

Amos Megged

**Power and Memory:
Indigenous Narratives of Past and Present
in the Valley of Matalcingo, Mexico (1530-1590)**

It is this paper's intent to closely examine the forms and modes by which the first four generations of Indian elites, to survive the Spanish Conquest and its aftermath in the Mexico Basin, were able to reconstruct what they had stored in collective as well as individual memory. In his classical study of the Aztecs under colonial rule Charles Gibson claimed that the possibility opened up by the Spaniards for communities to transform their formerly dependent position by claims to an independent entity "had a dramatic impact on the 'memories' of the native peoples as they were recorded in court documents as well as in historical accounts". Consequently, also, "ethnic identities diminished, and the historical traditions that maintained them were lost to memory" (Gibson 1964: 30-34, 36).

What the Indians were incited to tell of the past in order to restructure the present, what they would not remember, and in what ways and in which abodes of memory, their attempt to recall this past and tie it to the present, could, in time, materialize is what this study attempts to uncover. What is central to our inquest here, is the unique place of the Spanish colonial court of the Audiencia of New Spain, where memory re-emerged and was transformed into a collective form. Between 1530 and 1590, the Spanish colonial court of the Audiencia of Mexico became a singular place and a "melting pot", in which the most crucial process of memory reformulation after the Spanish Conquest occurred. The process, as I argue, essentially followed the pre-Columbian model and antecedents, whereby the court was indeed the natural place in which to reformulate such memory. Moreover, this study also seeks to closely interpret how canonical Foundation Stories in indigenous society emerged out of enduring power relations and how such relations branded their deep impressions upon local memory.

I chose to concentrate here on the Valley of Matalcingo/Toluca/Calixtlahuacan case study on memory reconstruction in the Mexico Basin.¹ This particular case unfolds before us the full significance of a “multi-faceted memory”, and the heavy shadows cast by the pre-Columbian past and the post-conquest present on the reliability and forbearance of these memories. The grand “Foundation Story” told in the Valley of Matalcingo throughout generations was made up of distinct layers and variations closely related to the power relations that existed in this Valley before the Spanish Conquest, as this study attempts to show. The local Foundation Story became, in time, inseparable of a whole cultural and political legacy that defined and confirmed present political and ethnic constellations, versus some different variations to the story, depicted in individual accounts that reinterpreted the events while presenting their testimony in court. What had followed throughout the entire Valley of Matalcingo’s case was pursued in the court of the Audiencia of Mexico in Mexico City under the reigns of four Viceroyes, and lasted well up to 1602. The Valley of Matalcingo’s lawsuit presented before the colonial court of the Audiencia of Mexico is, perhaps, the wealthiest in details of all other Spanish colonial court cases fought during the sixteenth century, concerning local indigenous history and memory. The appeal, in which the Marquesado claimed full rights over the Valley and town of Toluca, had begun with the Audiencia’s inquiring into the Marquesado’s patrimony over the Valley and its communities. The first phase took place in 1547, and fought by the Second Marqués, of which we do not have any direct records. The Third Marqués fought the last phase in court between 1589 and 1598, by. Throughout the three phases of the litigation, the Marquesado was unsuccessful in regaining

1 Pre-Conquest Calixtlahuacan was called in the Matalcingo language Pintanbati and in Nahuatl Calixtlahuac. It comprised of what was to become, after the reducciones, San Francisco de Tecaxit, Santa María Asunción, San Marcos Tepeytic, San Bartolomé Tlailimpan, San Martín Qutlachlipac, San Nicolás Acayac, and San Martín Tlaxomulco. “Relación de la probanza de los indios de la villa de Toluca en el pleito que el fiscal de Su Magestad trata contra ellos y el dicho marqués del Valle, sobre los pueblos de San Miguel Totocuytlapilco y San Bartolomé Tlaltelolco y otras aldeas de este valle de Toluca”, AGNM, HJ, 70, exp. 4 (1589-97), segunda parte, ff. 27v-28v; ff. 30r-30v. A far more extensive analysis of this case is contained in my forthcoming book, *Remembering Conquests: Indians’ Recalling in the Mexico Basin, 1530-1590*.

the Valley, especially the communities of Caliyamayac, Cinacantepec, Metepec, Tepemachalco, Tlacotepec and Tlalchichilpa.

Beginning in 1563, the Second Marqués, Don Martín Cortés resolicited in court for restitution, but then, in 1575, the Marquesado's jurisdiction over the Valley was further reduced when San Mateo Atengo was incorporated within the Crown's limits. Only in 1591, did the Marquesado, under the Third Marqués, win over the case against the Crown's attempt to reduce its jurisdiction to no more than a league and a half around the town of Toluca.² Between 1570 and 1583 an appointee of the Viceroy oversaw the Toluca and the Valley of Matalcingo's affairs, and between 1583 and 1595 a *corregidor* took over up to when jurisdiction was finally returned to the Third Marqués (Gerhard 1993: 330-331).

The two Mexican historians, Rosauru Hernández Rodríguez and Margarita Menegus Bornemann have both written extensively on the history of the Valley of Matalcingo, reconstructing its local history before and after the Spanish Conquest (Hernández Rodríguez 1945; Menegus Bornemann 1991). Nevertheless, they have both missed taking the long road into how the local ethnic groups inhabiting the Valley of Matalcingo were recounting their past, in such a distinct way. What I would like to contribute further here, is to try and contrast between the different versions of one particular history of this Valley of Matalcingo and how it is remembered and recorded by its various players. A special emphasis is given here to how major, dramatic episodes, conquests, resettlements, religious conversion, devastation and plagues had been experienced, reworked in local memory according to a distinct structural order or schema, dividing their memory into sub-themes. There are some key questions that await their answers while dealing with these materials. One could start off with how these episodes were treated in the present form of retelling the past, by the less renown players, like Juan Calli, and his peers, the elders of the local communities, as they relayed their versions in the colonial court. Could one distinguish in Calli's and his peers' narrative some form of unique "memory beacons", such as "Places of Memory" (*lieux de mémoire*), like the royal granaries in the Matalcingo Valley, or "time beacons" (indicating to, for example, times of

