid of their original clumsiness and complexity so as to enhance the "meaning." (282)

The major problem with ennoblement – and with criticizing a translator for employing it – is that every literary translator, in every translation they perform, comes to a point in their work when they struggle to decide between two possible translations for a sentence, phrase or even a simple word, and ultimately use the option that "sounds best" or that reflects certain equivalence that they wish to achieve. They may end up making one particular phrase sound more eloquent, more precise, more "readable," but it is impossible to know whether this "ennoblement" is intentional. And even when it is intentional and it does change the readability of the text, criticizing its use raises two major dilemmas in the study of translation: first, does the translator have the right to make language more "elegant" and readable in his or her target language? And second, if certain readers express the opinion that the translation reads better than the original text, is this actually considered a negative?

To answer the first question: yes, the translator has the right to make language more elegant in translation. Much like the author, a translator is a writer (or perhaps better said, a *rewriter*), and has an individual writing style. Once permission is granted to translate a work, the translator need not ask the author (or the individual who holds the literary rights) permission regarding each and every decision he or she makes. The more appropriate question is whether or not he or she *should* employ rhetorization. If a publishing house is pleased with the results of the translation, the translation might have a better opportunity to sell; if not, the translator could face professional consequences. If the author of the source text is pleased with the translation because of its readability in the target language, the translator will benefit and perhaps have the opportunity to work with more of the author's writing. However, the author could feel affronted by a translator who attempts to make his or her work "better" than the original, and again, this could have its consequences. In the case of my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, there are certainly instances in which the lines between making the text more elegant (in my opinion) and being faithful to the original are blurred, and in which manipulating the text to make it more "readable" may actually cause problems for the meaning of the text, instead of "enhancing" it. For example, as we observed in Chapter One, at the end of most chapters or "days" of Poniatowksa's source text, she cites Andrés Manuel López Obrador's address to the public. The following is an excerpt from one of these addresses:

Sí, lo que pasa es que ustedes son mucha pieza, son mujeres, hombres conscientes, niñas, niños, jóvenes. Es molesto vivir a la intemperie, dormir en el suelo, resentir las inclemencias del tiempo. También generamos molestias a terceros, pero vale la pena para que haya democracia. Sería terrible, sería realmente dañino para nuestro país, que se implantara una democracia simulada, una democracia de mentiras. Miren, tiene mucha fuerza política y moral nuestra demanda del recuento de los votos. (88)

At first, a possible way of translating a political text such as this could be to translate segments like this one by avoiding the use in English of the colloquial language that López Obrador uses to speak to the public, such as the following translation:

Yes, the truth is that the people here are many. You are women, aware men, girls, boys, youth. Living in the open air is a disturbance, as is sleeping on the ground, and suffering the inclement weather. We cause disturbance to others, however if the outcome is democracy, it all merits our commitment. A simulated democracy, a democracy of lies would be terrible, truly detrimental to our nation. Let it be known that our demand for a recount of the votes is weighted with much political and moral strength.

The previous translation implies certain elegance, as if López Obrador were speaking to a well-educated group of people. However, this kind of ennoblement of the source text would be detrimental to the translation because, again, López Obrador's speeches were real, and he actually did speak to the audience using very colloquial language. The significance of this is that his addresses were inclusive of

every person in the country no matter how much education they had received. The addresses reflect López Obrador's commitment to being "one of the people," no different than any other person fighting for the same cause as he is. The following translation is truer to the type of discourse employed by the politician and involves colloquial, informal language:

Yes, what's happening is that the people are a big part of this. You are women, aware men, girls, boys, youth. It's frustrating to live in the open air, to sleep on the ground, to suffer the harsh weather. We also cause frustration to others, but it is worth it, if the end result is democracy. It would be terrible, truly harmful for our country, if a simulated democracy, a democracy of lies were established. Look, our demand for a vote recount has a lot of political and moral strength behind it.

The translation above is reflective of the earlier discussion of text types, and how at times these can change from source text to target text. The language of the source text is clearly operational. In translation, as long as we agree that it is not meant to influence the target readers but rather educate them as to the nature of these political speeches in Mexico, the text is informative as well as expressive. The content matters as much as the language and expression; all serve to allow for analysis in the context of literary criticism. The employment of ennoblement would sacrifice the expression of the speech and thereby sacrifice the significance of the content.

5. QUALITATIVE IMPOVERISHMENT

Qualitative impoverishment and the fifth deforming tendency, quantitative impoverishment, are concepts that I will rather quickly gloss over, because they are unavoidably inherent to all translation. As Berman puts it, qualitative impoverishment

[...] refers to the replacement of terms, expressions and figures in the original with terms, expressions and figures that lack their sonorous richness or, correspondingly, their signifying or 'iconic' richness. A term is iconic when, in relation to its referent, it 'creates an image,' enabling a perception of resemblance. (283)

In other words, Berman states that words (he uses the term "butterfly" as an example) that have "iconic richness" are words that not only mean something, or signify as a term the signified object, but that the way the words sound gives them a new depth of meaning in that they create an image for the reader. A few examples of such words that are significant to the meaning of the text stand out, and probably not by coincidence, most are either words that derive from Mexican slang or are simply onomatopoeic expressions. For example, on page 126 of *Amanecer*, Poniatowska says that the "powerful" call the crowd "la chusma," which means "the rabble" or "plebs." The English translation that I chose is "the mob," which illustrates a group of disgruntled and potentially dangerous people, but for some reason the sonorous quality of the Spanish word that illustrates the chaotic, grimy

and unpolished characteristics of “the mob” is lost in translation. On page 218 Poniatowska uses the common Spanish phrase “de chuparse los dedos” to describe delicious food. The phrase literally means “worth sucking on your fingers,” so perhaps a natural translation would be “finger-licking good.” The latter phrase in English, however, compared with the expression in Spanish, sounds more hackneyed, commercial and unrefined (most likely because it is the current slogan for Kentucky Fried Chicken), so my translation is “to die for,” which clearly lacks the “iconic” quality that “chuparse” possesses. These are only two of countless examples of when qualitative impoverishment comes into play in this translation, but in the majority of cases it is impossible to avoid.

6. QUANTITATIVE IMPOVERISHMENT

As Berman puts it, “This refers to lexical loss. Every work in prose presents a certain *proliferation* of signifiers and signifying chains. Great novelistic prose is ‘abundant’” (283). The example he gives refers to the Argentine author Roberto Arlt’s use of the words “semblante,” “cara” and “rostro” in his work *Los siete locos* (1981), which all signify the same object: “face” in English. According to Berman,

Arlt employs *semblante*, *rostro* and *cara* without justifying a particular choice in a particular sentence. The important thing is that [*face*] is marked as an important *reality* in his work by the use of three signifiers. The translation that does not respect this multiplicity

renders the ["face"] of an unrecognizable work. There is loss, then, since the translation contains *fewer* signifiers than the original. (283)

Unfortunately, Berman does not give any real reference to any translation that does not respect the multiplicity of terms, and there is no proof that Arlt did not simply use all three signifiers as a way of incorporating variety into his narrative, or that he did not choose the terms arbitrarily. It is impossible to judge the expressivity or functionality of his text without the context. The simple fact is that some languages will have more terms for certain objects than other languages and thus again, qualitative impoverishment is unavoidable in translation. I would also argue that although using fewer terms in translation for the same concept in the source text deforms the work to a certain degree, this deformation is not overly severe; it does not fundamentally change the meaning of the word "face," for example, it only affects the work if the use of multiple terms in the source language is deliberate and calculated.

However, there is a problem when one term in the target language refers to two different concepts, and this, in *Amanecer*, can prove to be a problem. Poniatowska refers to the crowd (or the people in the protest) as "la gente" (the people), or "los manifestantes" (the protesters), or as we saw earlier, "la chusma" (the mob). "La gente" is by far the most common term for this concept, and as "la gente" are important protagonists of the story, this term is important. The most appropriate English translation is "the people." The problem, however, arises when

Poniatowska describes “el pueblo.” Literally, “el pueblo” means “the people.” However this term has always been a political one signifying a concept that is very important to left-wing political movements in Latin America: “the proletariat,” or “the common people,” perhaps. The underlying significance of this term is very important to the meaning of Poniatowska’s message and one must at least attempt to respect its weight in translation. It refers to the community of people – and the vast majority of the population – who are marginalized and/or who rise up together to fight for their rights as “people.” One possible English translation for “el pueblo” could be “the community,” but I certainly feel that this is completely lacking in the political undertones of the Spanish word. Although it may be considered quantitative impoverishment to use the same term for “el pueblo” as I use for “la gente,” I believe a good solution for this is to very simply use the definite article *the* to distinguish the two: “la gente” would be “people,” and “el pueblo” would be “the people.”

7. THE DESTRUCTION OF RHYTHMS

The destruction of rhythms in literary translation is prominent and critical in poetry, but as Berman argues it can affect prose as well in conjunction with rationalization, when the translator manipulates the structure of sentences, order of words or punctuation: “The novel is not less rhythmic than poetry. It even

comprises a multiplicity of rhythms. Since the entire bulk of the novel is thus in movement, it is fortunately difficult for translation to destroy this rhythmic movement” (Berman 294). Since I have already discussed rationalization and where it is necessary in the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, it is evident that there will be some destruction of rhythms within this project and yet, clearly, the movement of the entire work will not be deeply affected, especially considering the structure of Poniatowska’s writing that I discussed in Chapter One (the order of narrative, citations and political addresses that most of her chapters follow), so I will move on to the next deforming tendency.

8. THE DESTRUCTION OF UNDERLYING NETWORKS OF SIGNIFICATION

This is a deforming tendency that I would argue is less pertinent to non-fiction. Berman explains that literary works are comprised of underlying lexical patterns that are significant to the text in that certain words relate to each other to form almost a subconscious meaning:

The literary work contains a hidden dimension, an “underlying” text, where certain signifiers correspond and link up, forming all sorts of networks beneath the “surface” of the text itself – the manifest text, presented for reading. It is this *subtext* that carries the network of word-obsessions. These underlying chains constitute one aspect of the rhythm and signifying process of the text. After long intervals certain words may recur, certain kinds of substantives that constitute a

particular network, whether through their resemblance or their aim, their “aspect.” (284)

This concept is, in my opinion, very general and difficult to prove, although Berman gives one concrete example of Arlt’s work, mentioned earlier, in which it can be clearly observed. In Arlt’s Spanish source text, he uses augmentatives such as *portalón, alón, jaulón, portón, gigantón, and callejón* in order to signify “the inordinate size [these objects] have in nocturnal dreams.” (285) The English language lacks the same type of suffixes that Spanish has for diminutives (*-ito/a, -illo/a, -ico/a* et cetera) and augmentatives (*-ón, -azo/a* et cetera) and thus without being able to classify these certain words in the same way in translation, the network may be unrecognizable and therefore the significance of the “inordinate size” of these objects in dreams may be lost in the target language.

In *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, there are certainly lexical items that relate to one another and affect the overall significance of the text, for example words that illustrate left-of-center politics and revolution such as *plantón* (vigil/sit-in/protest), *resistencia civil pacífica* (peaceful civil resistance), *el pueblo* (The People), *derechos* (rights), *democracia* (democracy), et cetera, that are repeated frequently throughout the text. The fortunate aspect of this “network of signification” is that because it occurs in a non-fiction text, footnoting, clarification and/or expansion are perfectly reasonable solutions for explaining the network, should it even need explanation. Furthermore, because of the political nature of the work, this particular network of

signification is relatively explicit rather than underlying. Another example could be the author's use of diminutives and *apodos*, or nicknames, within the text. The most obvious examples of this are the protestors' (and Poniatowska's) nickname for Andrés Manuel López Obrador, "AMLO," and the fact that Poniatowska points out that her role as a public figure in the protest and in López Obrador's campaign prompts even strangers to call her "Elenita" (*Amanecer* 158). Another more obscure example is that one character, who reappears and whom I mentioned also in Chapter One, María de la Luz Mendoza de Chapela, is referred to as Luchita by those who have just met her in the Zócalo camps (23). These diminutives imply a fondness and familiarity between the characters, the author and even the readers, and are significant to the message of community and togetherness of the protest itself. In translation, these nicknames can be preserved and explained through a footnote or explanation within an introduction to any potential reader of the translation who may not know the meaning of diminutives attached to names in Spanish. Whereas in fiction, a translator has the option to "localize" names in order to bring the text over to the target culture (for example, Andrés could become Andrew in English, although this would be a questionable decision that I would never make as a translator), in non-fiction this temptation to change the cultural aspects of the source text is nullified because the characters exist in reality.

9. THE DESTRUCTION OF LINGUISTIC PATTERNINGS

This is a fairly abstract concept that refers to the author's "systematic" writing of sentence structures, word orders and types of sentences; a level of the text that "goes beyond the level of signifiers, metaphors, etc." (285). This "patterning system" that authors employ is often called "style," and Berman argues that although it is deliberate and calculated in the source text, it can be "asystematic" in translation. Translators do have a "style," but as Berman says:

Rationalization, clarification, expansion, etc. destroy the systematic nature of the text by introducing elements that are excluded by its essential system. Hence, a curious consequence: when the translated text is more "homogeneous" than the original (possessing a "style" in the ordinary sense), it is equally more *incoherent* and, in a certain way, more heterogeneous, more *inconsistent*. It is a *patchwork* of the different kinds of writing employed by the translator (like combining ennoblement with popularization where the original cultivates an orality). (285)

Basically, what I perceive this to mean is that while in Poniatowska's source text there are multiple "styles" of writing represented; the order in which she presents these styles is intentional, and does "cultivate an orality." There is a clear distinction between the sections that Poniatowska intends to be "read" (e.g. newspaper article excerpts) and sections in which she means to recreate an oral history (e.g. the transcriptions of Andrés Manuel López Obrador's speeches and the chanting crowds). In translation, if I mimic Poniatowska's sentence structuring, it is

no longer “systematic” and intentional, and thus I could be criticized if my “patchwork of styles” is inconsistent compared with the original.

10. THE DESTRUCTION OF VERNACULAR NETWORKS OR THEIR EXOTICIZATION

This deforming trend is a very important one in the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. As Jeremy Munday (2008a) says: “This relates especially to local speech and language patterns that play an important role in establishing the setting of a novel.” (149). Although *Amanecer* may not be considered a novel, per se, but rather a work of non-fiction, countless different voices are what shape the story and bring it to life. In other words, the dialogue between characters from every region of Mexico and from every stage and “station” of society is brought together as a patchwork of different local speech patterns that represent the diversity of the public affected by the political crisis that the text deals with. Naturally, like many countries, Mexico has a multiplicity of local speeches and cultures in different regions of the country, and the dialogical and dialectal diversity represented by Poniatoſka’s real-life characters is significant to the overall message of the text. I will delve further into this issue and how it is significant to the text later, but this patchwork of different voices and “narrators” (in that Poniatoſka uses her characters to tell the story in their own words, and at times she herself does not intervene in the narration) is a clear example of Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia

(1981). Multiplicity of voices is a strategy employed by the author to strengthen her message, and to distance herself slightly from the ideology of the text, allowing the responsibility to rest on the shoulders of her “other narrators,” to a certain degree. But I will expand on this further ahead.

Berman explains that there are three options the translator can use to deal with this phenomenon: first, he or she can erase the diversity of the speech patterns entirely by translating all of the dialogue “homogeneously,” without lexical variety. For example, in Poniatowska’s text this would mean translating the dialogue of teenagers in the street, elderly protestors, children, workers, farmers, politicians and even newspaper reporters, et cetera, using the same tenor and register. The following are three examples of different types of dialogue and are all found within the same section of the text (*Amanecer en el Zócalo* 111); the first (a) is a statement made by a stay-at-home mother who dedicates her time to cooking for the protestors in one of the campsites, the second (b) is a comment by an electrical engineer (middle-class worker) who participates in a blockade set up outside of a bank, and the third (c) is an excerpt of a newspaper article written in the publication *Milenio*²⁶ by journalist Juan Pablo Becerra-Acosta:

²⁶ *Milenio* is a major Mexican newspaper published in eleven cities across Mexico. Twice per month, the newspaper also distributes a magazine under the same title.

(a): Araceli Silba Ribera, madre de familia, de la Miguel Hidalgo, cocina un guisado más, para que “todos por lo menos tengan un taco en la panza.”

(b): Marcelino Bordillo, ingeniero electricista, participó en el bloqueo de Banamex. “Viera qué satisfacción verles la cara de enojo a los ricachones.”