2 AGI, Escr., 161A; AGNM, HJ, 70, exp. 4, cuaderno 1.

the plagues, and times of their cessation), that determine the chronological ordering of the events? Could one also distinguish related abodes or sites that incite memory? And what parts of the “collective memory” of the Valley of Matalcingo were obliterated, purposely or unconsciously, and what particulars did remain intact? Working on this theme, one may also find some fine parallels between what is involved here memory-wise and what Serge Gruzinski has brought to our attention about the Otomís of Querétaro in the mid-seventeenth century: “...no word said of their utter subjection to the Spanish invaders and of the abuse and mistreatment suffered at their hands. Instead of this, Otomí memory constructs and idealized image of the past in which, both materially and spiritually...” (Gruzinski 1998: 214-226).

The court records of the last phase of the Valley of Matalcingo’s case, are entitled: *Relación de la probanza de los indios de la villa de Toluca en el pleito que el fiscal de Su Magestad trata contra ellos y el dicho marqués del Valle, sobre los pueblos de San Miguel Totocuytlapilco y San Bartolomé Tlaltelolco y otras aldeas de este valle de Toluca*. It was fought between 1589 and 1598, in two separate hearings, during which the two sides presented the court with 80 witnesses. Twenty-eight of them, of Matlatzinca, Mazahua, Otomí and Nahuatl origin, provided the court with a valuable, “first-hand” memory of the events that dramatically altered life in this valley. That is, memory transferred directly from grandfather/father, to son, or coming from direct relatives, all of whom are named, in contrast to indirect, “common knowledge”, arising out of a canonical Foundation Story, disseminated amongst all the communities in the Valley of Matlatzinco. The witnesses, all of them veterans of conquests and wars fought in this valley, formed the bulk of the most senior in rank and age among the local indigenous populations. They all, perhaps for the first time, at least outside their own communities of origin, recalled their disjoint past, their fragmented memories of the pre-Conquest era under Mexica rule over the valley, the Spanish Conquest, the process of evangelization, the foundation of the new temples, and the devastation that ensued. Taking advantage of the special circumstances of the trial at hand, all those witnesses, as much as their entire communities were able to establish for themselves a far more coherent plot of their past and present memories. Through that trial, they were possibly able

to look back in a far more profound and complex form at what they were and what they are while facing the colonial situation. For us, as historians of cultural history of the early colonial period in Mexico this particular case, such witnesses' accounts present a whole new grounds on which to explore and decode the colonial cultural dramas that occurred within native society per se and between Indians and Spaniards.

Throughout this long lasting lawsuit, court memory and indigenous memory-history were closely interwoven. This is obviously linked with what the court received as information on which to rely upon, during the different phases of this lawsuit and with which what the witnesses presented in court was being compared. Part of the information received relied upon pictorial records (*lienzos*) preserved in local archives of the referred communities, others came out of oral interrogations carried out within those communities, and the rest were gathered by specially nominated Indian officials who took the time to bring to light the different versions circulating in the Valley as regarding both past and present. Obviously, one could find direct parallels among the different sources, and they all rely upon what was being maintained as an inseparable part of the "living" memory stock of these peoples. Judge Pablo Gonzales of Tula's report of 1547 provides an exemplary insight into the inner working of oral traditions that still remained dynamic in the Valley, twenty-seven years after its Conquest. It also emphasized the influence of such traditions on what the Spanish colonial court was to produce in its endeavor to bring to light the major events that affected the history as well as the present circumstances in this Valley, throughout the diverse phases of the Toluca lawsuit in the years to come.

The canonical texts that project the grand Foundation Story, such as Diego Durán's representation of the Tenochca version, may provide an overall view of the events taking place around 1476, based upon historical accounts produced from the center, that is, from Tenochtitlan, and thus emphasizes the Tenochtitlan context of these affairs. Durán's Tenochca version of the Foundation Story concerns Axayacatl's invasion and supremacy over the Valley of Matalcingo. It begins somewhere around 1476-77, when, according to local versions that circulated in the Valley, given below, Calixtlahuacan-Tulucan was ruled then by two supreme rulers, Cachimalteutl/(Cachimaltzin)

and Oipachimal. Axayacatl's impact on the area by then had already brought up a heated rivalry within Matlatzinca society, between, presumably, a faction within the ruling Calixtlahuacan-Tulucan dynasty, led by Cachimalteutl, in Tulucan who was in favor of collaborating with the Mexicas on the one hand, and on the other, centered in Tenantzinco, with its *tlatoani* Tezozomocli, resisting such alliance.

Axayacatl, as Durán's version attests, was engaged at that time in a significant task deeply immersed in the context of the Empire's "national" memory building. That is, inscribing his most recent conquests and accomplishments into the overall schema of the Mexica Empire's official memory, in which the Valley of Matalcingo's place was already determined, and therefore the version provided could only be understood in this light. We are told how, at the heart of Tenochtitlan, Axayacatl erected a new temple of the Sun. The temple would serve the purpose of the "nation's" memory building. At the upper floor of this temple stood, on the one side, the round stone depicting the year's feasts. On the other, stood a round stone altar dedicated to the Sun. Besides its ritualistic-sacrificial content, the stone would function as a genus of a "national monument, representing all the major Mexica mythological personalities, the wars won, the provinces conquered, and the captives brought to the temple to be sacrificed upon. In its center were the sun's rays, and adjoined was a stone trough in which those sacrificed were dismembered onto a canal through which the blood flowed. Durán attests in his account that he and others had witnessed the remains of this round stone. The scene was part of a public display on the occasion of a major event staged by Archbishop Alonso de Montúfar. In the course of which the latter publicly exposed the stone, presumably as a sample for the Indians' past infidelity and errors, in front of the gathering audience, at the main plaza of Mexico City. Axayacatl's act of building the nation's Official Memory could also be directly associated with what Auitzotl, who ruled Tenochtitlan between 1486 and 1502, did immediately following his inauguration into office in 1486. Axayacatl's successor had renovated the great temple of Tenochtitlan in the honor of his god. The populace of Tenochtitlan and its environs were obliged to come to the temple on the day following the grand feast, and remain there for the sound-and-light exposition of the victims' dismembering, "in order that this solemnity will remain [inscribed] for ever in memory", according to

Auitzotl's instructions (Durán 1967: ch. 35-36, 43-44; fig. 30). Emis-saries from Tulucan and Metepec, of Matalcingo and Calimaya, and other towns of the Valley of Matalcingo were also present on that major occasion as Durán (1967: ch. 43, 246) tells us.

Comparing the different versions laid out before us by the Tenochca, the Marquesado, and by the different protagonists represented in the Valley's different variations, we might understand better the inner working in which memory about major, historical events and their aftermath, such as those that occurred were reconstructed, twisted and maneuvered in diverse and not entirely complementary forms. We can also get the inner layers laid by those directly or indirectly affected by the events. The Tenochca version, represented in Durán's, seeks to attribute much prominence to the acts of both inscribing and commemorating Mexica's active role in the shaping of the events, occurring in this context both within the Valley of Matlalzinco and outside it, and in their rulers' mastery over fate in general, placed within the broader content of Mexica cosmological conceptualization. However, the most distinctive differences between the Tenochca and the Valley's version/s presented here lie primarily in the fact that the Tenochca version aims at structuring of an "Official Memory" that extends well beyond the geographical and mental limits of this valley, and contains only a small time fragment of the overall account represented in the Valley's version/s. The present fragment of the Tenochca version does not proceed beyond 1478. And even within the time limit of this era, it concentrates on narrowly chained episodes related to Axayacatl's campaigns and memorable, victorious acts, while excluding the acts of dividing the valley among Axayacatl's allies, the establishment of the royal granaries, setting of the limits among the local towns, etc. Durán's Tenochca version, nevertheless, provides yet another explanation to the final invasion of the Valley by Axayacatl, based upon internal rivalry, envy and power competence, between two opposing rulers within Matlatzinca society, without a Mazahua presence. The two opposing protagonists in Durán's version, Tezozomocli of Tenantzinco, and Chimalteutl of Tulucan, appear to have taken a path entirely contradictory to what the local Valley's version of the Indian witnesses' version in court provide us. One could only try to explain such incongruity by the fact that Durán's version seeks to record Tenochtitlan's glorious side of this story. Durán's version

takes us at this point all the way to the very significant act of Calixtlahuacan's ceremonial center's pillage, and the setting of its grand temple on fire. Below, under the Valley's Version, we get a slightly different account of the same episode. According to the Tenochca version, Axayacatl's troops proceeded, eventually, to the Tulucan center in Calixtlahuacan, passing through the temple, and setting fire to the principal Matlatzinca godly figure of Coltzin.³ This version records then the surrender and submission of Chimalteutl and his lords to Axayacatl, and the arrival of Tezozomocli at the scene, "voicing his obligation and thanks to Axayacatl". The final act and episode recorded at this point is, of the Matlatzincas' "own appeal" to Axayacatl to subdue them to Tenochtitlan, and propose to pay their tributes and dues directly to this king. The Tenochca's version represented by Durán is brought to an end with a detailed account of the grand reception prepared for the victorious Axayacatl and his men by the old *Tlacaelel* in Tenochtitlan, the royal parades, and solemn speeches made by Axayacatl in the memory of his royal ancestors. All this and what's to follow can be clearly related to the didactic schema of the Official Memory. The author records the gifts or, more likely, the *ex-votos* brought forward to the temple of Huitzilopochtli by the lord of Tenanzinco, as a gesture of recognition and acknowledgement of their supremacy, and as gratitude for their help against his internal foes in Tulucan. These included, the Matlatzinca priests and the lavish paraphernalia, brought along from the sacked temple of Tulucan, as well as a significant number of war captives, which Tezozomocli presented before the victors. The final note is the vivid account of the imposing dances performed by the war captives from Tulucan in the main plaza of Tlaltelolco, honoring the vanquisher (Durán 1967: ch. 43: 246).

The Valley's version of the events, in contrast, was made up of at least two different adaptations molded and disseminated within the Valley by the rivaling factions involved. It seeks, in contrast to the Tenochca's, to recover past wounds and heal the dishonor of the vanquished, by endeavoring to build up a coherent schema and present it within the bounds of its collective memory. That is, its own logical

3 Compare with Calli's version, below, that it was Cachimaltzin himself who had set the temple on fire!

elucidation as to how and why this valley was subdued for the period of forty two odd years to the foreign rulers. Local variations produced and manufactured within the more limited sphere of the collective memory of the Valley of Matalcingo itself, still in contrast, were aimed towards an entirely different direction, and were obviously maneuvered by Marquesado interests.

The official Marquesado version, yet another factor in this complex intertwine, was produced out of local indigenous memory. But, otherwise, it was clearly altered and reformed to suit the goal of regaining jurisdiction over what was claimed to be an inseparable part of the former Tulucan patrimony, is presented in 1594, in a document written either by a Marquesado official, or by Martín Cortés himself. It was entitled, *Petición Española* and presented in court as part of the Marquesado's defense.

The Valley's version/s offer us the *longe durée*, panoramic perspective of a time-span stretched between 1474 and 1570, that naturally incorporates the Spanish Conquest as part of this long sequence of memory building within the Valley itself and outside it. Secondly, one would not find in the Valley's version/s Axayacatl's plans and tactics prior to his move into the war scene in the Valley contained in the Tenochca version, nor would the former refer to the aftermath scene of the celebrations and offerings in Tenochtitlan. However, one should also be aware of the likelihood that the Valley's version/s should, as it does, associate itself with some parts of the Official Memory, indoctrinated in this Valley as in other parts of the Empire after the Tenochca conquest campaigns had finally ended. This is why it should be important to cautiously sense within the Valley's version/s, what's internal and what's external to the Valley's own recordings of this particular past.