(c): Juan Pablo Becerra-Acosta consigna en *Milenio*: “En el pavimento de la avenida Juárez, a la altura de la Alameda Central, los fieles del insurgente voto por voto extienden largos rollos de papel color carton en los cuales los transeúntes y afines a su causa escriben frases de apoyo a su movimiento de resistencia [...]”

The following examples of translation demonstrate a lack of variety in terms of register and tenor of speech, and are examples of inadequate translation. They also include the effacement of the vernacular:

(a): Araceli Silba Ribera, a stay-at-home mother from the Miguel Hidalgo region, cooks a little extra food, so that “everyone has at the least one taco to eat.”

(b): Marcelino Bordillo, an electrical engineer, took part in the Banamex blockade. “It is very satisfying to see the faces of frustration on rich people.”

(c): Juan Pablo Becerra-Acosta points out in *Milenio*: “Near Alameda Central, the founders of the slogan ‘vote by vote’ extend long rolls of

colored construction paper on which passers-by and friends of the cause write words of support for the movement of resistance [...]"

The reason this translation is inadequate is that, in my opinion, it does not contain enough variation and has the potential to lose the interest of the reader. The excerpt (c) is adequate, as the tone of his citation is formal and journalistic, so this is, indeed, the final translation of this section. But a stay-at-home mother and an electrical engineer would not necessarily speak in a similar tone of voice in their every day speech. Not only does this translation fail to bring the characters to life, but it also represses the reality and emotion in their voices by making them all sound the same. Furthermore, in the source text there are two Mexican slang terms within the first two examples that are significant to the setting of the text: *panza* and *ricachones*. In the previous translation, these terms have been translated very generally to *rich people* (*ricachones*) and *panza* has been eliminated entirely and transformed into the verb "to eat." As Berman says, this "effacement of vernaculars is [...] a very serious injury to the textuality of [the prose work]" (286) because it destroys the significance of the local setting of the source text. A solution for this will be discussed in the following point.

The second option for translating these examples of local speech would be to "exoticize" local terms and idioms using italics, for example. The problem with this solution is that, as Munday (2008a) says, it alienates the vocabulary that is

significant to the setting from the rest of the text (148). The benefit of this solution, of course, is that it allows the translator to utilize foreign words that do not exist in the target language and keep the target text close to the source culture. In my opinion, however, exoticizing slang, especially when different versions of that slang exist as an everyday reality in the target language, is redundant and quite frankly, a bit lazy on the part of the translator. Yes, it keeps the foreignness of the text intact, but it is an easy way out of trying to find a dynamic equivalence in the target text.

For example:

(a): Araceli Silba Ribera, a stay-at-home mother from the Miguel Hidalgo region, cooks extra hot meals, so that “everyone has at the least one taco in their *panza*²⁷”

(b): Marcelino Bordillo, an electrical engineer, took part in the Banamex blockade. “It is very satisfying to see the faces of frustration on *ricachones*²⁸.”

(c): Juan Pablo Becerra-Acosta points out in *Milenio*: “Near Alameda Central, the founders of the slogan ‘vote by vote’ extend long rolls of colored construction paper on which passers-by and friends of the cause write words of support for the movement of resistance [...]”

²⁷ *Panza* is a slang term for “belly.”

²⁸ *Ricachones* means “rich people,” from the word “rico/a” plus the augmentative “ones” meaning large. In this case it is used in a derogatory way.

Unfortunately for prose fiction, adding an explanation (such as a footnote or glossary) to define such words would interrupt the reading of the text and possibly confuse the reader. Fortunately in a non-fiction text such as *Amanecer*, such a plethora of explanatory additions to the text is already required and thus it may be acceptable, although perhaps not necessary, to insert them in these particular cases. The dilemma in a non-fiction text that is meant to read like a novel, however, is whether the information and cultural integrity (i.e. keeping the original words in italics in the translation) are more important than the fluidity of the reading. In the above example I am tempted to translate the text entirely so as to avoid the overuse of footnotes. Since the entire work includes countless examples of slang and local Mexican vernacular, it would be nearly impossible for the source-text reader to keep up with such a vast number of footnotes. However I do believe that a compromise can be struck that allows the original “tone” to be maintained while avoiding the third, most “ridiculous” option (to be discussed later), such as the following:

(a): Araceli Silba Ribera, a stay-at-home mother from the Miguel Hidalgo region, cooks a little extra food so that “everyone’s got at least a taco in their belly.”

(b): Marcelino Bordillo, an electrical engineer, took part in the Banamex blockade. “You’ve got no idea how great it is to see rich pigs look so pissed off.”

(c): Juan Pablo Becerra-Acosta points out in *Milenio*: “Near Alameda Central, the founders of the slogan ‘vote by vote’ extend long rolls of colored construction paper on which passers-by and friends of the cause write words of support for the movement of resistance [...]”

At times throughout this work, however, it seems that the use of italics is unavoidable, since the original term cannot possibly be translated appropriately. An example of this is the word *desafuero*, which refers to a process in which the immunity from prosecution and privileges held by Mexican politicians are revoked through legal proceedings. This is a case of a truly Mexican term with a very specific denotation and connotation referring to Mexico’s current political situation (as opposed to the previous examples, which represented more general Spanish slang used in many different countries and regions). In the case of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, this term frequently appears to refer back to the *desafuero* of Andrés Manuel López Obrador in 2005, and is an extremely important term in the overall text as it relates the politician’s current political agenda with past occurrences and political obstacles. There is no English word for *desafuero* and, as it appears so frequently throughout the text, it would be rather ridiculous to translate it each time as the “process in which the immunity from prosecution and privileges held by Mexican politicians are revoked through legal proceedings.” In the case of such a term, the clearest choice is to leave the foreign term in italics and explain it once through a footnote, so that the term can be repeated throughout the remainder of the translation.

Two other examples which I feel it is important to discuss before moving on are the following terms, also found frequently throughout the source text: *panista*, and *perredista*. *Panista* refers to a supporter or member of PAN, the National Action Party, and *perredista* refers to a supporter or member of the PRD, the Democratic Revolutionary Party (the Spanish term is a play on the way PRD would sound if it were a word in itself). The reason it is important to discuss these terms is in their relation to one another; as a translator, I feel it appropriate to translate them in the same way. Certain options are: *PANist* and *PRDist*, *PAN supporter* and *PRD supporter* (this example effaces the vernacular of the source terms by transforming nouns into nouns with qualifying prefixes), or, of course, *panista* and *perredista*, with the use of an explanatory footnote in the first instance the words appear in the text. The latter choice is most likely the best one, considering that, like *desafuero*, the terms appear often and are both very important to the meaning of the text.

The third option for dealing with local vernacular is when the translator attempts to find a similar version of “slang” in the target language as it exists in the source text, and Berman calls this strategy “ridiculous”:

Exoticization may join up again with popularization by striving to render a foreign vernacular with a local one, using Parisian slang to translate the *lunfardo* of Buenos Aires, the Normandy dialect to translate the language of the Andes or Abruzzese. Unfortunately, a vernacular clings tightly to its soil and completely resists any direct translating into another vernacular. *Translation can only occur between “cultivated” languages.* An exoticization that turns the foreign from

abroad into the foreign at home winds up merely ridiculing the original (286).

Thankfully, the dialogue in *Amanecer en el Zócalo* does not show very much variance in regional dialects; rather the variance in language appears mainly in the different ages, social classes and register of conversation (formal versus informal, written versus oral, for example). Thus the temptation to attempt to find a regional dialect of English that might be “similar” to the dialects of the various regions of Mexico is virtually nonexistent. That being said, there also exists the possibility of social dialect. If we define social dialect as the kind of language used by a certain grouping of people in a given society (groups divided by age, socioeconomic status, education level, etc), and perhaps go even further to say that it is the type of language certain groupings of people use in particular settings or atmospheres in a given society, then we can certainly pinpoint specific dialects in Poniatowska’s work.

In any case, there are general and widely used slang words in English as there are in Spanish, words that do not belong to any one dialect in particular, so it is perfectly appropriate to translate *panza* as belly, for example. In example (b), the context of the dialogue is casual and informal and the use of the augmentative *-ones* attached to *rica* is derogatory, indicating a sarcastic, humorous tone and the sense that the speaker thinks of the rich as over-privileged and deserving of the inconveniences of the protest. Thus *ricachones* can appropriately be translated as *rich*

pigs or *stinking rich people* and *caras de enojo* (faces of frustration/anger) can appropriately be translated as *[they] look pissed off*. I believe that the use of common English slang to preserve the tone and register of the source text without over-exoticizing the translation is an adequate compromise for this type of challenge.

11. THE DESTRUCTION OF EXPRESSIONS AND IDIOMS

This deforming tendency is also especially pertinent to the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. Every language possesses expressions that can be metaphorical and even historically or culturally significant, but translated directly into another language would often result in a nonsensical pairing of words that have no meaning to their reader. For example, the English expression “there is more than one way to skin a cat” means simply that there are many ways to complete a task. According to Michael Quinion, a British etymologist, this phrase has been seen in English literature dated as far back as 1678²⁹ and has been used in works of literature such as Mark Twain’s *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court* (1889) and Seba Smith’s *Way down East; or, Portraits of Yankee Life* (1854). However, the direct translation in Spanish (“hay más de una manera de despellejar un gato”) does not have the same meaning. In fact, there exist *refranes* (expressions) in Spanish

²⁹ <http://www.worldwidewords.org/qa/qa-mor1.htm>

that refer roughly to the same proverb in English, such as “cada quién tiene su manera de matar pulgas” (“everyone has his/her own way of killing fleas”) and “cada maestrillo tiene su librillo” (“every teacher has his/her own book”). However Berman maintains that in a work of literature, if these expressions are translated to seek equivalence, the translator is ignoring the cultural significance of the source text:

To play with “equivalence” is to attack the discourse of the original. Of course, a proverb may have its equivalents in other languages, but... these equivalents do not *translate* it. To translate is not to search for equivalence. The desire to replace ignores, furthermore, the existence in us of a *proverb consciousness* which immediately detects, in a new proverb, the brother of an authentic one: the world of our proverbs is thus augmented and enriched. (287)

I would contest this argument and say that to find a proverb or expression in the target language that corresponds with the source language does not destroy the discourse; rather, the readers of the translation will relate the same way to the proverb in the target text as the readers of the source text relate to its own proverb, and thus the translator will find a dynamic equivalence, as Nida would say. That being said, there are, of course, different degrees of equivalence of proverbs between languages. Finding a dynamically equivalent proverb for the *refrán* “más vale tarde que nunca,” for example, is easy: “better late than never.” But finding a Spanish equivalent for “there’s more than one way to skin a cat” may prove more difficult, and the Spanish translation may, indeed, change the aim of the discourse.

But here I would like to take the concept of the destruction of expressions and idioms to a different level that is more significant to the text: the translation of slogans and expressions created by the protestors of this movement.

The first expression I will discuss is the most prevalent throughout the text, and represents the philosophy of the protestors, that their votes should count and be recounted in order to rescue the concept of democracy in Mexico: *¡Voto por voto, casilla por casilla!* In English, this translates directly to “Vote by vote, polling booth by polling booth!” In my translation, I have translated this expression to “Vote by vote, ballot by ballot!” I made this modification to the text for the purposes of keeping the phrase’s conciseness intact. A possible alternative would be “Vote by vote, poll by poll!” but in the simplest explanation possible, I believe my translation has a better ring to it. I freely admit, however, that I have damaged the expression according to Berman’s theory, so long as we keep in mind that we are not discussing metaphor in this instance, but rather an expression that is repeated countless times throughout the work and is infinitely important to the cultural context of the source text. Even still, I also believe that the meanings of both slogans are similar enough to carry the same weight. This phrase represents the people’s demand for a recount—for their votes to count and to be counted properly. In short, it represents the peoples’ demand for democracy. In no way do I believe that my modification has taken away from the phrase’s significance. Lexically speaking, “to vote” represents the symbolic act of making one’s voice be heard and having a

political opinion. In English, the word “ballot,” as much as the word “polling booth,” represents the physical act of showing up to vote and immortalizing one’s opinion in writing.

There are other slogans throughout the text that present more of a challenge than the previous one, namely expressions that use rhythm and rhyme to sound chant-like, such as “*Llueve, llueve, el pueblo no se mueve!*” (“Rain, rain, the people do not move!” *Amanecer*, 123), “*Felipe, entiende, el pueblo no te quiere!*” (“Felipe, understand, the people do not want you!” 123), and “*Es un honor estar con Obrador!*” (“It is an honor to be with Obrador!” 361). There are, of course, many others, but these three slogans represent three distinct translation challenges. First, I was fortunate with the phrase “*Llueve, llueve...*” because I thought of an English translation that not only expresses adequate equivalence, but also preserves the rhyme and rhythm of the original expression: “Rain, rain, the people will remain!” The second phrase is much more difficult. I have toyed with changing it almost entirely so as to keep the rhyme and rhythmic nature of the original, such as: “Hey! Felipe! Get out of Amlo’s way!” but although this relays the idea that the people do not want Felipe Calderón as their president and support Andrés Manuel López Obrador instead, it still loses much of its original meaning. The third expression is similar to the first in that a rhyme is not difficult to find (for example, “We have pride at Obrador’s side!”) but then again, the translation transforms the idea of

“being honored to support the candidate” to “being proud to support the candidate.”

The discussion above does not even touch on another problem with this translation: the fact that the work is nonfiction. These slogans were used in reality and, if mentioned today in Mexico, would most likely remind any protesters of their days in the Zócalo. They have become historically significant, not because of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* or Poniatowska, but because they were popular slogans of a massive civil movement. In theory, because of the frequency of these slogans throughout the work (not to mention the difficulty in translating them), these expressions could potentially be left in Spanish with the use of italics in translation, and a footnote added at the first instance of their use explaining their meaning in English. This goes back to the exoticization of the translation, but perhaps keeping the foreignness of this work intact would actually do more justice to the original work considering it deals with real-life experiences. Another possible solution, which would employ both translation strategies – finding a dynamic equivalence while referring back to the original slogans – would be to translate the slogans into English, adding a footnote at the instance they are first mentioned that indicates the original phrase in Spanish. To me, this is the best possible solution, as the “expert reader” would have access to the full, undamaged significance of the expressions.

12. THE EFFACEMENT OF THE SUPERIMPOSITION OF LANGUAGES

This final deforming tendency brings together the eleven before it, and according to Berman it is the challenge in translation around which all other challenges revolve:

This is the central problem posed by translating novels – a problem that demands maximum reflection from the translator. Every novelistic work is characterized by linguistic superimpositions, even if they include sociolects, idiolects, etc. The novel, said Bakhtin³⁰, assembles a *heterology* or diversity of discursive types, a *heteroglossia* or diversity of languages, and a *heterophony* or diversity of voices. (287-8)

We have already discussed *Amanecer en el Zócalo*'s use of different discursive types and voices, and to some extent we have seen that translating the work is a challenge for that reason. Berman exemplifies this challenge by referring us to Thomas Mann's novel, *The Magic Mountain* (1924), in which the two principal characters speak to each other in French, even though the original work is written in German. Berman explains that the interesting aspect of this work is that the French language differs between the two characters because the man is a young German and the woman is Russian. In the French translation by Maurice Betz, three distinct versions of French can be recognized, because "Betz let Thomas Mann's German resonate in

³⁰ Bakhtin, 1982: 89.

his translation to such an extent that the three kinds of French can be distinguished, and each possesses its specific foreignness.” (288). Berman goes on to explain that “this is the sort of success – not quite impossible, certainly difficult – to which every translator of a novel ought to aspire.” (288)

As I mentioned earlier, Poniatowska’s countless voices are fairly homogeneous considering the characters who speak all come from different parts of the country – the linguistic diversity outlined by Berman above is not observed as much as the diversity of different kinds of discourse such as political discussion, journalistic writing, formal and informal conversations and even religious doctrine. Fortunately these types of discourse are easily distinguishable in translation, and I will show examples of this in Chapter Three. And clearly, as we saw in point ten, “the destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization,” there is, in fact, diversity in the way different people speak formally or informally, but these differences are characterized more by tone and register than by the superimposition of languages.