Moving now to the different versions of the Valley's Foundation Story entailed within the Indian witnesses' testimony in court during the last phase of the Toluca case, one could perhaps take the whole package and look for the reconstructed Valley's Version/s in its entirety. That is, an overwhelming view of how the era between 1474 and 1570 was being recorded in local "collective memory", which might be more or less an amalgam of what was being deduced, taught and circulated as "history" throughout the Valley area. What was being recorded, however, could have been presented in court was al-

ready biased and changed according to the witness's position, role-taking, and siding with one of the two litigants, the Crown and the Marquesado. Nevertheless, one is still able to overcome this barrier by searching for individual variations and deviations from the basic plot. Let us move first to what was the Valley's "coherent" Foundation Story, as opposed to the above, Tenochca version presented by Durán, and in what major points does it overlap with points of departure raised by Judge Pablo González's Report.

The Valley's "Foundation Story", as presented by both the pro-Crown witnesses, as well as the pro-Marquesado ones can be delineated into two distinct time-spans. These time-spans are, evidently, structured according to the Christian, lineal conception of time, not according to the indigenous, cyclical one. The first time-span that appears in individual versions, stretches between 1474 and 1490, when the Valley of Matlalzinco came under the direct rule of the Tenochca rulers, Axayacatl, his brother Ahuycozin, and Moctehuzuma Xocoyotzin, Axayacatl's son. The second, is situated between 1520 and 1570, under the yoke of the first and second Marquesado del Valle. The Valley's Version/s of the events marking Axayacatl's imposing impact over the Valley's fate is clearly told from nearly an entirely different angle to that of the Tenochca. The grand story as is told by the witnesses concerning the first time-span, centers on the primary phase of the influence exerted by Axayacatl over this Valley of Matlalzinco. This is followed by the subsequent subordination of the native city-states there to his rule, including the capitulation of the Matlatzinca ruling dynasty in Calixtlahuacan's political and religious center that took place between 1474 and 1476. The nomination by Axayacatl of Cachalteutl/(Cachimalteutl) as the dynastic ruler in Calixtlahuacan, Metepec and Zinacantepec, is followed by the uprising and assassination attempt by the remaining Matlazinga lords residing in the Calixtlahuacan center against Chimalteutl. Cachalteutl, not Tezozomocli, is described to have fled to Tenochtitlan, and pled before Axayacatl for help against his Matlazinga foes; Axayacatl sanctioned the request and headed a conquering force of Nahuatl-speakers led by captains from his ally city-states of Tlacopan, Texcoco, Tlaltelolco and Azcapotzalco to the Valley of Matlazingo. The rebelling Matlazinga lords are then defeated after fierce fighting, and fled out of the entire valley in the direction of Michoacan, where they resettle for

good. When the re-conquest ends, Cachalteutl was reinstated as the supreme ruler of Calixtlahuacan, and Axayacatl was asked by the former to leave his Nahuatl-speaking troops behind to settle in the Valley and provide protection (a buffer zone?) against the Matlazinga. Axayacatl conceded, and the former alliance between him and the Mazahua ruling dynasty was reestablished upon the following terms. That he and his successors in Tenochtitlan should always approve of this local, ruling dynasty and, that in return, half of the lands and their yearly yield will be granted to Axayacatzin and his accompanying allies, in the form of tribute (collected by his *calpixqui* and guarded in the granaries constructed for this purpose).⁴

The second time-span, between 1520 and 1570, begins with the powerful and symbolic act of first baptizing of Calixtlahuacan ruler, Tuchcoyotzin (Don Hernando Cortés), Chimalteutl's heir, by the Spanish conqueror, Cortés's accompanying priests. The Foundation Story proceeds with the coming of the first Spanish settlers, after Gonzalo de Sandoval's conquest of the province in 1521 with the aid of Otomí armies, and the submission of the nearby towns to the new rule of the Villa de Toluca. At this point, the narrative highlights the grand historical similarity between Tuchcoyotzin's choosing to side with the Spaniards, in 1520, and Cachalteutl, his grandfather's choice, back in 1474, in siding with Axayacatl. The Foundation Story proceeds with Tuchcoyotzin's subsequent reinforcement of law and order in the valley and in its communities, and in return he is made by the Marqués as an "overlord" of these lands. Then, comes the founding in 1526 of the first Franciscan monastery on the outskirts of Toluca, right at the site facing the royal granaries, the erection of other parish churches in the outlying communities, followed in 1542, by the memorable act of the burning of the royal granaries. The overall process of the mass baptizing of the entire population of the valley coincided with the founding of the new Villa of Toluca. The Congregation process (*reducción*) of the still dispersed populations of the ex-settlements and *calpoltin* of Calixtlahuaca in the valley, took place according to these testimonies around 1545. The process was led by Don Miguel de San Bartolomé, a *cacique* and *principal* of Capulhuacque,

4 Testimony by Don Andrés de Tapia, AGNM, HJ, 70, exp. 4, cuaderno 1, ff. 21v-22r.

commissioned for this task by the second Marqués, Don Martín Cortés.⁵

The second time-span in the witnesses' accounts culminates, symbolically enough, with the dramatic act in 1551. The denunciation of Tuchcoyotzin to the Franciscan friars at the nearby Tuluca monastery, presumably by some of the traditional foes of Chimalteutl's royal house, and based on its historical collaboration with the Mexicas, on charges of having committed incest with his daughter, and of having constantly practiced idolatry, years after his initial baptism by the first Marqués. Tuchcoyotzin was thereafter taken away to Mexico City where he was detained at the Franciscan monastery, around 1548, never to return.⁶ One might, perhaps, associate the charges brought up against Tuchcoyotzin, as well as the actions taken against him, as part of the Crown's maneuvering of local politics in contra the Marqués's allies in the area. One could possibly connect the idolatry case of Tuchcoyotzin with a possible resurgent current of revivalism, in Metepec as well as in Toluca during the late 1540s, however we have no further support for this assumption (Greenleaf 1962: 64). In Tuchcoyotzin's absence from Toluca, Don Luis de Santa María, who acted as the *guardiá dirigente de Toluca* oversaw the local state of affairs. Don Luis appeared earlier on before Pablo González in his inquiry. In 1552, Tuchcoyotzin's son, Don Pedro Cortés OcomaChimalteutl (born ca. 1509), succeeded Don Luis de Santa María. He was about forty years of age by then. The great epidemics that ensued and ravaged this valley between 1576 and 1581, and between 1595 and 1597, the very times when the Toluca court proceedings were in their midst, provide an "epitaph" for this Valley's Foundation Story.

One should be well aware of the fact that the individual deviations and versions provided in court by some of the witnesses that, doubtlessly, do highlight more of the personal memory-type, were obviously juxtaposed at some point or another with the "coherent" Valley Foundation Story. Eighty-one-year-old Lucas de Vitoria, for example, had heard the story from his father Coatzoncoz, just before he died, back in 1529, when he was about 15 of age. By then, the Valley's

5 Testimony by Francisco de Santiago, AGNM, HJ,70, cuaderno 1, f. 41v. See also Wood (1998: 167-221).

6 *Ibid.*

Version of the Foundation Story was beginning to form, out of different individual memories, as well as out of what was displayed and depicted from the *lienzos* of his community, Santa Ana Tlaucingo, where his father and other elders of the nearby communities regularly convened in the evenings discussing and sharing those matters of past events.⁷ However, another of the more reliable witnesses, Baltazar de Vergara, provided yet the wealthiest and one the most critical of all the rest of the local, individual versions. Vergara brings up an entirely new version of the Valley's Foundation Story, similar in some points to that of Durán's Tenochca version. Vergara was about twenty-seven-year-old (or less), when he heard the information from his father (in 1551). The latter had heard the story from his late father and from other old men in the community. His narrative includes direct citations disseminated in his community from the encounter in Tenochtitlan between Cachalteutl and Axayacatl, as well as the wording passed between them while placing the siege on Calixtlahuacan. According to his version, Calixtlahuacan and the entire Valley of Matalzingo was possibly ruled by two supreme lords: Cachalteutl (of Tulucan) and Oipachimal (of the rest of the Valley), who were relatives, belonging to the same ruling Matlatzinca dynasty, and who resided together in the royal palace in Calixtlahuacan. Oipachimal, as this version accounts, intended to do away with Cachalteutl, so to become the sole ruler of the entire Valley including Tulucan. Chimalteutl, having acknowledged the plot, had secretly fled to Tenochtitlan to provide Axayacatl with an account of the plot and ask for his backing against Oipachimal. Accordingly, Chimalteutl was by then already a committed vassal of Axayacatl, possibly ever since the latter's primary phase of conquering the valley by 1474. Axayacatl was suspicious of Chimalteutl's covert purpose in coming to Tenochtitlan. He suspected him of being a Matlatzinca "mole", who was sent by the dual ruling dynasty of Calixtlahuacan to collect information regarding the empire's supposed might and its possible weak spots. He therefore kept him in custody in Tenochtitlan for a period of three years (1476-1479?). After that time, Chimalteutl had urged the former to subdue, or, reconquer by might the entire Valley of Matalzingo, for the sake of doing away with Axayacatl's suspicions ("asolándoles toda la tierra").

7 *Ibid.*, cuaderno 2, ff. 23v-24v.

“Without leaving even a single Matlatzinca soul [probably of the opposing faction] alive there, and tearing down their magueys” (*metl*), which could well be interpreted as a symbolic act of whipping out the Opachimal’s lineage indicated jurisdiction (represented in its pictorial form by rows of magueys), as well as destroying the entire civic and religious center of Calixtlahuacan. Chimalteutl then offered Axayacatl, according to de Vergara’s version, to join him in the battle he would wage against the Opachimal Matlatzinca: “no temas que yo iré contigo para que entiendas que no te engaño”.⁸

Axayacatl apparently consented, summoning to his palace the *tlatoque* of Tlaltelolco, Azcapotzalco, Texcoco and Tlacopan, and offered them to join him with their armies in this foray. Having entered the Valley of Matlalzinco, and Axayacatl’s armies positioned on the foot of the mountain of Tulucan, and next to the Río de Chinagutzenango, Cachalteutl made yet another offer to Axayacatl. That he himself would climb first, with his men to Calixtlahuacan’s center, and there he would make sure that the entire site was free of any threat and of Oipachimal’s guards. Thereafter, he would proceed to the royal temple, *casa de los ídolos*, in Chimalteutl’s wording, and set it on fire, as a definite sign of his own loyalty to Axayacatl (“yo iré a Calixtlahuacan y ver a de qué manera está la gente, y te haré seña de la casa de los ídolos para si entrarás a una batalla”). This act was clearly intentioned as powerful, symbolic gesture of subjection and consolidation with the rule of Tenochtitlan. As suggested, Cachalteutl entered first the royal palace on top of the mountain, and there he encountered Oipachimal’s guards, who told him that the latter had gone with his men to seek out animal sacrifices (“que era qualquiera cosa viva que hallasen, que era venado, conejo, liebre, o culebra”) to offer their major idol/god. Supposedly, to obtain his grace and backing for the forthcoming battle with Axayacatl. Chimalteutl, after having heard the information, killed them all, and proceeded immediately to the royal temple (“dónde estaban los ídolos”), setting it on fire. As planned, the great cloud of smoke rising from the burning temple (ulucan’s toponim in the *Codex Mendoza*), signaled to Axayacatl, down below, that the entire area was clear for his entry, and that the foray could

8 Testimony by Baltazar de Vergara, *ibid.*, cuaderno 2, ff. 22r-23v.

progress as planned. Axayacatl's armies conquered the entire area surrounding Calixtlahuacan, as well as the center itself, on top of the mountain, and forced Oipachimal and the overwhelming majority of Matlatzinca who belonged to his subject towns, to exile to Michoacan.