My objectives in this chapter have been to show that during a preliminary reading of a source text, the translator discovers major issues that will affect the translation. During my preliminary consideration of the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, I observed that the primary challenges that I would face in this task would revolve around the concern for finding a balance between preserving the source-text’s author’s ideology and attempting to produce a target text that is informative

and not necessarily persuasive in nature. In other words, the difficulty in this translation would spring from trying to preserve the structure of the Mexican *crónica* while changing its function. From the above observations by Antoine Berman and how they relate to my observations from the text in question, it can be concluded that although it is impossible to avoid interfering with the source text in translation, at times alteration is appropriate and even necessary in order to create a text that can appeal to the target audience. In the following chapter I will discuss more specific difficulties and problems encountered in the translation process itself.

CHAPTER FIVE

SPECIFIC LEXICAL, DISCURSIVE AND CONTEXTUAL CHALLENGES OF THE TRANSLATION OF *AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO*

This final chapter will be somewhat of a departure from the preceding four more theoretical chapters of my dissertation. Following my analyses of the source text's nature and context and the challenges that derive from them, and following my investigation into different methods of adapting the text in translation to reach a determined audience, I will analyze certain passages of the source text and my translations thereof that showcase the unique challenges of this project and how I have put my research into practice. Rather than theory, this chapter will reflect my personal perspective on the decisions I made (and have yet to make) during the translation process.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Mexican *crónica*, being an historic account of a social movement or event written in a literary style more proper to a novel, is the different types of discourse involved in the work. Elena Poniatowska tends to use multiple voices and illustrate multiple identities throughout her *crónicas*, taking the different types of discourse to a new level of complexity that poses intriguing challenges when it comes to translating her. For this chapter I have

chosen a passage from the source text and the translation to analyze, focusing on the different types of discourse involved in the text and the text's relationship to other forms of literature, the different voices employed in these discourses, the importance of intertextuality in this excerpt, and the grammatical and lexical issues that arise in the text. I will then use my analysis of the original text to explain some of the more pressing challenges I encountered in translating it. And while the translation is a draft, I will explore some of the alternative translations I would consider in a revised edition of this text before producing a final draft. The passage I have chosen for analysis is meant to be a synecdoche as it is highly reflective of and includes many examples of specific translation problems from the entirety of the work, and I will refer to other examples from the translation throughout the analysis.

Lois Tyson explains the complex notion of discourse in a fairly simple way: "Discourse is a social language created by particular cultural conditions at a particular time and place, and it expresses a particular way of understanding human experience." (281). In other words, discourse is not just language – it exists within language and language exists within it, and it is constantly shifting and changing with the shifts and changes that culture and society make over time.

In short, discourse is not static; in fact, a single sentence's meaning can change by simply being uttered in a different tone of voice or at a different volume. According to Michel Foucault, however, we can define certain "types" of discourse

by examining the idea of discursive formations. In his work *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault explains that discursive formations occur when we can pinpoint order between objects: “Whenever, between objects, types of statements, concepts or thematic choices, once can define a regularity (an order, correlation, positions and functioning, transformations) we will say [...] that we are dealing with discursive formations.” (38). For the purposes of this chapter, when we talk about “multiple discourses” in Poniaotowska’s work, it should be noted that we are referring to what Foucault would call “discursive formations:” certain ways of speaking or writing, certain ideologies and thoughts or groupings of ideologies or thoughts or statements that we can somehow categorize because of the semblance of order that exists within them. As an example, different political discourses exist because we observe that PAN supporters and PRD supporters express differing beliefs. Different religious discourses exist because we observe Catholics (such as Poniaotowska) and agnostics (such as Jesusa, Poniaotowska’s friend and one of the main “characters” in the work) expressing different ideas of the truth about spirituality.

It stands to reason that every culture is made up of multiple discourses, or multiple discursive formations. Within culture, these discourses compete with each other in the battle to decide what is truth and what can or should be believed. The primary challenge of translating a work that houses such a multiplicity of discourses – or voices, as we will see below – is that the translator is trying to take

this multiplicity of competing discourses and introduce it to a new culture with its own inner struggles between discourses. Say, for example, two people are arguing over which colour is better: red or blue. The “red is better” argument is one discourse, while the “blue is better” argument is another, competing discourse.

What happens when we bring a third and fourth person in to argue that yellow and green are actually the best colours, respectively? The argument would most likely only grow more competitive and more friction between what is right and what is wrong created. This is what happens when we attempt to parachute one culture’s “truth” (or in this case, competing truths) into an already vast multiplicity of competing truths; it becomes all the more difficult to make the culture of arrival understand the foreign message.

My analysis of the discourses in *Amanecer en el Zócalo* follows Foucault’s thought that discourse controls and dominates what we know of the world, that language and knowledge work together, much like language and power. Since knowledge leads to power, and since the statements we utter lead to knowledge constructed by the conditions of those statements, every statement we utter is power in itself. To analyze the different types of discourse involved in Poniatowska’s original text, I must at the same time analyze the different voices that speak throughout the text, because the author’s use of voices is her way of expressing different discursive types leading to knowledge of the world from which those voices come. *Amanecer en el Zócalo* is divided into four major parts, each part

subdivided into “chapters” marked by the fifty days of protest, and each chapter further subdivided into “passages” that illustrate specific events or conversations in which Poniatowska participated or that she witnessed, marked by titles such as the two we see in this section of text (*Misa en ascuas*³¹ and *Más de mil canciones y el “pejeshopping”*³²). The author employs different styles of writing, or types of communication throughout her text. The type of communication she most often uses is journalistic—a “collage” of statements taken from newspaper articles reassembled by the author. Poniatowska also includes a more literary, illustrative style of communication—her own thoughts and descriptions of daily life in the Zócalo.

Before looking at the different types of discourse used in the passages I have selected for analysis, I will briefly describe the importance of intertextuality, as it ends up serving the same purpose as the use of different voices and writing styles. According to Julia Kristeva (1986), intertextuality can be defined as the relatedness of words or texts to other words or texts:

³¹ Translation: “Mass, Interrupted.” This subsection of the crónica refers to an instance in which the Zócalo protestors stormed a Catholic Mass.

³² Translation: “More than one thousand songs and the ‘pejeshopping.’” This subtitle refers to the paraphernalia made in honour of Andrés Manuel López Obrador during the protest, including many songs, poetry and articles sold at the “pejeshopping,” a market of stands selling items dedicated to “El Peje,” which is a nickname for Amlo. The name is derived from a type of fish originating from Tabasco, López Obrador’s home state, and it has no English translation.

The word's status is thus defined horizontally (the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee) as well as vertically (the word in the text is oriented towards an anterior or synchronic literary corpus)...each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read...any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. (37)

Poniatowska's writing "absorbs and transforms" previous texts such as newspaper articles, poetry and music, but if we use the term "text" in a metaphorical way (as Kristeva uses "word"), her writing is also constructed in such a way as to refer her readers to historical events, tragedies, comedic instances, religious experiences and beliefs, and memories of everyday life. The very existence of her *crónica* depends on these other "texts" that have been absorbed and transformed by the various voices and discourses she uses and the way she assembles them. This use of intertextuality, much like Foucault's idea of the use of discourse, is a way for Poniatowska to control the knowledge she wishes her readers to gain from her work.

The entire first passage of the section of text I have chosen, with the exception of the final two paragraphs, comes directly from Patricia Muñoz Ríos's article in *La Jornada* on August 21, 2006.³³ But what is important here is not the fact

³³ See <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2006/08/21/index.php?section=politica&article=005n1pol> for the original article in Spanish.

that Poniatowska quotes this article written by Patricia Muñoz Ríos, but rather *how* she transcribes it. As we see in the analysis of this passage, Poniatowska does not use proper citations or quote the article in its entirety; she picks and chooses parts of the article to include in the passage, assembling what she believes to be pertinent, and perhaps influential, to her readers. She goes so far as to rearrange sentences and exclude entire paragraphs from the original article. What is left is a mixture of political, journalistic and religious discourses; segments of a newspaper article that would arguably trigger the most extreme and personal reactions from the readers. The voices included in this passage are the protestors from the “CPBT” (Coalición Por el Bien de Todos, or Coalition for the Good of All) a coalition created to support Andrés Manuel López Obrador in the Mexican presidential race of 2006, some unnamed Catholic parishioners, the Archdiocese of Mexico and, of course, two journalists: Patricia Muñoz Ríos and Ángel Bolaños.

Poniatowska’s reasoning for writing in the styles that she does may be multi-dimensional. In her journalistic communication, she deliberately chooses to include some quotations and exclude others, and she reshapes some of the voices within the text to become more poignant than they were in the original articles that she cites. For example, on page 77 of the original text, Mexican journalist Patricia Muñoz Ríos is quoted as saying: “Ahí, los manifestantes iniciaron otra vez un coro en el que decían: ‘Norberto Rivera, el infierno te espera’ y también le reprocharon ser ‘defensor de pederastas’” (“There, [at the Cathedral doors], the chorus of protestors

shouted ‘Norberto Rivera, Hell is waiting for you,’ and accused him of being a ‘defender of pedophiles’” [my translation]). However, Poniatowska’s text includes only the words “Norberto Rivera, el infierno te espera” and “Norberto Rivera, defensor de pederastas.” In selectively excluding part of the original quotation, she excludes the objectivity of the original article, and inserts her own subjectivity into her text. Furthermore, with what she does include, she refers her readers to a previous scandal wherein Cardinal Norberto Rivera was suspected of covering up the actions of a pedophile priest.³⁴ Of course, this reference was already made in the original article, but the fact that Poniatowska included it (and emphasized it by transforming it into what looks like a slogan rather than a simple quote) when she excluded other aspects of the story, suggests to me that she is using this reference to support her ideological agenda. A second reason for why Poniatowska may have written this way is because of the lasting nature of a book as opposed to the transitory nature of a newspaper article. If the purpose of the *crónica* is to solidify in text form the memory of a social movement, Poniatowska uses her *crónica* to solidify in her text what she deems as important journalistic events from the time of this historic event.

³⁴ See <http://articles.latimes.com/2006/sep/20/local/me-abuse20> for story.

Other passages of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, like the second passage of this section as I mentioned earlier, are written more informally, as a diary-like story of Elena Poniatowska's personal memories of particular moments during the protest. In a passage on page 79 of the source text, for example, Poniatowska speaks to Jesusa Rodríguez, a good friend of the author and one of the most recognizable and active members of the Mexico City Protest. As in many other passages of Poniatowska's *crónica*, we see here the mild conflict between the two women: while the author is a faithful Catholic, Rodríguez frowns on the religion and often chastises Poniatowska throughout the work for her allusions to the Church. There is an interesting juxtaposition between Poniatowska's religious appreciation in this passage and her carefully constructed description of the conflict between the protestors and the church in the previous passage. The author seems to be concerned about outwardly expressing her position when it comes to politics and religion. She certainly takes a side subtly, as I have explained before, by selecting and assembling certain information in her text. However, she is careful, even when illustrating others' opposition to the church, to express that she, herself, maintains her faith and loyalty to Catholicism.

As I will explore further in my translation analysis, Poniatowska has a tendency towards keeping her distance from the left-wing "propaganda" of her *crónica*. This may seem hypocritical, because at times in the work it feels as though she is only passively committed to the cause she is writing about. But I believe this

tendency stems from her career as a journalist, and her commitment to telling the truth, even if the truth goes against the ideologies of her target readers. Even though the author switches styles from journalistic to personal and narrative in many chapters or passages of her text, she often tends to end the passage with another journalistic citation. She rarely expresses whether or not she agrees with the journalist's opinion, be it a pro or con position towards the Zócalo protest; she lets her readers decide. This is also a consequence of using the genre of the *crónica* and the use of multiple voices to more effectively communicate her message (see my discussion of heteroglossia in Chapters Two and Four). And although she rarely gives a specific reference (newspaper article date, page, section, etc) for where the original text can be found, the hundreds of newspaper quotes from multiple sources demonstrate the immense amount of reading, research and time that she invested in creating a work that mixes a multitude of discourses, ideologies and voices, in order to give her readers the most rounded and full knowledge of the world about which she is writing. This analysis of discourse, intertextuality, and particularly grammatical and lexical issues will be elaborated in the analysis of my translation and the problems within it.

AMANECER EN EL ZÓCALO (MÉXICO: PLANETA, 2007) PP. 77-80.

Misa en ascuas

Patricia Muñoz Ríos nos remite a las puertas de Catedral: "Líbranos del PAN, de Felipe Calderón," rezaron ayer miembros de la CPBT al asistir a la misa dominical en la Catedral en busca del cardenal Norberto Rivera para condenar su injerencia en la política.

"Norberto, no juzgues para que no seas juzgado; no somos loquitos, sólo vemos las cosas diferentes. ¡Voto por voto, casilla por casilla!" "Dios es amor."

Algunos feligreses gritaron: "¡La casa de Dios se respeta!" Indignada, una señora mayor pidió: "¡Sáquenlos ... sáquenlos!" y un sacerdote del área de bautizos dio aviso: "Ya llegaron otra vez perredistas muertos de hambre." La misa dominical transcurrió tan tensa que el cardenal Rivera la remató a toda velocidad.

"Norberto Rivera, el infierno te espera." "Norberto Rivera, defensor de pederastas."

"¡Son reventadores, son provocadores!," alguien dio la voz de alerta por un magnavoz.

Para evitar que entraran más inconformes, los vigilantes cerraron las puertas de la Catedral. "Los de camiseta amarilla son una amenaza."

Antes de retirarse los manifestantes rezaron un padrenuestro, que al final pedía: "Libranos de Calderón, amén."

La arquidiócesis de México precisó que el Gobierno del DF brindará seguridad durante la misa que oficiará Norberto Rivera en la Catedral "para evitar algún altercado entre fieles católicos y manifestantes" y no porque "veamos un riesgo a la integridad física del cardenal" .

"La Catedral no es un lugar apropiado para hacer una protesta de tipo político," escribe Ángel Bolaños.

Más de mil canciones y el "pejeshopping"

Todos los días llegan al templete poemas y canciones en hojas de papel y hasta en cuadernos completos. También arriban discos acerca de AMLO con su cara sonriente en la carátula. ¿Cómo pudieron hacerlos, cuánto cuesta grabar un disco? Además de los muñecos de tela cosidos por las costureras del terremoto del 85 que representan a AMLO de cuerpo entero con la banda presidencial, me regalan discos y Jesusa dice que a ella le han dado más de mil canciones compuestas por la gente. "Yo no sé si a Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas también le escribían corridos pero sé que hay un culto por AMLO como jamás se había visto," exclama Jesusa.

-Oye, pues esto ya no es el Zócalo, esto es Lourdes o la Villa; al rato van a empezar los milagros y aquí se nos va a llenar de muletas, ex votos y jaculatorias -le respondo.

-¡Qué fea palabra!

De veras el templete es un pequeño santuario "donde la sangre oficia sus misterios paralelos" diría Octavio Paz pero allí no se venera a la Virgen de Guadalupe sino a AMLO. Llegan multitud de ofrendas, retratos de AMLO al óleo de todos los tamaños, esculturas que lo representan, almohadas bordadas en punto de cruz con su sonrisa y su mechón sobre la frente, fotografías en glorioso tunicolor, pocillos con su imagen, mantas, una parafernalia inmensa que no es la que fabrica el PRD, ni corresponde al aluvión habitual de plumas y relojes, camisetas y cachuchas, cintillos y pañoletas que se regalan a los militantes, sino fetiches y amuletos de un culto preocupante porque ¿quién bajará a AMLO de ese altar?

Una de las características del paseo a lo largo del corredor Zócalo-Reforma es el *pejeshopping*. Su imagen — ya sea en banderas, pines, gorras, pulseras, etiquetas adhesivas, diademas, caricaturas y playeras — se ha convertido en un verdadero producto de colección.

Videos, discos compactos — con todo y el "Rap del Peje" - , flores amarillas y libros saltan a lo largo del corredor y se le van pegando a uno.

Chaneca los tiene todos. No sé cómo pueden caber en su casa de San Jerónimo. Va a tener que construirse otro piso.

Muchos vendedores ambulantes dejan sus clásicos puntos de venta en la Alameda o en la calle de Moneda y llegan al plantón. "Aquí está el negocio." Aprovechan la afluencia de asistentes a las asambleas informativas de AMLO y a los campamentos y ofrecen pulseras e imanes antiestrés (mí papá usaba una de cobre), suéteres, pants, zapatos, corbatas, calcetines, guantes, elotes, chocolates, dulces, muñecos de peluche. El número de comerciantes ambulantes en Madero va en aumento a pesar de la prohibición. La mayoría de los vendedores reciben el "chiflido de alerta" mediante aparatos de radio. Así, cuando pasan los cuicos esconden su mercancía que vuelven a instalar diez minutos más tarde.

--Yo sólo compro lo del Peje -me informa Chaneca.

Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna analiza el carácter de AMLO: "López Obrador debía reconocer cuánta responsabilidad tiene en haber ayudado a que las cosas se encuentren donde están. Será muy difícil que reconozca sus fallas y errores, que se equivocó al no ir al debate, que eligió mal a sus colaboradores cercanos, que no le importa la eficiencia sino la lealtad absoluta, que no escucha a nadie que no se llame AMLO, que dilapidó una ventaja cómoda en las encuestas. Que la soberbia le gana constantemente."

TRANSLATION DRAFT***Mass, Interrupted***

Patricia Muñoz Ríos points us to the Cathedral doors: “Liberate us from PAN, from Felipe Calderón,” members of the CPBT (Coalition for the Good of the Whole) chanted yesterday, during the Sunday Mass at the Cathedral, condemning Cardinal Norberto Rivera for his interference in politics.

“Norberto, don’t judge us or you will be judged; we are not crazy, we just see things differently. Vote by vote, ballot by ballot!” “God is love.”

A few parishioners cried back: “Respect the House of God!” An elderly woman pleaded, indignant: “Throw them out! ... Throw them out!” and a priest near the baptismal font warned: “The pitiful PRD supporters have come again!” Sunday Mass became so tense that Cardinal Rivera ended it as soon as possible.

“Norberto Rivera, Hell is waiting for you.” “Norberto Rivera, defender of pedophiles.”

“You are exploiters, you are agitators!” someone shouted through a megaphone.

Guards closed the Cathedral doors, so that no more protestors could enter.

“Anyone wearing a yellow shirt is a threat.”

Before leaving, the protestors said the Lord's Prayer, changing the ending to: "Deliver us from Calderón, amen."

The archdiocese of Mexico indicated that the Government of Mexico City would provide security for the Masses in which Norberto Rivera officiates in the Cathedral "to prevent any altercation between Catholics and protestors" and not because "we are concerned for the Cardinal."

"The Cathedral is not an appropriate venue for a political protest," writes Ángel Bolaños.

More than one thousand songs in the "pejeshopping"

Every day, songs and poems ranging from one-page to book-length are recited from the bleachers. CDs are even made in honor of AMLO, with his smiling face on the covers. How did they make them? How much does it cost to record a CD? I am given gifts of cloth dolls of AMLO wearing the presidential sash, sewn by the seamstresses of the '85 earthquake, as well as a CD. Jesusa tells me that she has been given more than a thousand songs composed by the people. "I don't know if they wrote songs for Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas as well, but I know that there is a craze for AMLO unlike anything I've ever seen," Jesusa exclaims.

“Listen, this is no longer just the Zócalo. This is Lourdes or the Villa of Guadalupe. Soon we are going to see miracles performed, and the square is going to fill with crutches, offerings and Hail Marys,” I reply.

“What an ugly word!”

The bleachers really are a little sanctuary “where blood demonstrates its mysterious parallels,” Octavio Paz would say, but here, the people worship AMLO, not the Virgin of Guadalupe. A whole array of offerings arrive, portraits of AMLO of all sizes, sculptures of him, his smile needle-pointed onto pillows, beautifully colored photographs, vases with his image on them, blankets. There is so much paraphernalia that does not come from the PRD, nor represents the usual flood of pens and watches, shirts and sweatshirts, ashtrays and scarves that are so often given to the protestors. These are gifts and amulets from a disquieting religious over-glorification and no one could take AMLO off his altar.

One of the interesting characteristics of the path between the Zócalo and Reforma is the *pejeshopping*. AMLO's image—on flags, buttons, hats, bracelets, stickers, wreaths, cartoons and sneakers—has become a real collectors' item.

Videos, CDs of all kinds of music, yellow flowers and books fill the street. Chaneca has all the paraphernalia possible. I have no idea how it all fits into her house in San Jerónimo. She's going to have to add on a new floor.

Many of the traveling merchants leave their stalls in the Alameda or Moneda Street and come to the vigil. "This is where all the business is." They take advantage of the number of people who come to AMLO's information sessions, and they offer bracelets and anti-stress magnets (my father had a copper one), as well as sweaters, pants, shoes, ties, socks, gloves, popcorn, chocolates, candy and stuffed animals. More and more traveling merchants are filling Madero Street despite the prohibition. Most of them receive "warning calls" via radio signals. That way, when the police pass by they can hide their merchandise and set up again ten minutes later.

"And I only buy things from the *pejeshopping*," Chaneca tells me.

Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna analyzes AMLO's character: "López Obrador should have recognized how much responsibility he has in having helped things to get the way they are today. It will be very difficult for him to recognize his failures and errors, that it was a mistake not to attend the debate, that he chose the wrong collaborators, that he should be worried about efficacy instead of absolute loyalty, that he refuses to listen to anyone who disagrees with him, that he squandered his advantage in the polls. That his pride constantly works against him.

TRANSLATION ANALYSIS

For the purposes of this analysis, I have copied and pasted small segments or paragraphs of the above translation directly into my analysis below to serve as subtitles within this chapter, and have highlighted certain phrases within these segments, which will be the focal points of my analysis. I will look at the following specifics: where I encountered problems in the translation in light of Poniatowksa's discourse and style of writing; alternative translations that emerged in the editing process and some that I would still consider in future drafts of this text; certain situations in which I have modified the original text; and finally aspects of the original's message that I feel have been lost in translation.

Mass on eggshells and More than one thousand songs in the "pejeshopping"

1. Translating the titles of the passages "Misa en ascuas" and "Más de mil canciones y el 'pejeshopping'" caused different problems for different reasons. First, these titles are meant to provoke the readers, and basically meant to summarize the contents of passages that follow. "Misa en ascuas," literally, means "Mass on tenterhooks." The term *on tenterhooks*, according to Merriam Webster's Dictionary, means "in a state of uneasiness, strain or suspense." I struggled over this phrase for some time, wondering whether "on eggshells" (my translation) was equivalent and colloquial enough to have the same effect in the translation. My decision to use "on

eggshells” as opposed to “on tenterhooks” is that, in my opinion, the former phrase is used more frequently and carries a similar meaning: to me, to be walking on eggshells signifies being in a precarious situation in which one could lose one’s footing at any time, or in which one continually runs the risk of compromising a fragile situation. As can be seen in the final draft, I chose to translate this subtitle as “Mass, interrupted” for two reasons. First, the subtitle corresponds to a passage in which Mass is literally interrupted by the protestors in the Zócalo, protestors who question the authority and even the identity of the Catholic religion within the context of Mexican society and politics. Secondly, this title, for Anglophone readers, loosely references the well-known American film title *Girl, Interrupted* (1999) wherein the female protagonist is sent to a mental institution and consequently questions her own identity and her role in society. Although the theme of this passage and the theme of the film are unrelated, the intertextual word play underlines the importance of colloquialism and popular culture references in this work and, to me, achieves a similar functionality of the title in the source text.

In translating the second title, the word “pejeshopping,” presents certain difficulties. The word refers to a market in which vendors sell merchandise dedicated to the name and image of Andrés Manuel López Obrador, who bears the nickname “el Peje” to his supporters. This term represents an excellent example of where I can keep the text’s “foreignness” intact in translation: the first time in the translation that we see the word “Peje,” (page 5, my translation; page 21, source

text) I have added a footnote to the translation explaining the origin of the term. From there on after, I can leave the word in its Spanish form thus allowing this Mexican cultural detail to speak to the English readers.

At first, however, I thought of translating the term “pejeshopping” into a phrase such as “Amlo Market” or “Peje’s Market,” but after some consideration I decided to leave the term untranslated. My reason for this is that since Poniatowska writes the word in italics in the source text, the word could even be unfamiliar to Mexican readers who did not take part in or attend the protest, because they may not know of the colloquialisms invented during those fifty days. It is, of course, a recently coined term used to denote the spontaneous upgrowth of this market, and though Mexican readers would immediately understand the reference, many would not have witnessed it firsthand. To me, this word suggests a kind of “inside joke” among those camping between the Zócalo and Reforma, and I wanted to preserve that cultural aspect in the translation. As an obvious lexical creation through composition, it has its comical aspects and belongs to the kind of humorous morphological creativity in colloquial style that Mexicans so love. Since English readers, by this point in the text, will already have learned that “Peje” is another nickname for López Obrador, and since “shopping” is already an English word, I believe this is one instance where a “foreign” aspect of the source text will survive well in the target language, and the English reader can deduce its meaning from previous encounters with the word “Peje.”

The question of leaving certain Mexican-specific Spanish phrases in their original language arises throughout the translation. A specific example of this occurs on page 77 of the source text. Poniatowska brings the readers' attention to the artistic contingent of the protest emphasizing the common objective to encourage protestors to think creatively and read books as a way to expand their minds:

“Apaga tu ‘tele’, enciende tu intelecto. Lee un libro.” Al exhorto lo acompañan propuestas de lectura, como *Juárez y su obra*, de Justo Sierra; *Huesos en el desierto*, de Sergio González Rodríguez sobre las mujeres asesinadas de Ciudad Juárez y *El Yunque, la ultraderecha en el poder*, de Álvaro Delgado. (77)

The issue in a passage such as this is whether to leave the book titles in Spanish or whether to translate them into English. The final decision I made was to leave them in Spanish and add English translations in subtitles, and then there is a necessity to ensure whether or not the works have already been translated into English, and to ensure that the correct and original translations are used. As it happens, none of the following three books have been previously translated into English:

“Turn off your TV, turn on your intellect. Read a book.” This proposal is accompanied by reading suggestions, like *Juárez y su obra* (Juárez: His Work and His Time), by Julio Sierra; *Huesos en el desierto* (Bones in the Desert), by Sergio González Rodríguez about the women murdered in Ciudad Juárez, and *El Yunque, la ultraderecha en el poder* (The Anvil, the Extreme Right in Power), by Álvaro Delgado.

Besides the obvious questions above regarding whether or not to include English titles, two other, rather difficult issues to resolve arise in the above excerpt of the text. The first has to do with the title of Julio Sierra's book. Although Poniatowska wrote it as *Juárez y su obra*, the actual title of the book is *Juárez: su obra y su tiempo* (as is reflected by my English translation). Clearly, my translation points a finger at Poniatowska's mistake, but since I have chosen to include the Spanish title in the work, should I also change it to the correct original title? Should I ask the author's permission to do so, effectively bringing her attention to her original mistake? Should I include a footnote indicating the correct title? My decision is to leave the mistake as it appears in this case. The reason for this is that I believe the error serves as an interesting discussion topic in the study of this work. It could be that Poniatowska wrote the *crónica* hastily and although a heavy amount of research went into the writing, she neglected to fact check certain details, which speaks to the authenticity of the entire book, because she very well may have made a mistake in facts concerning the election and its outcome or even in names of characters.

In fact, another mistake of Poniatowska appears later in the work, wherein she discusses the Federal Electoral Tribunal (TRIFE)'s decision to recount the votes in only a small percentage of the ballot boxes nationwide (11,839). The number of ballot boxes counted is explicitly mentioned four times in this chapter, and is first presented on page 121 of the source text mistakenly as 11,398. Over the next seven

pages, Poniatowska cites this number as 11,893 and 11,938, indicating a typographical error on her part and glaring editorial neglect on the part of her publishers. Originally I performed research into the correct number (which turned out to be 11,839) and my initial decision was simply to make the number consistent across the chapter in the translation. But after some reflection it occurred to me that although a footnote is required to disclose the accurate figure to English readers, in a translation such as this, that aims to produce a text that will be studied in an academic environment, it would be more interesting to leave the author's error in the text. I spoke earlier about taking responsibility as a translator, and in this case I believe that adding a footnote and directing the reader's attention to my own awareness of the error would not only suffice in demonstrating my own attention to detail and my commitment to producing an accurate text, it would also generate the separation I seek between myself and the author's original words and ideology. An explanation such as this would demonstrate my neutrality in that I do not wish to correct Poniatowska's mistakes – in fact, leaving the mistake intact makes way for an interesting study discussion. This type of error calls into question her authority and accuracy, and my belief is that in an academic environment this would serve as an interesting point of study in the context of Latin American nonfiction and testimonial literature.

Going back to the textual example I cited earlier, I mentioned there was a second difficulty in the translation of the original Spanish titles mentioned by

Poniatowska. Of the three books named, the second, *Huesos en el desierto* by Sergio González Rodríguez remains untranslated into English like the other two. The obvious translation for the title, which I showed above, is “Bones in the Desert”. The problem here is that there already exists a book by that name in English: *Bones in the Desert: The True Story of a Mother's Murder and a Daughter's Search* by Jana Bommersbach (St. Martin's True Crime: 2008). I could consequently face copyright issues here if I were to not make it absolutely clear that the two books are unrelated, and that González Rodríguez' book is not translated into English. The best solution to this interesting problem is to simply put a footnote in the translation saying, “Not to be confused with Bommersbach's 2008 work.” Clearly, however, when it comes to cultural references such as these, in a nonfiction translation it is necessary to perform “background checks” on these issues so as to not create any confusion for the English readers.

Patricia Muñoz Ríos points us to the Cathedral doors: “Liberate us from PAN, from Felipe Calderón,” members of the CPBT (Coalition for the Good of All) chanted yesterday, during the Sunday Mass at the Cathedral, condemning Cardinal Norberto Rivera for his interference in politics.

2. In this first paragraph of the excerpt I am faced with challenges and potential alternative translations that are similar to many other examples throughout the entire work. First, as I have mentioned before, in a second draft of this translation I have added a small clarification explaining the identity of Patricia Muñoz Ríos. This is also the case later in the excerpt where Poniatowska mentions Ángel Bolaños and Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna. All three are Mexican journalists, three of many quoted by the author throughout her work. The problem I faced in translation was that trying to perform an internet search on all of the various journalistic figures throughout the text proved a difficult task, and one that the reader of the target text should not necessarily have to perform on his or her own. One option is to footnote every instance in which a personality who would be unfamiliar to the English reader is named, but this, in my opinion, would break up the text too often. The second option, like the case of the acronyms mentioned below, would be to add a glossary of central characters, recurring journalists and public figures, but this would raise the question of who to include and who to leave out. For example, it would make sense to include a figure such as Patricia Muñoz Ríos because she is quoted more than once, and it might seem excessive to include the names of random protestors with whom Poniatowska has passing conversations. But not including this latter group of people in a glossary would suggest that their presence in the *crónica* is less important, and as I discussed in Chapter One, their voices are significant to the message of the text. Option three is,

in my opinion, the most appropriate: with simple clarification such as “*Journalist Patricia Muñoz Ríos,*” for example, or “*General Director of the magazine Emi-Equis, Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna,*” the reader’s experience with the text could be much “smoother.” I should also note that I asked the author about this issue and she agreed with my decision, and gave me *carte blanche* to add whatever explanations I felt necessary directly into the text.

The next problem I encounter in this segment is the question of acronyms. As a highly political text, each page swarms with acronyms such as PAN, PRD, CPBT, IFE, TEPJF, etc. It is ironic that the translator encounters this problem, as Poniatowska herself talks about her own difficulty with all the acronyms during a later scene in the book, while she is becoming more heavily involved with López Obrador’s team:

George Orwell decía que en la Guerra civil de España lo enfermaban todas esas siglas POUM, PC, que aparecían en todas partes. Ahora, me sucede lo mismo, el TEPJF, o sea Tribunal Electoral del Poder Judicial de la Federación, me parece el peor medicamento. Nos envenena a todos esa avalancha de siglas a cual más feas: CPBT, SAT, PRD, IFE, TRIFE, PAN, PRI, PT, FOBAPROA, IFAI, COFIPE, FAT, CONAGO y quién sabe cuántas más. (162)

George Orwell said that all the acronyms, like POUM and PC, that appeared all over the place during the Spanish Civil War made him ill. The same thing is happening to me now, the TEPJF, that is, the Federal Judicial Electoral Tribunal, seems to be the worst kind of medicine. We are all poisoned with this avalanche of hideous acronyms: CPBT, SAT, PRD, IFE,

TRIFE, PAN, PRI, PT, FOBAPROA, IFAI, COFIPE, FAT, CONAGO, and who knows how many more. (My translation).

In light of preserving some of the foreign aspects of the text while adding explanations where necessary, my decision was, and still is to leave all of the acronyms, consistently and without exception, in their Spanish language formats, and translate the full titles where Poniatowska spells them out in the text, for example: PRD (Democratic Revolutionary Party) or PAN (National Action Party). My reasons for doing so are twofold: first, if the English reader is disoriented by a given acronym, he or she will have more success finding its original meaning when searching for “PAN” as opposed to “NAP” simply because more often than not these acronyms are left in their original state in other sources. Second, this way, the foreign aspect of the source text, again, remains intact in translation, thus acting as a didactic tool for the reader. These acronyms will be included in a glossary of terms appended to the final draft of the translation (see Appendix #2).