As this version continues, Axayacatl thereafter reaffirmed Chimalteutl's rule over Calixtlahuacan and the entire Valley of Matalzingo, but divided the lands and the annual yield, half and half, between himself and the rulers of Texcoco, Azcapotzalco, Tlaltelolco, and Tlacoapan, on the one hand, and with Chimalteutl, Tulucan's reimposed ruler, on the other. The order of things, as this version tells us, remained so throughout the rule of Tizoc and Moctehuzuma Xocoyotzin, and up to the new rule of the first Marqués del Valle. Reviewing Baltazar de Vergara's version, it should be significant to note that it provides an explanation as to the roots of Chimalteutl and his heirs' treatment by the Valley's inhabitants as collaborators with the Mexica. It also dully explains why, under the new Spanish rule, some of these lords might have presented in court their intentioned account in favor of the Crown, that the Valley's lands and yield had never really belonged to the local dynasty in Calixtlahuacan, but only to the king of Tenochtitlan and to the supreme lords of the Triple Alliance. These very elders might have also possibly been the ones who, back in 1548 reported Don Pedro Cortés OcomaChimalteutl to the Franciscans on the charges of practicing idolatry. So that, this version of the events recorded in some of the communities and circulated in others, did do some justice to the commemorated, as well as retrieved memory of the defeat and subjection experienced under the Mexica. Well before the new upheaval brought about by the Spanish Conquest, and in a way, helped alleviating these pains in order to accommodate, in recent memory, those fresh ones.

Others of the witnesses testifying in the Toluca lawsuit supplemented or deviated from some of the contours outlined by Baltazar de Vergara concerning the first time-span. Seventy-two years old Pablo Felipe, for example, had heard his version from his father, Francisco Caltoncal, as well as from his grandfather, Cacilotepitzin (who had never been baptized). Cacilotepitzin had witnessed himself how Chimalteutl went out to Tenochtitlan and informed Axayacatl of the plot to assassinate him, a plot perpetrated directly by the priests residing at the *casa de los ídolos*, Calixtlahuacan's temple, and supported by

some of his *macehualtin*. We get the same details concerning Chimalteutl's detention in Tenochtitlan, according to this present testimony, for a period of four years, at the end of which Axayacatl came to the Valley with an impressively large army. Chimalteutl climbed the mountain of Uciatepech and massacred the priests presiding over the temple as the gods' guardians, and signaled Axayacatl by smoke to take the mountain and the royal palace by force. As the foray ended, and the overwhelming majority of the local inhabitants dispersed, Axayacatl advised Chimalteutl to remain in his palace, protected by Axayacatl's troops against any repeated attempt to do away with him.⁹ This explains the presence of the Mexica *calpixqui* and his troops in Atengo, in charge of the royal granaries, but also as a "security force" to guard and assist the local Matlatzinca ally in times of trouble. Seventy-six-year old Diego de Vitoria Coatl, a *macehual* living in Metepec, in the *barrio* de San Lorenzo, repeated the same general outlines of the Valley's Foundation Story as regarding the first time-span. Yet, his version provided the court hearing, an additional flavor to the Temple of the Idols' scene. Accordingly, on the Calixtlahuacan mound: he had heard from his father, Francisco Ozumaoatl, just before he died at the age of 40, back in 1558, who himself had heard from his father, Macatl, that, "when Chimalteutl set fire to the temple in Calixtlauac he cut the heads of the lords who wished to do away with him..."¹⁰

The pro-Crown, 93-years-old Francisco García Mimich, responding to the 13th question of the interrogation in the 8 October 1598 court session, drew up quite an original plot out of what was basically the Valley's Foundation Story, a plot that could be divided into four subsections and inter-winding themes of memory. He began by stating that when the Spaniards came to this valley he was fourteen years old by then. He then proceeded with the first works of conversion in Tuluacan by the Franciscans. They were two sole friars who edified a small church made of local stones next to the mountain of Tuluacan.

9 "Ya quedás en tu casa y señorío, y te han ido todos tus indios y por sí volvieran no te matan, quiero dejar aquí en el valle de Matlatzingo esta gente de guerra que traído conmigo para que si volvieren tus enemigos te defiendan, y siembran estas tierras que son buenas..."; Testimony by Pablo Felipe, AGNM, HJ, 277, ff. 25v-26v.

10 *Ibid.*, f. 795v.

He and other of his peers had helped cementing the church walls. At the time, there were a few households on top of the mountain, inside an enclosure (*corrales*), with their commodities stored nearby. The church was named Santa María de los Angeles, and there he himself, his father, and others of their neighbors were first baptized. Among them was Tuchcoyotzin, a descendant of the royal house of Chimalteutl, situated in Calixtlahuacan, so he had heard. Hernán Cortés had honored him and thus clothed him in a Castilian style, placing a gilded lance in his hand and a golden thread on his hat and made him the first Indian governor of the new head town Toluca, who had gained this position after having subjected all the land. He then instructed him to order the Valley's inhabitants to go to church, work in the construction of the local friary and houses for the Spaniards who were with the friars. The Marqués had also ordered to harvest the plots and bring the yield to be stored at the granaries that stood in the gorge, where, a few years later, the Franciscan monastery stood and to where the rest of the populace came to be baptized and hear their first mass. Tuchcoyotzin thereafter transformed the dispersed communities of the valley into an urban nature, followed by the edification of other churches in each of the newly structured, urban *barrios* of Toluca. In the fourth part of the plot, Mimich then strictly emphasized the "fact" that Tuchcoyotzin was never beforehand recognized as the Valley's ruler, nor of the town of Toluca and that not Axayacatl, or his son Moctezuma Xocoyotzin had granted him any of the lands, nor to his ancestor, Chimalteutl.

Chimalteutl's sin, as was branded upon local memory, was his fleeing the valley together with the rest of his subjects abandoning it behind for Mexica plunder and conquest, and thus made this royal house devoid of their former possessions and rule: the supreme ruler in the time of the Mexica conquest, Chimalteutl, is thus portrayed here as having betrayed the local inhabitants of the Valley, by having surrendered the lands to Axayacatl. Thereafter, allegiance with this house has ceased to exist, even though the lands still formally belonged to Calixtlahuacan. The remaining Matlatzinca inhabitants of the Valley, as well as the Mexica and Otomí newcomers, no longer recognized its rule, and paid their yield directly to Mexico-Tenochtitlan, and to Texcoco and Tlacopan. The local rulers in Toluca were reinstated after they had returned from their exile, but they were no longer in charge

of the entire valley, but only over the jurisdiction closest to their head town on the mountain, Calixtlahuacan.¹¹ The limits of those lands are thus recognized and identified in Mimich's version of the Valley's collective memory as representing as well as manifesting in memory the reprisal against the royal house of Chimalteutl for their abandonment and surrender. The act of the burning of the granaries right after the Spanish Conquest, which is not mentioned in Mimich's version, and the erection of the Franciscan monastery (between 1524 and 1526) were the last acts of rupture from the past rule of this royal house. In other versions, the bringing of Tuchcoyotzin to stand trial in Mexico City on charges of idolatry and incest was undoubtedly so another final act of the same chain of a restructured memory-reprisal.

The particular place reserved in local memory restructuring for the first acts of baptisms in the valley as well as the unique sites of the first Franciscan church and monastery in linking together an often fragmented chain of events, is also worth noticing. Eighty-nine-years-old Don Francisco de Luna, principal and *ex-regidor* of Tulucan slightly refuted Mimich's version. He had personally known and remembered Tuchcoyotzin ever since he himself was about twelve years of age, back in 1521. At that point, he was being brought up, together with Tuchcoyotzin's son, Ocomachimaltzin (Don Pedro Cortés), by the Franciscan friars at the church of Santa María de los Angeles. Ocomachimaltzin, who was his friend, had taken him on many occasions to meet his father, Tuchcoyotzin, at his place on top of the Tulucan mountain, and he would witness there how the nearby inhabitants carried over offerings and tributes to Ocomachimaltzin's father, and therefore could attest for the latter's position of power in the area in spite of old animosities.¹² Tomás de Ledesma of Almoloya, testifying in favor of the Marquesado, remembered how, right after the Matalcingo Valley was subdued one Franciscan friar, Fr. Francisco Morante, who came with the conquerors, began edifying the small church of Santa María de los Angeles, where he himself, his father and others were baptized. He also remembered how, further on from the church's site, near the mountain were situated small houses in the form a *tian-*

11 Testimony by Francisco García Mimich, AGNM, HJ, leg. 70, exp. 4, 1598, primera parte. f. 33r.

12 Testimony by Don Francisco de Luna, *ibid.*, f. 33r.

quiz (marketplace), or a plaza, in which resided some Mexica merchants named *pochtecas*, who sold merchandize from other regions of the Empire. Right there, within three or four years, the Franciscans established the first monastery. There also, the first *barrio* of San Francisco was formed and to which the *pochtecas* together with the former inhabitants of Calixtlahuac had moved to live, after the church of Santa María de los Angeles had been abandoned. He also attested that the lands and their yield had never belonged to the Mexica rulers, Axayacatl and his descendents.¹³ Don Diego García Itzbuyn, a *fiscal* at the church of Ixlahuacan, and a principal attested that back in 1523 he had seen both Tuchcoyotzin and Mazacoyotzin (Moctehuzuma Xocoyotzin's nephew and the last Mexica ruler in Toluca before the return of Tuchcoyotzin) reside next to where the Franciscan monastery was later erected.¹⁴ Seventy-five-year-old Juan Pastor Tonal, principal and resident of Metepec remembered how he had first met Tuchcoyotzin when he himself was already thirty years old and the former of an old age by then and many years after he had been baptized. And he had seen Tuchcoyotzin and his son Ocomachimaltzin dressed in Spanish clothing and living next to the Franciscan monastery.¹⁵

Witnesses who supported the Marquesado's side of the Toluca lawsuit, generally chose to ignore the entire part of the pre-Conquest period in the Valley's Foundation Story, with the obvious intention of "obliterating" the major role of Tenochtitlan in the guiding and directing of the developments before the Spaniards' arrival. They have thus "abandoned behind" the alliance established between Chimalteutl and Axayacatl, as well as the dramatic events leading to the conquest and burning of Calixtlahuacan's center. Their plot usually begins right away with the post-Conquest era, with the acts of evangelization in this Valley.

Juan Calli of Capuluac's testimony is, perhaps, the first direct testimony and memory beginning with the very acts of the Spanish Conquest in the Valley of Matlalzinco, in contrast with other accounts going back to Axayacatl conquest of the Valley. It represented a clear-