The final aspect of the segment I would like to briefly touch on is my addition of the full title of the Coalition following the acronym “CPBT.” First, the title in Spanish is “Coalición por el Bien de Todos.” The title in this draft of my translation is not the same translation I had originally performed; the former title was “Coalition for the Good of The Whole.” My final decision, “Coalition for the

Good of All,” was the translation used by Wikipedia ³⁵. Simply put, this online encyclopedia may not be the most reliable source of information because of the fact that any user can add information or a definition to any entry, but the number of users that rely on this website for information out of pure interest or curiosity is growing. As a translator and in the best interest of the readers, I wanted to use a title for which they could search and on which to find further information. I felt the addition of the full title in parentheses (it only appears in its acronym form in the original, implying the assumption that readers of the source text would recognize the acronym immediately) was a necessary modification to the source text, because this is the first instance in the entire work when the CPBT is mentioned. An alternative to this addition would be to insert a footnote, but at present I prefer the current option because, as much as possible, I would like to prevent the reader from having to interrupt the reading experience in having to search for an explanation.

“Norberto, don't judge us or you will be judged; we are not crazy, we just see things differently. Vote by vote, ballot by ballot!” “God is love.”

A few parishioners cried back: “Respect the House of God!” An elderly woman pleaded, indignant: “Throw them out! ... Throw them out!” and a priest near the baptismal

³⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coalition_for_the_Good_of_All

font warned: "The pitiful PRD supporters have come again!" Sunday Mass became so tense that Cardinal Rivera ended it as quickly as possible.

3. In this passage several different items caused problems that I would like to discuss. The first, "we are not crazy," is an example of where a possibly better alternative would be to use a contraction: "we're." The reason I struggle with this is that in other passages of the book, I have more often than not used contractions such as "don't," "isn't," "weren't," et cetera, in circumstances involving a casual conversation and even in Poniatowska's narrative. This, to a certain extent, is my way as a translator of preserving the "foreignness" of a text. Normally in formal texts and narratives, contractions would not be used. By using them, I can demonstrate the "casual" aspect of Poniatowska's writing; a simple feature that can demonstrate the relationship between content (political, ideological, formal) and style (casual, illustrative, colloquial) that is inherent in Poniatowska's *crónicas*. This casual or colloquial language can be a point of study and analysis for the academic readers to whom I direct the text.

The next issue I will discuss is that my translation at the end of this section posed an interesting problem. In the original article that Poniatowska quotes here, Patricia Muñoz Ríos says, "Todo este panorama hizo que la misa dominical transcurriera tan tensa que el cardenal Rivera Carrera la terminó lo más rápido

posible." (See p. 210). The translation of this would be: "This entire scene put Sunday Mass under such tension that Cardinal Rivera Carrera brought it to a close as quickly as possible" (my translation). Poniatowska modifies this sentence in her *crónica*, writing "La misa dominical transcurrió tan tensa de el cardenal Rivera la remató a toda velocidad" (p. 78). Not only does the author absolve the protestors for putting Mass under such tension, she changes the ending of the phrase to something much more casual, translating into English as "finished it off at full speed." This is the translation that I decided on in later drafts and to me this phrase carries a significance closer to the source text than my first attempt. In my opinion, it seems as though Poniatowska is making light of the situation and painting a humorous picture of the Cardinal racing through prayers and "fast forwarding" to the end of Mass. This is most likely a device used by Poniatowska to keep her readers amused and interested, and the alternative translation to my first attempt is a similar means to a similar end.

"Norberto Rivera, Hell is waiting for you." "Norberto Rivera, defender of pedophiles."

"You are exploiters, you are instigators!," someone shouted through a megaphone.

Guards closed the Cathedral doors, so that no more non-conformists could enter.

"Anyone wearing a yellow shirt is a threat."

4. As I mentioned in the introduction to this textual analysis, a few problems arose with the translation of “Norberto Rivera, defensor de pederastas.” Without superfluous repetition I will simply comment that my choice as a translator in this case would be to provide a footnote to the readers referring them to an archived newspaper article (see footnote 2) that explains the background of the protestors’ accusation of Rivera as a “defender of pedophiles.” This way, those specialized readers who may have background knowledge of the political situation that inspired this work and the personalities involved may proceed with an uninterrupted reading of the text. For those readers requiring additional information, the information is provided without taking away from Poniatowksa’s writing style.

*Before leaving, the protestors said the **Lord’s Prayer**, changing the ending to: “**Deliver us from Calderón, amen.**”*

The archdiocese of Mexico indicated that the Government of Mexico City would provide security for the Masses in which Norberto Rivera officiates in the Cathedral “to prevent any altercation between Catholics and protestors” and not because “we are concerned for the Cardinal.”

"The Cathedral is not an appropriate venue for a political protest," writes Ángel Bolaños.

5. In this section, Poniatowska once again misquotes, perhaps deliberately, the original article in *La Jornada*. While Muñoz Ríos' text reads "Antes de retirarse los manifestantes rezaron un Padre Nuestro, que al final pedía: 'líbranos de Calderón,'" Poniatowska changes "Padre Nuestro" to "padrenuestro" This is a small modification that perhaps serves to "colloquialize" the narrative, or perhaps it was not a deliberate change. The English title of this particular prayer is the Lord's Prayer, and I have kept it capitalized because in my experience, the title almost always is. The second change the author made, however, is more apparent. While Muñoz Ríos quotes the protestors ending the Prayer with "deliver us from Calderón," Poniatowska adds an "amen" to the prayer. In my opinion, the "amen" gives this illustration more finality and more punctuation, and also adds the element of humour to the text in that it bears a closer resemblance to the original prayer, "deliver us from evil, amen." The obvious replacement of "evil" with "Calderón," (the National Action Party candidate and Mexico's current President) is pointed, and Poniatowska's inclusion of this quote in her text is equally so. The fact that she punctuates it with "amen" could be seen as a deliberate accentuation to the already incisive phrase. My decision to keep the "amen" in the translation comes from my decision to honour Poniatowska's choice to include it in her source

text. And again, academic readers of the translation can use this as a tool for study and analysis of the text.

*Every day, songs and poems ranging from one-page to book-length are recited from the **bleachers**. CDs are even made in **honor** of **AMLO**, with his smiling face on the covers. How did they make them? How much does it cost to record a CD?*

6. In this section, the first lexical item I will discuss is the word “templete” from the source text. Translated directly, this word means “shrine” or “bandstand,” but in the source text it is used on numerous occasions to refer to the site in the Zócalo plaza from which López Obrador and other speakers and performers address the crowd. In my first draft my translation was “bleachers” because I wanted to portray the image of a multi-level temporary “stand,” but in later drafts I modified this term to “podium,” to portray the image of a speaker’s post. The problem here, and perhaps a place in which some of the original’s meaning was lost in my translation, is that “podium” may illustrate a physically smaller installation than “templete.” A possible alternative could be “stage.” My decision, however, was to stay with “podium” as I felt it best reflected the image of the place from which Amlo speaks to the protestors.

The next lexical item, “honor,” is symbolic of an overall decision I made to translate the text using American spelling as opposed to Canadian or British. The first reason for this is that in the source text, there are various references to the United States, and considering Mexico’s political and geographical proximity to the United States, I made an assumption that I would have more success finding an American publisher for the translation. This is an aspect of the translation that will remain undecided until a publisher is indeed found, because I also assume that if a Canadian publishing house is interested in publishing the translation, an editor will ask that I edit the text for Canadian grammar and spelling.

The final item in this section that I would like to discuss is the nickname “AMLO.” This is, as is clear in the source text and translation, an acronym for the name Andrés Manuel López Obrador. In the source text it is written all in capital letters, and at first this was how I wrote it in the translation. In the end I decided to change “AMLO” to “Amlo” in later drafts of this translation. The reason for this is the pronunciation of the nickname. I wondered whether an English-speaking reader might be tempted to read the acronym as “A-M-L-O,” which would take away from the familiarity of the nickname, which I find important in the text. In my opinion, the fact that a presidential candidate is nicknamed in this way is significant in that it transforms the image of him into a figure of popular culture. In North America, where there seems to be a growing curiosity (or obsession) with the lives of celebrities, it is commonly known that figures of popular culture’s names

sometimes become shortened or abbreviated, and even combined. For example, singer/actor Jennifer Lopez is often referred to as “J-Lo” and actors Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie, who are arguably the most well-known couple in Hollywood, are commonly referred to as “Brangelina.” Perhaps this makes the general public feel closer or more familiar with the celebrity. In light of this, I believe the nickname “Amlo” is significant in the social movement treated by the source text in that it symbolizes how close the public feels to the leader of the movement. Although I have modified the source text here, I believe that my adjustment helps to transmit the equivalent significance from the source text.

*I am given gifts of cloth dolls of AMLO wearing the presidential sash, **sewn by the seamstresses of the '85 earthquake**, as well as CDs. Jesusa tells me that she has been given more than a thousand songs composed by the people.*

7. In the next section of text Poniatowska makes references to the “seamstresses of the '85 earthquake.” This is a typical situation in which the author makes an historical reference that would not be familiar to an English-speaking audience. During the aftermath of the Mexico City earthquake of 1985, a human rights scandal arose when it was discovered that seamstresses working in sweatshops in Mexico’s downtown area around San Antonio Abad Street were

allegedly left beneath the ruins of their poorly constructed workplaces.³⁶ The scandal led to the creation of women's rights and human rights labour unions, which are significant to Mexico's political history. The mention of these women and their involvement in and support of López Obrador's social movement is significant to the source text, because it symbolizes the history of social activism in Mexico, the constant and continual left-wing movement toward social change, and the fact that this movement encompasses more than just a fight for democracy, but also women's rights and human rights in general. In short, the mention of the seamstresses of '85 poses the problem of the necessity of more than a simple explanation of who these women are. I could add a footnote with a brief explanation, but an additional solution to this problem would be an explanation within the preface to this text describing the importance of the "all-encompassing" leftist movement for social change in Mexico.

"I don't know if they wrote songs for Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas as well, but I know that there is a craze for AMLO unlike anything I've ever seen," Jesusa exclaims.

³⁶ See Carlsen, Laura. "Two Decades of Aftershocks from Mexico's 1985 Earthquake." *Global Politician*, 2005. <http://www.globalpolitician.com/21286-mexico>

8. Poniatowska's reference to Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas in this section poses a problem similar to that of the seamstresses, namely it refers to an historical event that could be unfamiliar to Anglophone readers. Here, it is Jesusa Rodríguez speaking about whether or not the general public honoured Cárdenas in 1988 the same way they honoured López Obrador in 2006. The potentially unfamiliar aspect of this to an Anglophone audience is the similarity between the two electoral situations. In 1988, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas was the Democratic National Front party candidate in the presidential election, but when an electronic system error occurred in the computers used to count the votes, Carlos Salinas was named President even though the vote-counting process was compromised.³⁷ Cárdenas is mentioned several times throughout the source text but the history of this situation is never fully disclosed by the author. In order to make explicit that which is implicit here, as with the seamstresses, I would add a footnote referring the readers to further information as well as explain the connection in the translation's preface.

*"Listen, this is no longer just the Zócalo. This is Lourdes or **the Villa of Guadalupe**. Soon we are going to see miracles performed, and the square is going to fill with crutches, offerings and **Hail Marys**," I reply.*

"What an ugly word!"

³⁷See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuauhtémoc_Cárdenas for further information.

9. The first issue I would like to discuss in this section is the reference to “la Villa,” which I have translated as “the Villa of Guadalupe.” Clearly here I have used Berman’s devices of expansion and clarification, as an English reader may not be familiar with the whereabouts or significance of “La Villa.” La Villa is located north of the Zócalo square in Mexico City, and it is the site of the Basilica of Guadalupe, and it is considered one of the more important religious sanctuaries for Mexican people. In short, it is the Mexican equivalent of France’s Lourdes Cathedral, and a very important Catholic reference. In addition to the expansion I have added within the text itself, I also decided in the final draft to add a footnote referring the reader to Mexico City’s online city guide, which offers a comprehensive explanation of the site’s importance.³⁸

In this section we also find further religious vocabulary in “muletas” (crutches—a reference to the Bible in which Jesus Christ heals the sick and injured), “ex votos” (votive offerings) and “jaculatorias” (meaning “short prayer”). My initial translation for “jaculatorias,” “Hail Marys,” comes from my own knowledge and research of Catholic prayers. The “Hail Mary” is a short prayer to the Virgin Mary³⁹, and my decision to use this translation stems from the assumption that this is a relatively recognizable term and that it would be relatively common knowledge

³⁸ See <http://www.mexicocity-guide.com/attractions/villa.htm> for further information.

³⁹ See <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07110b.htm> for further information.

that a “Hail Mary” is a Catholic prayer, especially used in the context of Poniatowska’s dialogue. Therefore, at first I did not feel this would need any further extra-textual elaboration. The problem, however, emerges in the next line when Jesusa replies “¡Qué fea palabra!” (“What an ugly word!”). In the source text, Jesusa is referring to the word “jaculatorias” as an “ugly word,” perhaps because the enunciation of the word itself is ugly to her, or perhaps because of her aversion to Catholicism and the fact that she does not want the movement in question to be compared to a religious ceremony or gathering. Since Poniatowska offers no further elaboration on Jesusa’s meaning, it is up to the reader either of the source or of the translation to evaluate and determine his or her own thoughts on Jesusa’s reply and the meaning behind it. But since “Hail Mary” is two words, “What an ugly word!” must be transformed into a phrase such as “What ugly words!” I have thought of changing this reply to a something like “Don’t even go there!” or “God, I hope not!” but I worry that this is too much of an assumption about Jesusa’s meaning. This, clearly, is still a decision I struggle with.

Clearly there are several translation problems here. *Jacualtoria* is an uncommon word originating from religious jargon that has the same Latin roots as the verb “eyacular”: to ejaculate. So although the “jota” could be considered an ugly sound, there are also semantic and stylistic reasons for classifying this as an ugly word. Secondly, there seems to be no real direct translation for the word into English. The definition of “jaculatoria” as a “short prayer” comes from the idea of

short verbal outbursts of religious fervor, whereas the Hail Mary is a much more deliberate, formal and non-spontaneous prayer. In the context of this translation it works somewhat because of the Catholic reference, but the equivalence is lacking and Jesusa's "ugly words" comment makes no sense. One suggestion I received from Professor Rodney Williamson at the University of Ottawa was to change "Hail Mary's" to "Hail Amlo's," since Amlo is the object of worship here, and once again, Jesusa's disgust can be linked back to her nonreligious personality and her desire to not confuse the causes of the Zócalo protest with Catholic ritual. As for Jesusa's response, at times, as we have seen before, the translator has to simply sacrifice the linguistic patternings of the original for the sake of the translation's fluidity. A more general exclamation such as "Oh, how awful!" would be more appropriate in this context.

The bleachers really are a little sanctuary "where blood demonstrates its mysterious parallels," Octavio Paz would say, but here, the people worship AMLO, not the Virgin of Guadalupe. A whole array of offerings arrive, portraits of AMLO of all sizes, sculptures of him, his smile needle-pointed onto pillows, beautifully colored photographs, vases with his image on them, blankets.

10. In this section I have chosen to discuss the quotation of Octavio Paz.

When I first read and translated the text, I dog-eared this segment to remind myself to approach it again later, because it presented a similar problem to one I had experienced earlier on in the translation, and I recognized the necessity for additional research. In the earlier passage in the source text of which I am speaking, Poniatowska “quotes” Simone Weil saying “el precio de la verdad es uno mismo” (31) without giving any indication as to where this quote was found. After much research and effort to find the original translation of this citation in English, I asked the author from which source she found the quote and she told me that it was something she had in her head from a long time ago, and she was not sure where she read it. I did not feel it was appropriate to simply translate her quote into my own words since I was sure a source existed that should be given credit for the citation. So, after more work and research I found, in Simone Weil’s essay *Human Personality* (1962), the quote “The only way into truth is through one’s own annihilation.” (70). The circumstance with this quote from Octavio Paz is similar. At first, because of the previous situation, I assumed that since the source text explains that the quote is something Octavio Paz *would* say, the translation or source of the quote may be hard to find, since, like the previous example, it may have been something the author simply remembered having read or heard. So I left my translation as a rough draft until I indeed found the correct quote in a collection of poems in the original Spanish and in English translation. My final decision was to

use the original translation – “where blood performs its own, parallel rites” (Paz 5) – and give credit citing the source text and translation in a footnote.