13 Testimony by Tomás de Ledesma, *ibid.*, f. 45v.

14 AGNM, HJ, vol. 458, leg. 277, no. 2, f. 898v.

15 AGNM, HJ, 70, exp. 4, f. 29r; AGNM, HJ, 458, leg. 277, no. 2, f. 787r.

cut accommodation of the new rule by way of establishing a memorized version of the *raison d'être* behind this accommodation. Calli was about thirty-nine years of age when the Spanish Conquest occurred. He provided the court with a first-hand testimony and memory of the most dramatic, and final acts of subjection to the Spaniards at the Toluca ridge. Calli, like many others of his peers in Capuluac, overburdened by the forced labor that they were obliged to provide the royal city of Tenochtitlan, chose to welcome the Spaniards with open arms. As he told the court, "they all came out to receive the Spanish Marqués with gifts of turkeys, and flowers", to redeem themselves of the past's burdens, as he described it to the Spanish judges. Calli thereafter recounted Hernán Cortés's grand entrance into the Grand Palace of Calixtlahuacan, and there, at the palace, the symbolic acts of submission to the Spanish Marqués, by Tochcoyotzin, the local ruler. At Quetzalcoatl's temple in Calixtlahuacan, after he had baptized him with holy water, Don Hernando Cortés ritually dressed Tochcoyotzin's naked body in Spanish garments, handed him over a golden sword and placed a silk cap on his head, thus turning him, in Calli's wording, into a "true Christian". Calli then vividly described the Franciscans' act in 1524 of erecting Santa María de los Angeles, the first church in the valley, next to the snow-covered peak of the Cerro de Toluca. He also recalled the subsequent baptizing of the entire populations of the valley, the construction in 1526 of the first Franciscan monastery there, next to the old granaries; and then, the funding of the town of Toluca through the act of bringing together several dispersed settlements of Calixtlahuacan. Nevertheless, throughout his unique testimony, not even once did Calli refer to either the period preceding the Spanish Conquest of this valley, nor to the acts of plunder and deaths that followed the conquerors' path, nor did the present emerge in his narrative as a continuance to past occurrences. This might be directly associated with what Serge Gruzinski (1998: 214-226) describes concerning the seventeenth-century Otomís' "mutilated memory" as it is envisioned from the *Relación anónima* of Querétaro: "It is as if the aim of the *Relación* were to deny the true nature of the Conquest, and the defeat and degradation of the vanquished, be these the Chichimecas or the Otomís themselves."

Finally, Pierre Nora named "memory incentives" as Places of Memory (*lieux de mémoire*). What is the crucial role of Places of

Memory – *loci memoriae* – in bringing about and reviving memory, and eventually turning it into a coherent, collective narrative of the past and thereafter into the core of the revived ethnic identity in the Valley of Matalcingo’s remembrance? One of the Places of Memory that are repeatedly reemerging in the grand narrative of indigenous memory in the Valley of Matalcingo, are the royal granaries, established in Atengo by King Axayacatl of Tenochtitlan, around 1474-1475. The royal granaries play, indeed, a focal role in the restructuring of the memory of the political, socio-economic and ethnic power-relations of subordination and dependence that existed in this valley before, and after the Spanish Conquest in the Valley of Matalcingo. It also involves the reordering of local history around the major theme of a foreign rule and local collaboration of the Chimalteutl dynasty ruling over Tulucan, with this rule. Between 1589 and 1592, out of the twenty-eight “first-hand” testimonies, eleven are directly evolved around these royal granaries. Don Domingo de San Antón Muñoz Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, the Chalca historian, tells us how, these royal granaries, in Tulucan, Metepec, Tlacotepec, Tepamaxalco, Calymayan and Tenanco were part of what Axayacatl gave to his elder sister, Chalchihnenetzin to support herself after her husband, Moquihuix, Tlaltelolco’s ruler, had abandoned her, for a younger woman and had left her in rags and starving “by the grinding stones”. His elder sister’s shame and anguish had moved Axayacatl, according to Chimalpahin’s version, to wage a heroic war against Tlaltelolco and thereafter subdue it. Accordingly, the royal granaries existed in this valley five years prior to Axayacatl’s conquest, that is, by 1471 (*Codex Chimalpahin* 1997, II: 43-45). The year 5 *Acatle*, 1471, is mentioned in the *Anales de Cuauhtitlan* as the year when boundary markers were set up in the “eagle land” (*Cuahutlalli*) in Matalcingo, delineating Cuahutitlan’s assigned land granted to them by Axayacatl in this Valley, with the representatives of the four parts of Cuahutitlan present (Carrasco 1991: 258). Thus, it is quite likely that the granaries were erected as early as that, when Axayacatl’s hold of this Valley was still premature and unstable, being engaged at the same time with other enemies to the north and west. The granaries are depicted there as a gift of condolence to a forsaken sister, a forsaken woman who endured hardships and humiliation. For this sake, as Chalco’s version of the “collective memory” recounts, Tenochtitlan went to war, and

Tlaltelolco finally came to be subdued (*Codex Chimalpahin* 1997, II: 43-45).

Bibliography

- Carrasco, Pedro (1991): *The Tenochca Empire of Ancient Mexico*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Codex Chimalpahin* (1997): *Codex Chimalpahin. Society and Politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlaltelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and Other Nahua Altepetl in Central Mexico*, 2 vols. Eds. and trans. by Arthur J. O. Anderson, and Susan Schroeder. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Durán, Fray Diego (1967): *Historia de las Indias de la Nueva España*, 2 vols. México: Editorial Porrúa.
- Gerhard, Peter (1993): *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press (revised edition).
- Gibson, Charles (1964): *The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule. A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico 1519-1810*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Greenleaf, Richard (1962): *Zumárraga and the Mexican Inquisition, 1536-1543*. Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History.
- Gruzinski, Serge (1998): "Mutilated Memory, Reconstruction of the Past and the Mechanisms of Memory among Seventeenth-Century Otomís". In: Mills/Taylor (eds.), pp. 214-226.
- Hernández Rodríguez, Rosaura (1945): *El valle de Toluca, su historia, época prehispánica y siglo XVI*. México: UNAM, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (tesis de maestría).
- Menegus Bornemann, Margarita (1991): *Del Señorío a la República de indios. El caso de Toluca, 1500-1600*. México: Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación.
- Noguez, Xavier/Wood, Stephanie (eds.) (1998): *De tlacuilcos y escribanos*. México: El Colegio de Michoacán/El Colegio Mexiquense.
- Mills, Kenneth/Taylor, William B. (eds.) (1998): *Colonial Spanish America. A Documentary History*. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Inc.
- Wood, Stephanie (1998): "El problema de la historicidad de los títulos y los Códices Techialoyan". In: Noguez/Wood (eds.), pp. 167-221.