*There is so much paraphernalia that does not come from the PRD, nor represents the usual flood of pens and watches, shirts and sweatshirts, ashtrays and shawls that are so often given to the protestors. These are gifts and amulets from a **gentle crowd, and no one could take AMLO off his altar.***

11. This paragraph, describing all of the paraphernalia being sold and given as gifts in the plaza, is quite a long paragraph yet in the original Spanish, it is only divided up into two sentences (one, very long). This is a commonly known trait of Spanish: its sentences tend to be much longer than those in English. So this is a point where I modified the text, breaking this paragraph up into four sentences where it seemed natural to do so in English. In the final sentence of this draft translation, however, I misread the text at first. In the source text the sentence ended with “sino fetiches y amuletos de un culto preocupante porque ¿quién bajará a AMLO de este altar?” My first translation, which I struggled with afterwards, realizing that there was something off about it, was “These are gifts and amulets from a gentle crowd, and no one could take AMLO off his altar.” Reading this phrase after leaving it for a while, I realized it was completely wrong, and most

likely I was thrown off by the multiple possible meaning of the word “culto” in Spanish. The word “culto” can mean educated, cultured, learned or highbrow, or it can mean “cult” as it does in this context. The phrase, in my later drafts, reads as it should: “These are the idols and amulets of a disquieting cult. After all, who is going to make Amlo get down off his altar?” Poniatowska’s meaning here is interesting, because although she clearly supports the movement (as evidenced by her writing this *crónica*), she mentions hers and her colleagues’ concern over the “mob mentality” of the protest on various sporadic occasions (see, for example, page 283 of the source text). This is similar to her mention of her loyalty to the Catholic Church, in that she is clearly in favor of the movement, and yet she does not agree with one hundred percent of the conflicts it causes or the effects it has on the people involved. Perhaps references like this one are Poniatowska’s way of attempting to remain somewhat impartial and objective, and to illustrate one side of the movement while showing her empathy for the other.

Videos, CDs of all kinds of music, yellow flowers and books fill the street.

Chaneca has all the paraphernalia possible. I have no idea how it all fits into her San Jerónimo house. She’s going to have to add on a new floor.

13. The first lexical aspect of this section I will discuss is my previous omission of “con todo y el ‘Rap del Peje’” from the source text. This, in my first draft, was left in bold so that I could further investigate the origin of the “Rap del Peje.” After some research, I concluded that there is no particular song, or rap, to which Poniadowska is referring, but rather this was the author’s way of expressing that *all* kinds of music, even a rap dedicated to Amlo, were recorded on CDs and sold in the market described in this passage. In this first draft I was also unsure of what to do with “saltan a lo largo del corredor y se le van pegando a uno.” After some consideration, I decided on a similar illustration in English. So, in later drafts the translation of this first sentence became “Videos, CDs of all kinds of music – even a song called ‘Peje’s Rap’ – yellow flowers and books jump up and grab you from all corners of the corridor.”

The next three sentences that I have highlighted to discuss are Poniadowska’s description of her friend, Chaneca, who accompanies the author throughout the protest and plays a significant role in the *crónica* relative to other voices. I would not necessarily suggest an alternate translation here, but my reason for discussing it is simply to emphasize that in this example, Poniadowska is teasing Chaneca in a friendly manner. Throughout the work it becomes more and more clear that Chaneca is one of the many women who are attracted to Andrés Manuel López Obrador because of more than just his politics. Poniadowska frequently pokes fun at her friend for having a schoolgirl crush on the leader of the movement, and I think

that this is an interesting aspect of Poniatowska's writing. Much like the example of how the author (and millions of other Mexicans) call López Obrador "Amlo," the author's way of teasing her friend publicly in her work makes the reader feel closer to the character; the readers feel as though they are a part of the joke and as though if they came across Chaneca in the street they could easily tease her too, in a friendly and casual manner. My belief is that this style of communication creates the feeling of solidarity among the readers of this book.

*Many of the **traveling merchants** leave their stalls in the Alameda or Moneda Street and come to the vigil. "This is where all the business is."*

They take advantage of the number of people who come to AMLO's information sessions, and they offer bracelets and anti-stress magnets (my father had a copper one), as well as sweaters, pants, shoes, ties, socks, gloves, popcorn, chocolates, candy and stuffed animals. More and more traveling merchants are filling Madero street despite the prohibition. Most of them receive "warning calls" via radio signals. That way, when the police pass by they can hide their merchandise and set up again ten minutes later.

"And I only buy things from the pejeshopping," Chaneca tells me.

14. The idea of "traveling merchants" ("vendedores ambulantes" in Spanish) is misleading here, and my concern is that the meaning of the source text is lost in

my translation. This was a lexical item that I changed in later versions. The author is referring to vendors of inexpensive merchandise such as jewelry, scarves, sometimes pirated or stolen CDs and videos, who set up their goods directly on the street and have no license to sell. This term comes up often throughout the text, because during the protest there were so many people occupying Mexico City's historic centre day after day that the vendors were getting more business there than usual. My decision was to call them "street vendors" and since this is the first instance the term appears in the translation, I would insert a clarifying explanation directly into the text. In the final draft, this sentence reads as follows: "Many of the street vendors selling their goods illegally leave their stalls in the Alameda or Moneda Street and come to the vigil." This small clarification in the text allows for the original meaning of "vendedores ambulantes" to come through in the translation.

*Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna analyzes AMLO's character: "López Obrador should have recognized how much responsibility he has in having helped things to get the way they are today. It will be very difficult for him to recognize his failures and errors, that it was a mistake to not **attend the debate**, that he chose the wrong collaborators, that he should be worried about efficacy in stead of absolute loyalty, that he refuses to listen to anyone who disagrees with him, that he squandered his advantage in the polls. That his pride constantly works against him."*

15. The final aspect of the text that I will touch on is found in the final paragraph. This is a reference from the magazine *Emi-Equis*⁴⁰ that alludes to what Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna clearly believes to be a mistake made by Andrés Manuel López Obrador when he refused to attend a presidential debate on April 25, 2006 when he was already ahead in the polls.⁴¹ His actions allegedly resulted in his popularity dropping. This is a translation problem similar to countless others throughout the entire work, wherein the author of the source text makes mention of an event that would be familiar to the source culture, but potentially unfamiliar to the readers of the translation. The solution to this problem is the same as one I have employed before. Because Amlo's refusal to take part in the presidential debate is mentioned several times throughout the *crónica* and because it is an important piece of the puzzle when one considers his loss in the presidential election, I would briefly explain the situation in my preface to the translation, and add a footnote referring the reader to further information.

From the preceding analysis of the problems arising in this translation, it remains clear that Poniatowska's *crónica*, because of her use of various voices, types of discourse and means of communication, is a complex work to bring into a new

⁴⁰ See <http://www.Emi-Equis.com.mx/028MXCONT006.html> for full article in Spanish.

⁴¹ See http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-04-26-mexico-election_x.htm

culture without a significant amount of intervention by the translator to make explicit that which is implicit in the source text. In nearly twenty pages I have explained the challenges I faced in barely three pages of the translation. I have only in fact touched on the aspects of the text that are most problematic in the quest to make the work reach the target culture in an educational, engaging and enlightening way.

CONCLUSIONS

I would like to conclude this dissertation by returning to questions I asked at the beginning, and then to go through each chapter, outlining the conclusions I have drawn throughout the text. In five chapters I have attempted to answer questions laid out in the introduction, which were:

1) How is the Mexican *crónica* characterized and where does it “fit” in the Mexican literary system?

2) Based on a study of previous *crónicas* in translation, what type of audience can we expect to read the translation of *Amanecer en el Zocalo*? What methods have the translators of other *crónicas* used in the past in order to reach their target audiences (for example, have they used prefaces, footnotes and other paratexts)?

3) In looking at an overview of a few select contemporary translation theories, which ones can the translator of the contemporary Mexican *crónica* use to help justify the decisions made in this type of work?

4) Is it necessary to make modifications to *Amanecer en el Zocalo* in translation and could altering the text be considered a positive practice?

5) Finally, all previous questions considered, what are the general and specific challenges of translating *Amanecer en el Zócalo*, given its local Mexican theme, its political and cultural content, the fact that it is a work offering a very different perspective on a well-known demonstration of social activism and above all, its nature as a contemporary Mexican *crónica*? How are these problems resolved in the translator's decision-making process? How can I solve these problems in translation by adapting the text to speak to my intended target audience? What choices did I make in the translation of this work that end up modifying the type or genre of the text, and how could these decisions affect the readers' reception of the work in the culture of translation?

My hypotheses, and the arguments I hoped to justify were, at the beginning of this study:

1) The Mexican *crónica*, being a genre that is both typical of and unique to Latin America, is central and important to the Mexican literary system.

2) The audience to which I will direct my translation will be one that is interested in learning about the history, politics and culture of Mexico. I expected in the cases of other translated *crónicas* that they have been read primarily by academics, students and researchers (either for professional or personal interest).

3) My expectation was that I would find theories concerning the functionality of the target text would help me navigate the translation and make appropriate decisions for my intended audience.

4) I believed the source text would be fundamentally altered in translation, and that the target text could no longer be considered a typical “*crónica*” in accordance with traditional descriptions of this genre.

5) My expectations were that the specific difficulties in translating *Amanecer en el Zocalo* would stem from the source text’s nature as a Mexican *crónica*, which is, firstly, not a widely recognized genre in North America, and secondly, not a widely translated genre. This meant that I would have to create a text that would reach an audience whose interests and needs differed from the audience of the source text. The decisions that I would have to make in the translation process would have to address the needs of an audience that could be unfamiliar not only with the context and cultural content of the text, but also with its form. But I would also want to preserve aspects of the text that make it worthy of study, because of its nature as a work that seeks to unveil cultural and political truths.

Translating a Latin American *crónica* presents unique challenges because the translated work can no longer be considered a “*crónica*” according to the widespread notions of its definition. The peculiar thing about this phenomenon is that it is both deliberate and uncontrollable at the same time. It is uncontrollable

because, the *crónica* could exist in North America, but only if it addressed North American cultural, social or political issues. The *Mexican* or *Latin American crónica* cannot exist in North America without inevitably shifting genres. And the phenomenon is deliberate because the translator's choices, decisions and intentions change the genre of the text. I will elaborate further by going back to Esperança Bielsa's comprehensive characterization of the Latin American *crónica*, and showing how the seven characteristics she identifies for the *crónica* cannot apply to the translation thereof.

If we can briefly turn back to Chapter One (pp. 43-44) we are reminded that Bielsa's first characteristic of the *crónica* is that "The *crónica* deals with real events and characters that have a certain quality of immediacy and presentness (it also possesses, however, a space for the creation of fictional characters and events, usually related to an identifiable reality)." (39). In translation the quality of "immediacy" and "presentness" does not exist in the same way it did in the source text. This translation – if it is published – will tell the story of an event that happened at least five years prior to publication. It narrates history, not present reality. In this way, there is less room for the creation of fictional characters and events, because translators are not trying to mythologize history, we are trying to tell it accurately to an audience that is unfamiliar with it. In other words, while the *crónica* may strive to recreate an event using elements related to an identifiable

reality, the translation strives to make the reality that the *crónica* deals with identifiable to an unfamiliar audience.

Secondly, according to Bliesa, the *crónica* “often offers a recreation of the atmosphere and characters of the event it narrates; it has a descriptive intention.” (38). The translation of a *crónica* offers a recreation of a recreation of the atmosphere and characters of the event it narrates, and although it has a descriptive intention insofar as it intends to recreate the intention of the source text, the notion of *intention* here is fundamental. The translator’s intention is not the same as that of the original author. This harkens back to Reiss’s idea of text-type. In Chapter Three I concluded that the translation is inevitably a different type of text than the source text because the intention of the writer and the intended audience are different.

Third, the *crónica* “narrativizes and fictionalizes in various degrees the real events it portrays, producing an ambiguity between reality and fiction, or between the perceived opposition of information and imagination. Some can be read, thanks to techniques they use to reconstruct actions and scenes, as fiction. At the same time, these techniques allow the author to reconstruct, imagine and recreate the empty spaces that exist in the story that is being narrated to transmit it to the readers in all its integrity.” (38). In translation, the text is no longer “narrativized” or “fictionalized” to the same degree as the source text *crónica*. Because of the translator’s intention to take implicit aspects in the source text and make them explicit for an audience that is most likely unfamiliar with the real events of the

crónica, there is less room for ambiguity between reality and fiction. This means that while the author of the *crónica* has leeway to reconstruct, imagine and recreate the empty spaces in the story, the translator attempts to explain the empty spaces (a good example of this would be providing for the reader a link to a full news article, where the author has only provided a one-sided excerpt in the source text). In this way, the translation cannot really be read as fiction, because the reader is constantly reminded that this text is based on real history.

Fourth, “The author [of the *crónica*] occupies a central position in his or her writing. *Crónicas* often includes narrations of the experiences of the *cronista* written as first person accounts. In other cases, and more generally, the *crónica* is a subjective narration of events, often from a character’s point of view.” (39). Clearly, in translation, the author of the source text still occupies a central position in the text, but the narration becomes a derivative first-person account in translation. I have proven in Chapter Five that my voice, in my explanations, glossary and in the choices I make, is also present in the text. Furthermore, we observed that while the source text is a subjective narration of events from the author’s point of view, in the translation I have striven to provide the reader with a more rounded and multilateral telling of the events. In this way, it can be concluded that the translator’s point of view is combined with the original author’s in the translation of a subjective-turned-objective text.

Fifth, “The *crónica* possesses a style. It is a text with stylistic singularity through which the *cronista* addresses the reader with his or her own recognizable voice.” (39). In translation, the *cronista*’s style is altered by the translator’s voice and choices, as we observed in Chapter Five. Many Mexican readers who know Poniatowska and follow her works would recognize her voice in *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. If Poniatowska worked with a “regular” translator into the English language (or if her texts were translated more often) the case might be similar in translation. But we can conclude that this quality of the *crónica* is not the same in translation, because of the limited number of *crónicas* translated, and because of the various translators who have worked with Poniatowska’s texts. In short, because every translator makes different choices in translation, the “recognizable voice” of Poniatowska (or any *cronista*) disappears in translation.

Sixth, “There is a strong presence of orality in the *crónica*, both when it reproduces in a direct way the language of the street in the words of its characters, and in the narrator’s own language, which is a non-literary language, close to spoken language. It can be argued that the *crónica* is, generally, a highly dialogized form, in which the narrator’s voice is constantly being eroded by the voices of its characters.” (39). In translation, the orality of the *crónica* is somewhat diminished. First, because the “language of the street in the words of its characters” is transmitted through another language that cannot possibly find perfect equivalencies between nuances of slang, jargon and regional or social dialects. We

concluded in the discussion of Berman's deforming tendencies that altering the text in translation can be, and in this case is, a positive thing, but that attempting to find an equivalent "slang" or street language in English would border on the ridiculous. Secondly, the sense of orality is further diminished by the explanations and paratexts included by the translator. In oral interactions, there is dialogue and discussion and there are usually several voices involved. But seldom is dialogue interrupted by an "objective" voice (such as a translator's) with explanatory interjections.

Finally, "*Crónicas* finish but have no end. They portray a reality that continues existing when the *crónica* has come to an end and have, as a consequence of this fact, a certain character of indeterminacy." (39). This last quality is an interesting one to discuss in the context of translated *crónicas*. First of all, there is no "end" to *Amanecer el en Zócalo* for its readers, because the political situation in Mexico did not end along with the conclusion of the *crónica*. But this is not quite the same in translation. Of course North American readers would understand that the events dealt with in the text are a part of history, which is continuous, but it is how deeply the events inspiring the text affect the readers that decides how long they are affected by them afterwards. For example, within Mexico the elections of 2006 are still, five years later, affecting the way Mexicans live their lives and consider their government. But the typical American or Canadian reader of this translation would probably not have been directly affected by the Mexican elections of 2006,

and although an interested reader might decide to read or research further about the subject after reading the text, there is more of a sense of finality at the end of the reading experience than there was for someone who lived the actual experience described in the original *crónica*.

CONCLUSIONS DRAWN

Throughout this thesis I have attempted to answer one major question for each Chapter, drawing conclusions to prove my hypotheses over the course of this study. In Chapter One I outlined the history and cultural significance of the *crónica* in Mexico, and provided a brief biography of Elena Poniatowska. We also saw how *Amanecer en el Zócalo* complies with the definition of the *crónica* as explained by Carlos Monsivais, Esperança Bielsa and other experts in the field. In discussing theories of systems in culture and literature, then describing the Mexican literary system and looking at the significance of the *crónica* within it, I concluded in Chapter One that the answer to my first thesis question is as follows: The Mexican *crónica* fits centrally into its literary system because it is an ever-evolving genre of literature that addresses urgent and present issues in society. It contributes to the development of society and, as such, occupies a central position within its own literary polysystem. This conclusion is crucial to the development of my thesis,

because it acts as grounds upon which we can launch our study of the translation of the *crónica*, and as a justification for performing the translation.

In Chapter Two I answered the second thesis question and justified my argument that, like other *crónicas* translated before it, *Amanecer en el Zócalo* in translation should be altered to fit more naturally into the North American literary system. I also concluded that the translator has the authority to intervene in the text in order to address the needs of his or her audience, since the translator takes on the role of editor and, to some extent, journalist in the translation of the *crónica*. By examining three previously translated *Crónicas*, *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Poniatowksa, 1971), *Nada, nadie: las voces del temblor* (Poniatowska, 1988), and *No nacimos pa' semillas* (Sálazar, 1990), I was able to justify my decisions to add a preface, a glossary of terms, footnotes and other expansions. Furthermore, the examination of three other *crónicas* in this chapter strengthened my explanation of the *crónica* in Chapter One, when I elaborated on the diverse themes addressed by the *crónica*, all relating to a grander topic of social advancement and equality.

In Chapter Three, I provided an overview of some of the major translation theories from the 1960s to the present. I had various reasons for including this chapter. First, because this study has been undertaken under the umbrella of Literature Studies, I wanted to include something more than a simple introduction to translation theory for the readers of this dissertation, bridging the gap between literary studies and translation studies. Second, I demonstrated the shift from

source text-oriented theories to target text-oriented theories of translation, and show that functionalist, target-oriented methods of translation are the most appropriate and useful in the translation of the contemporary Mexican *crónica* for an education-driven North American audience. I concluded that by taking into consideration the needs of the target audience and placing less importance on the preservation of the form of the source text, I can most easily justify the decisions made in my translation, as outlined in Chapter Five. Finally, the third chapter was meant to serve as a segue into the fourth, in which I demonstrate that “deforming” the text in translation actually serves the communicative purposes of the Mexican *crónica* in a positive way.

In Chapter Four I outline Antoine Berman’s “deforming tendencies” in translation and demonstrate how I have employed each of these tendencies in my translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. But while the term “deformation” undoubtedly carries negative connotations, I aimed to prove in this chapter that “deformation,” or alteration, change, intervention in translation is not only necessary but should be welcomed. I outlined in detail situations in my translation where I made use of rationalization, clarification, expansion, ennoblement and popularization, qualitative impoverishment, quantitative impoverishment, the destruction of rhythms, the destruction of underlying networks of signification; the destruction of linguistic patternings, the destruction of vernacular networks and their exoticization, the destruction of expressions of idioms, and the effacement of the

superimposition of languages, in order to create a text that turned out to be something potentially more recognizable to my target audience than the traditional Mexican *crónica* that *Amanecer en el Zócalo* was. All in all, I concluded that change is a necessary and unavoidable phenomenon in the translation of the *crónica*, and that in the end, “deforming” the source text is the only way in which the translator of a *crónica* can achieve the final product desired.

Finally, in Chapter Five, I outlined specific challenges I faced in the translation of *Amanecer en el Zócalo* (given the reasons for these challenges, which I outlined in Chapters One and Two), and explained and justified the decisions I have made and have yet to make if and when the translation is published in English. I prove in this chapter that translating the Mexican *crónica* does, indeed, come with its own particular set of problems and difficulties, and I prove that while at times the translator is forced to alter the genre of the text (for example, by adding a footnote to explain some implicit cultural aspect that would need no explanation in the source culture) at other times this alteration is deliberate and voluntary, and evidence of the translator’s desire to create a specific genre of text (for example, by offering the reader a link to an online newspaper article so that they may acquire more background information). All in all, the most significant conclusion I made in this chapter, as the culmination of all of my other arguments and conclusions, was that the primary difficulties of translating the contemporary Mexican *crónica* are a result of its nature and characteristics: the culturally implicit aspects of the text, the

form of the text as a nonfiction work written in the style of a novel, and its nature as a text that deals immediately and urgently with a real-life event. Consequently, the translator's solutions to the problems result in the fundamental alteration of the source text, and in the creation of a nonfiction text that cannot be read the same way as the partially fictitious *crónica*. The resulting text is directed at a readership that will select it for its educational merits, and that will read it in order to learn more about an unfamiliar reality, while the source text was aimed at a readership that had an intimate connection with the reality addressed by the *crónica*.

The purpose of this dissertation was to realize a study of the contemporary Mexican *crónica*, and specifically of the work *Amanecer en el Zócalo* by Elena Poniatowska, which has had limited exposure in the world of North American academia. The second purpose was to translate the *crónica* into English, because the contemporary Mexican *crónica* has had even less exposure to the North American literary system. This study contributes originally to knowledge in many ways. My aim was to contribute to the study of *Amanecer en el Zcalo*, the 2006 Mexican Election and the *crónica*, and also to contribute to the use of commented translation as a legitimate and fruitful area of doctoral study. This dissertation closely examines the specific problems with the translation of Mexican creative nonfiction, which can explain the lack of *crónicas* translated into English in North America. Finally, it proves that a genre of literature that is widespread and increasingly popular in Latin America is hardly known at all outside of academia in Canada and the United

States, which means that our literary systems still have much room to grow, develop and change, and that there is ample opportunity for further and higher learning about the various cultures that make up North and Latin American societies.

APPENDIX #1: CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF PONIATOWSKA'S MAJOR WORKS

Year	Title	Publisher (First Edition Spanish)	Genre	Translated into English
1954	<i>Lilus Kikus</i>	Ediciones Era	Short Stories	Yes- <i>Lilus Kikus and other stories</i> . University of New Mexico Press
1956	<i>Melés y Teleo: Apuntes para una comedia</i>	Revista Panoramas	Play	No
1960	<i>Todo empezó el domingo</i>	Fondo de Cultura Económica de España	<i>Crónica</i>	No
1961	<i>Palabras Cruzadas. Crónicas</i>	Ediciones Era	<i>Crónica</i>	No
1969	<i>Hasta no verte, Jesús mío</i>	Ediciones Era	Novel	Yes- <i>Here's to you Jesusa</i> . Penguin: 2001
1971	<i>La noche de tlatelolco. Testimonios de historia real</i>	Ediciones Era	<i>Crónica/</i> Testimony	Yes- <i>Massacre in Mexico</i> , The Viking: 1975
1978	<i>Querido Diego, te abraza Quiela</i>	Ediciones Era	Collection of fictional letters from Angelina Beloff to Diego Rivera	Yes- <i>Dear Diego</i> . Pantheon: 1986
1979	<i>Gaby Brimmer</i>	Editorial Grijalbo	Nonfiction – biography	Yes- <i>Gaby Brimmer, and Autobiography in three voices</i> . Brandeis University Press, 2009
1979	<i>De noche vienen</i>	Editorial Grijalbo	Short Stories	No

Year	Title	Publisher (First Edition Spanish)	Genre	Translated into English
1980	<i>Fuerte es el silencio</i>	Ediciones Era	<i>Crónica</i>	No
1982	<i>Domingo 7</i>	Océano	<i>Crónica</i>	No
1982	<i>El ultimo guajolote</i>	Cultura, Secretaría de Educación Pública, M. Casillas Editores	<i>Crónica</i>	No
1985	<i>¡Ay vida, no me mereces! Carlos Fuentes, Rosario Castellanos, Juan Rulfo, la literatura de la Onda</i>	Joaquín Mortíz	Non-fiction	No
1988	<i>La flor de lis</i>	Ediciones Era	Novel	No
1988	<i>Nada, nadie. Las voces del temblor</i>	Ediciones Era	<i>Crónica</i>	Yes – <i>Nothing, Nobody: the Voices of the Mexico City Earthquake.</i> Temple University Press, 1995
1991	<i>Todo México</i>	Diana	<i>Crónica</i>	No
1992	<i>Tinísima (Vida de Tina Modotti)</i>	Ediciones Era	Novel	Yes – <i>Tinisima,</i> University of New Mexico Press, 1995
1994	<i>Luz y Luna, las lunitas</i>	Ediciones Era	Collection of non-fiction/ <i>crónicas</i>	No
1997	<i>Paseo de la Reforma</i>	Plaza y Janés Barcelona	<i>Crónica</i>	No

Year	Title	Publisher (First Edition Spanish)	Genre	Translated into English
1998	<i>Octavio Paz: las palabras del árbol</i>	Plaza y Janés	Biography	No
1999	<i>Las soldaderas</i>	Ediciones Era	<i>Crónica</i>	No
2000	<i>Las mil y una... la herida de Paulina</i>	Plaza y Janés	<i>Crónica</i>	No
2000	<i>Juan Soriano Niño de mil años</i>	Plaza y Janés	Biography	No
2000	<i>Las siete cabritas</i>	Ediciones Era	Biography/ <i>crónica</i>	No
2001	<i>Mariana Yampolsky y la buganvillia</i>	Plaza y Janés	Biography	No
2001	<i>La piel del cielo</i>	Alfaguara	Novel	Yes – <i>The Skin of the Sky</i> . NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2004
2003	<i>Tlapalería</i>	Ediciones Era	Short Stories	No
2005	<i>Obras Reunidas</i>	Fondo de Cultura Económica	Compilation of works	No
2006	<i>El tren pasa primero</i>	Alfaguara	Novel	No
2007	<i>Amanecer en el Zócalo: los 50 días que confrontaron a México</i>	Planeta	<i>Crónica</i>	Not yet published
2008	<i>Jardín de Francia</i>	Fondo de Cultura Económica	<i>Crónica/</i> testimony	No

APPENDIX #2 – TRANSLATION EXCERPT FINAL DRAFT

Mass, interrupted

Journalist Patricia Muñoz Ríos⁴² points us to the Cathedral doors: “Liberate us from PAN, from Felipe Calderón,” members of the CPBT (Coalition for the Good of All) chanted yesterday, during the Sunday Mass at the Cathedral, condemning Cardinal Norberto Rivera for his interference in politics.

“Norberto, don’t judge us or you will be judged; we’re not crazy, we just see things differently. Vote by vote, ballot by ballot!” “God is love.”

A few parishioners cried back: “Respect the House of God!” An elderly woman pleaded, indignant: “Throw them out! ... Throw them out!” and a priest near the baptismal font warned: “Those pitiful PRD urchins are back again!” Sunday Mass was under such tension that Cardinal Rivera finished it off at full speed.

“Norberto Rivera, Hell is waiting for you.” “Norberto Rivera, defender of pedophiles.”⁴³

⁴² Full article in Spanish:

<http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2006/08/21/index.php?section=politica&article=005n1pol>

⁴³ See <http://articles.latimes.com/2006/sep/20/local/me-abuse20> for more information.

“You are exploiters, you are agitators!” someone shouted through a megaphone.

Guards closed the Cathedral doors, so that no more protestors could enter.

“Anyone wearing a yellow shirt is a threat.”

Before leaving, the protestors said the Lord’s Prayer, changing the ending to:

“Deliver us from Calderón, amen.”

The archdiocese of Mexico indicated that the Government of Mexico City would provide security for the Masses in which Norberto Rivera officiates in the Cathedral “to prevent any altercation between Catholics and protestors” and not because “we are concerned for the Cardinal.”

“The Cathedral is not an appropriate venue for a political protest,” writes journalist Ángel Bolaños.

More than one thousand songs and the “pejeshopping”

Every day, songs and poems ranging from one-page to book-length are recited from the podium. CDs are even made in honor of Amlo, with his smiling face on the covers. How did they make them? How much does it cost to record a CD? I’m given gifts of cloth dolls of Amlo wearing the presidential sash, sewn by the seamstresses

of the '85 earthquake⁴⁴, as well as a CD. Jesusa tells me that she's been given more than a thousand songs composed by the people. "I don't know if they wrote songs for Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas as well, but I know that there is a craze for Amlo unlike anything I've ever seen," Jesusa exclaims.

"Listen, this is no longer just the Zócalo. This is Lourdes or the Villa of Guadalupe.⁴⁵ Soon we're going to see miracles performed, and the square is going to fill with crutches, offerings and Hail Marys," I reply.

"What ugly words!"

The podium really is a little sanctuary "where blood performs its own, parallel rites," as Octavio Paz would say, but here, the people worship Amlo, not the Virgin of Guadalupe. A whole array of offerings arrive, portraits of Amlo of all sizes, sculptures of him, his smile needle-pointed onto pillows, beautifully colored photographs, vases with his image on them, blankets. There is so much paraphernalia that does not come from the PRD, nor represents the usual flood of pens and watches, shirts and sweatshirts, ashtrays and scarves that are so often given to the protestors. These are gifts and amulets from a disquieting religious

⁴⁴ See <http://www.globalpolitician.com/21286-mexico> for more information on the seamstresses of the 1985 Mexico City earthquake.

⁴⁵ The Villa of Guadalupe is Mexico City's most important religious site, where the Basilica of Guadalupe can be found. See <http://www.mexicocity-guide.com/attractions/villa.htm> for further information.

over-glorification and no one could take Amlo off his altar.

One of the interesting characteristics of the path between the Zócalo and Reforma is the *pejeshopping*. Amlo's image – on flags, buttons, hats, bracelets, stickers, wreaths, cartoons and sneakers – has become a real collectors' item.

Videos, CDs of all kinds of music – even a song called 'Peje's Rap' – yellow flowers and books jump up and grab you from all corners of the corridor. Chaneca has all the paraphernalia possible. I have no idea how it all fits in her San Jerónimo house. She's going to have to add on a new floor.

Many of the street vendors selling their goods illegally leave their stalls in the Alameda or Moneda Street and come to the vigil. "This is where all the business is." They take advantage of the number of people who come to Amlo's information sessions, and they offer bracelets and anti-stress magnets (my father had a copper one), as well as sweaters, pants, shoes, ties, socks, gloves, popcorn, chocolates, candy and stuffed animals. More and more street vendors are filling Madero despite the prohibition. Most of them receive "warning calls" via radio signals. That way, when the police pass by they can hide their merchandise and set up again ten minutes later.

"And I only buy things from the *pejeshopping*," Chaneca tells me.

Ignacio Rodríguez Reyna, General Director of the magazine *Emi-Equis*, analyzes Amlo's character: "López Obrador should have recognized how much

responsibility he has in having helped things to get the way they are today. It will be very difficult for him to recognize his failures and errors, that it was a mistake to not participate in the debate, that he chose the wrong collaborators, that he should be worried about efficacy instead of absolute loyalty, that he refuses to listen to anyone who disagrees with him, that he squandered his advantage in the polls. That his pride constantly works against him.

APPENDIX #3: GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

- AFI: Agencia Federal de Investigación; *Federal Investigations Agency*
- AMLO/Amlo: Andrés Manuel López Obrador, leader of the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD)
- APPO: Asamblea Popular de los Pueblos de Oaxaca; *Popular Assembly of the Peoples of Oaxaca.*
- BBVA-Bancomer: Banco Bilbao Vizcaya Argentaria – Banco de Comercio
- CANACO: Cámara Nacional de Comercio, Servicios y Turismo de la Ciudad de México; *Mexico City National Chamber of Commerce, Services and Tourism*
- CANACOPE: Cámara Nacional de Comercio en Pequeño de la Ciudad de México; *Mexico City National Chamber of Small Businesses*
- CCE: Consejo Coordinador Empresarial; *Business Coordination Council*
- CCH: Colegio de Ciencias y Humanidades; *College of Sciences and Humanities*
- CD: Cámara de Diputados; *Chamber of Deputies*
- CDHDF: Comisión de Derechos Humanos del Distrito Federal; *Mexico City Commission for Human Rights*
- CEIICH: Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Ciencias y Humanidades; *Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Science and Humanities*
- CEM: Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano; *Mexican Episcopal Conference*
- CEPR: Center for Economic and Policy Research

- CGH: Consejo General de Huelga; *General Strike Council*
- CIASES: Centro de Investigaciones Agrícolas del Sureste; *Southeast Center of Agricultural Investigations*
- CJF: Consejo de la Judicatura Federal; *Federal Justice Council*
- CISEN: Centro de Investigación y Seguridad Nacional; *National Security and Investigation Center*
- CND: Convención Nacional de la Democracia; *National Democratic Convention*
- CNTE: Coordinadora Nacional de Trabajadores de la Educación; *National Education Workers' Coordination Committee*
- COFIPE: Código Federal de Instituciones y Procedimientos Electorales; *Federal Code of Electoral Institutions and Procedures*
- CONAGO: Conferencia Nacional de Gobernadores; *National Governors' Conference*
- CNPA: Coordinadora Nacional Plan de Ayala; *Ayala Plan National Coordination Committee (Indigenous Rights group)*
- CPBT: Coalición por el bien de todos; *Coalition for the Good of All*
- DF: Distrito Federal; *Federal District* (alternate name for Mexico City)
- EZLN: Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional; *Zapatista Army of National Liberation*
- ENAH: Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia; *National School of Anthropology and History*
- FAP: Frente Amplio Progresista; *Broad Progressive Front*

- FAT: Frente Auténtico del Trabajo; *Authentic Workers' Front*
- FECAL: Felipe Calderón, leader of the National Action Party (PAN)
- FOBAPROA: Fondo Bancario de Protección al Ahorro; *Banking Fund for the Protection of Savings*
- GDF: Gobierno del Distrito Federal; *Federal District Government* (Government of Mexico City)
- IBAP: Instituto de Protección al Ahorro Bancario; *Institute for the Protection of Bank Savings*
- IFAI: Instituto Federal de Acceso a la Información Pública; *Federal Institute for the Access of Public Information*
- IFE: Instituto Federal Electoral; *Federal Electoral Institute*
- INAH: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia; *National Institute of Anthropology and History*
- INAOE: Instituto Nacional de Astrofísica, Óptica y Electrónica; *National Institute of Astrophysics, Optics and Electronics*
- INBA: Instituto Nacional de Bellas Artes; *National Institute of Fine Arts*
- IPN: Instituto Politécnico Nacional; *National Polytechnic Institute*
- IVA: Impuesto al Valor Agregado; *Value-Added Taxes (VAT)*
- LEAR: Liga de Escritores y Artistas Revolucionarios; *League of Revolutionary Writers and Artists*
- MAM: Museo de Arte Moderno; *Museum of Modern Art*
- ONG: Organización No Gubernamental; *Non Governmental Organization (NGO)*

- ONU: Organización de Naciones Unidas; *United Nations* (UN)
- PAN: Partido Acción Nacional; *National Action Party*, the party of the current government in power, headed by leader of the government, Felipe Calderón, current President of Mexico
- PEMEX: Petróleos Mexicanos; *Mexican Petroleum*
- PFP: Policía Federal Preventiva; *Federal Preventative Police*
- PGR: Procuraduría General de la República; *Solicitor General's Office*
- PREP: Programa de los Resultados Electorales Preliminares; *Preliminary Electoral Results Program*
- PRD: Partido de la Revolución Democrática; *Democratic Revolutionary Party*, led by Andrés Manuel López Obrador
- PRI: Partido de la Revolución Institucional; *Institutional Revolutionary Party*
- PRIAN: An reference to the collaboration between the PRI and PAN
- PT: Partido del Trabajo; *Labour Party*
- SAT: Servicio de Administración Tributaria; *Tributary Administration Service*
- SCJN: Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación; *National Supreme Court of Justice*
- SNTE: Sindicato Nacional de Trabajadores de la Educación; *National Education Workers' Union*
- SSP: Secretaría de Seguridad Pública; *Public Security Secretariat*
- TDT: Televisión digital terrestre; *Digital television programming*

- TEPJF: Tribunal Electoral del Poder Judicial de la Federación; *Federal Judicial Electoral Tribunal*
- TLC: Tratado de Libre Comercio; *Free Trade Agreement* (NAFTA)
- TRIFE: Tribunal de la Institución Federal Electoral; *Federal Electoral Institute Tribunal*
- UAM: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana; *Metropolitan Autonomous University*
- UCM: Universidad de la Ciudad de México; *University of Mexico City*
- UE: Unión Europea; *European Union* (EU)
- UMIC: Unión de Mujeres Indígenas y Campesinas; *Union of Indigenous and Campesina Women*
- UNAM: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México; *National Autonomous University of Mexico*
- UNID: Universidad Interamericana para el Desarrollo; *Inter-American University for Development*

WORKS CITED

Albertson, David. "Wolfgang Iser." Stanford University, 2000.

<http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/iser/> (Consulted on May 3, 2010).

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Thick Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed.

Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. pp. 389-401.

Aranda Luna, Javier. "Amanecer en el Zócalo." *La Jornada*. June 27, 2007.

<http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2007/06/27/index.php?section=cultura&article=a07a1cul> (Consulted on July 28, 2008).

Argüelles, Juan Domingo. "Entrevista a Elena Poniatowska: Los libros imparten felicidad." *Historias de lecturas y lectores. Los caminos de los que sí leen*.

Barcelona: Paidós, 2005. pp. 279 - 296.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans.

Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Texas: University of Texas Press, 1982.

_____. "The Formal Method of Literary Scholarship." *The Bakhtin Reader*. Ed.

Pam Morris. London: Edward Arnold, 1994. Pp 113-186.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Methuen, 1980.

Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd, Cromwell Press, 1998.

BBC News. "Mexico Poll Hopefuls End Campaign." June 29, 2006.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/5124934.stm> (Consulted on April 4, 2010).

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator: And Introduction to the Translation of Beaudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*." Trans. Harry Zohn. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. Pp. 75-85.

Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. pp. 279-289.

Bielsa, Esperança. *The Latin American Urban Crónica: Between Literature and Mass Culture*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2006.

Blanco, José Joaquín et al. "Questioning the *Crónica*." Trans Beth E. Jorgensen. *The Contemporary Mexican Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre*. Eds. Corona, I. and Jorgensen, B. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002. pp. 61-71.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *In Other Words*. Trans. Matthew Adamson. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Brewster, Claire. *Responding to Crisis in Contemporary Mexico: The political writings of Paz, Fuentes, Monsiváis and Poniatowska*. Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 2005

Bruce-Novoa, Juan. "Subverting the dominant text: Elena Poniatowska's *Querido Diego*". *Knives and angels: women writers in Latin America*. Ed. Susan Basnett. London: Zed Books, 1990. pp. 115-131.

Buzelin, Helène. "Unexpected Allies: How Latour's Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies." *The Translator*. Volume 11, Number 2 (2005), 193-218.

Castillo, Debra A. *Talking Back Towards a Latin American Feminist Literary Criticism.*

Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Corona, Ignacio and Jørgensen, Beth E. "Introduction." *The Contemporary Mexican*

Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre. Eds. Corona, I. and

Jørgensen, B. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. pp. 1-25.

Delabastita, Dirk. "Translation and the Mass Media." *Translation, History and*

Culture. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter Publishers,

1990. Pp. 97-109.

De la Campa, Román. "Latin, Latino, American: Split States and Global

Imaginaries." *Comparative Literature.* Fall 2001; 53, 4; Research Library. Pp.

373-388.

Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought: An introductory reader.* New York: Routledge,

1995

De Wet, Karen. "Dialogues Generated by Pivotal Figures in Literary Systems: A systemic Approach to the Study of Literature." *Methods for the Study of Literature as Cultural Memory*. Eds. Raymond Vervliet and Annemarie Estor. Vol. 6. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 1997. pp. 7-18.

Derrida, Jacques. "De Tours de Babel." Trans. Joseph F. Graham. *Difference and Translation*. Ed. Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Polysystem Theory (Revised)." Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Papers in Culture Research*. Tel Aviv: Porter Chair of Semiotics, 2005.

<http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers/papers/ps-revised.pdf>

_____. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. Pp. 199-205.

Finnegan, Nuala. *Ambivalence, Modernity, Power: Women and writing in Mexico since 1980*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2007.

Foucault, Michel. 1969. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

_____. "Translation, Poststructuralism, and Power." *Translation and Power*. Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko (eds.) Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002. pp. 195-217.

Gentzler, Edwin and Tymoczko, Maria. "Introduction." *Translation and Power*. Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko (eds.) Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002. pp. xi- xxviii.

Gugelberger, Georg & Kearney, Michael. "Voices for the Voiceless: Testimonial Literature in Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives*. Vol. 8, No. 3, Voices of the Voiceless in Testimonial Literature, Part I. California: Sage Publications Inc., 1991. pp. 3-14. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2633736>

Halliday, Michael. *Systems and Function in Language*. Ed. Gunther Kress. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Hermans, Theo (Ed). *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. London and Sydney: Croom, 1985.

Hoepffner, Bernard. "The Burden of the Translator." *Translating Identity*. Eds.

Madalena Gonzalez and Francine Tolron. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006. pp. 193-198.

Inghilleri, Moira. "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in

Translation and Interpreting Studies." *The Translator*. Volume 11, Number 2 (2005), 125-145.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Jørgensen, Beth E. *Engaging Dialogues: The Writing of Elena Poniatowska*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994.

_____. "Framing Questions: The Role of the Editor in Elena Poniatowska's *La noche de Tlatelolco*." *Latin American Perspectives*. Issue 70, Vol 18 No. 3. Summer 1991, pp. 80-90.

King, John. "The Boom of the Latin American Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Latin American Novel*. Ed. Efraín Kristal. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. pp. 59-79.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, dialogue, and the novel." *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. T. Moi.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1986. pp. 35-61

Leeson, Lynn Hershman and Swinton, Tilda. "Curing the Vampire: Elena
Poniatowska." *Intermedia Art: New Media, Sound and Performance*. Tate.
http://www.tate.org.uk/intermediaart/elena_poniatowska.shtm
(Consulted on April 9, 2009).

Lefevere, André. "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a
Theory of Literature." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence.
London: Routledge, 2000. pp. 239-55.

_____. "That Structure in the Dialect of Man Interpreted." *Comparative
Criticism* 6. Ed. E.S. Shaffer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
pp. 87-100.

_____. "Translated Literature: Towards and Integrated Theory." *Bulletin:
Midwest MLA*. Number 14, Vol. 1. Spring, 1981. Pp. 68-78.

_____. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. New York
and London: Routledge, 1992.

_____. "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites?: The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm." *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. London: Croom Helm. Ltd., 1985. Pp. 215-243.

"Left." *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica, 2011. Web.
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1380891/left> (Consulted July 12, 2011).

Leñero, Vicente and Marín, Carlos. *Manual de periodismo*. Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1986.

Lindstrom, Naomi. *The Social Conscience of Latin American Writing*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Social Systems*. Trans. John Bednarz Jr. and Dirk Baecker. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Medina, Dante. "Patience and Urgency." *The Contemporary Mexican Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre*. Eds. Corona, I. and Jorgensen, B. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. pp. 47-51.

Middlebrook, Kevin J. "Mexico's Democratic Transitions: Dynamics and Prospects."

Dilemmas of Political Change in Mexico. Ed. Kevin J. Middlebrook. London:

Institute of Latin American Studies, 2004. Pp. 1-53.

Milner, Andrew. *Literature, Culture and Society*. New York: New York University

Press, 1996.

Monsiváis, Carlos. *Amor Perdido*. Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1977.

_____. *Dias de Guardar*. Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1970.

_____. *Entrada Libre*. Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1987.

_____. *Escenas de pudor y liviandad*. Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1988.

_____. "On the Chronicle in Mexico." Trans. Derek A. Petrey. *The*

Contemporary Mexican Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre.

Eds. Corona, I. and Jorgensen, B. Albany: State University of New York

Press, 2002. pp. 25-35.

_____. "Un peligro para México." *El Universal*. May 28, 2006.

<http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/editoriales/34459.html> (Consulted on November 15, 2010).

Mossop, Brian. "Translating Institutions: A Missing Factor in Translation Theory."

TTR Vol. 1, No. 2. 1988: pp. 65-71.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies*. Second Edition. London: Routledge,

2008 (a).

_____. *Style and Ideology in Translation: Latin American Writing in English*.

London: Routledge, 2008 (b).

Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed.

Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. Pp. 153-168.

_____. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and*

Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.

Nord, Christiane. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic*

Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis. Trans. Christiane

Nord and Penelope Sparrow. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991

Nunn, Frederick M. "The Latin American 'New Novel' in Translation: Archival Source for the Dialogue Between Literature and History." *Translating Latin America: Culture As Text*. Binghamton: State University of New York Press, 1991. pp. 67-74.

Paz, Octavio. "Piedra del sol – Sunstone." *The Collected Poems of Octavio Paz, 1957-1987*. Bilingual Edition. Ed. Eliot Weinberger. Trans. Eliot Weinberger, Elizabeth Bishop, Paul Blackburn, Lysander Kemp. USA: New Directions, 1991. pp. 1-37.

Poniatowska, Elena. *Amanecer en el Zócalo*. Mexico: Ediciones Planeta, 2007.

_____. *El Tren Pasa Primero*. Mexico: Alfaguara, 2006.

_____. "A Question Mark Engraved on my Eyelids." *Mexican Writers on Writing*. Ed. Margaret Sayers Peden. Trans. Cynthia Steele. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 2007. Pp. 96-109.

_____. "How I Started Writing *Crónicas* and Why I Never Stopped." Trans Beth E. Jorgensen. *The Contemporary Mexican Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre*. Eds. Corona, I. and Jorgensen, B. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. pp. 37-45.

_____. *La noche de Tlatelolco*. Mexico: Ediciones Era, 1971.

_____. *Massacre in Mexico*. Trans. Helen R. Lane. New York: The Viking Press, 1975.

_____. *Nada, nadie: las voces del temblor*. Mexico: Ediciones Era, 1988.

_____. *Nothing, Nobody: The voices of the Mexico City Earthquake*. Trans. Aurora Camacho de Schmidt, Arthur Schmidt. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995.

Reguillo, Regina. "Border(line) Texts: The Chronicle, Writing in the Open." *The Contemporary Mexican Chronicle: Theoretical Perspectives on the Liminal Genre*. Eds. Corona, I. and Jorgensen, B. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Reiss, K. "Decision Making in Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. Pp. 168-179.

Sálazar, Alonso J. *No nacimos pa' semilla: La cultura de las bandas juveniles de Medellín*. Bogotá: CINEP, 1990.

_____. *Born to Die in Medellín*. Trans. Nick Caistor. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1991.

Shaw, Donald L. *Nueva narrativa hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1992.

_____. *The Post-Boom in Spanish American Fiction*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Simon, Sherry. "Translating the Will to Knowledge: Prefaces and Canadian Literary Politics." *Translation, History and Culture*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter Publishers, 1990. Pp. 110-117.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. "A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany." *Translation, History and Culture*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter Publishers, 1990. Pp. 79-86.

Starcevic, Elizabeth. "Elena Poniatowska: Witness for the People." *Contemporary Women Authors of Latin America: Introductory Essays*. Vol. 1. Eds. Doris Meyer y Margarite Fernández Olmos. New York: Brooklyn College Press, 1983. pp. 72-79.

Steele, Cynthia. "Gender, Genre, and Authority: *Hasta no verte Jesús mío* (1969), by Elena Poniatowska." *Politics, Gender and the Mexican Novel, 1968-1988*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992. Pp. 28-65.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995

_____. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. London: Routledge, 2000. pp. 205-219.

_____. *Translational Norms and Literary Translation into Hebrew, 1930-1945*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University, 1977.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999.

Valdés, María Elena de. Chapter Six: "Identity and the Other as Myself: Elena Poniatowska." *The Shattered Mirror : Representations of Women in Mexican Literature*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 1998. pp. 114-143.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards and ethics of difference*. London: Routledge, 1998.

_____. *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of Translation*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Vermeer, Hans J. "Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie." *Lebende Sprachen* 23. 1978. pp. 99-102.

_____. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." (1989). Trans. Andrew Chesterman. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Second Edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. Pp. 227-238.

Vice, Sue. *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Wall, Allan. "So How Far to the Left is AMLO of Mexico?" *Mexidata.Info*. May 22, 2006. <http://mexidata.info/id900.html> (Consulted on November 14, 2010).

Weil, Simone. "Human Personality." *Selected Essays 1934-1943*. Trans. Richard Rees; Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Zlateva, Palma. "Translation: Text and Pretext 'Adequacy' and 'Acceptability' in Crosscultural Communication." *Translation, History and Culture*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter Publishers, 1990. pp. 29-37.