
'Y el olor de la sangre manchaba el aire':
Tlatelolco 1521 and 1968 in
José Emilio Pacheco's
'Lectura de los "Cantares Mexicanos"'

VICTORIA CARPENTER

York St John University



Abstract

When Octavio Paz compared the Tlatelolco 1968 massacre to the conquest of the Aztec empire he created a foundation (and indeed, at times, the inspiration) for the view of the massacre as a symbol of a long-lasting internal conflict. This paper explores how the Tlatelolco 1968 poetry reflects (or appropriates) the 1521 texts. Are these texts used as extra metaphors of what happened in La Plaza de las Tres Culturas on 2 October, as links to the square's infamous past, or is there a more enduring reason for the retelling of the story of the fall of Tenochtitlán? To answer these questions, I will examine four versions of José Emilio Pacheco's poem 'Lectura de los "Cantares Mexicanos": Manuscrito de Tlatelolco (octubre 1968)'. The reading will be informed by the theory of habit (Bourdieu) and collective remembering and forgetting (Halbwachs and Bartlett).

Resumen

La comparación que hizo Octavio Paz entre la matanza de Tlatelolco en 1968 y la conquista del imperio azteca por los españoles respalda (y a veces inspira) la interpretación de la matanza como un símbolo del conflicto duradero. El presente análisis se enfoca en cómo refleja la poesía de Tlatelolco 1968 a los textos de la Conquista de 1521 o en qué se apropia de los textos coloniales. ¿Sólo sirven estos textos como más metáforas de lo que pasó en La Plaza de las Tres Culturas el 2 de octubre? ¿O son vínculos con el pasado ínfame de la plaza? ¿O hay una razón más profunda para la que se narra la caída de Tenochtitlán otra vez? Se va a analizar cuatro versiones del poema 'Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos"' de José Emilio Pacheco para buscar respuestas a esas preguntas. Las teorías de hábito (Bourdieu) y de la memoria y desmemoria colectiva (Halbwachs y Bartlett) informan nuestro estudio.

1968 was a year of worldwide turmoil and Mexico was no exception. In preparation for the Olympic Games (their opening was on 12 October in the capital), Mexico found itself amidst student protests and strikes by teachers, university

BHS 95.4 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.3828/bhs.2018.26>

professors, doctors and railway workers. Student protests were particularly detrimental to the plan of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI)¹ to present the country as a haven of democracy. Between July and October 1968 there were several serious altercations between students from vocational and preparatory schools and police and army forces in the capital.

On 23 July the *granaderos* (paramilitary riot forces) entered Vocational School No. 5 in Mexico City, following supposed reports of a gang fight on the school campus (Castillo García 2008). On 26 July, the Instituto Politécnico Nacional (IPN) and the Federación Nacional de Estudiantes Técnicos held a protest march; at the same time, the Central Nacional de Estudiantes Democráticos from the Universidad Autónoma de México marked the fifteenth anniversary of Fidel Castro's attack on the Moncada army barracks. The government considered both events a security threat and *granadero* troops were once again dispatched to disperse the demonstrations. Following the events of 26 July the government's use of force against students escalated (see Balam 1969; Zolov 1999: 119–31; Meyer, Sherman and Deeds 2007: 583–88).

On 4 August the Consejo Nacional de Huelga (CNH)² published a statement in response to the government's attack on schools and encroachment on the autonomy of university campuses. The statement contained six demands, which became the student movement's aims from this point onwards:

1. Libertad a los presos políticos. 2. Destitución de los generales Luis Cueto Ramírez y Raúl Mendiola, así como también del teniente coronel Armando Frías. 3. Extinción del Cuerpo de Granaderos, 'instrumento directo en la represión' y no creación de cuerpos semejantes. 4. Derogación del artículo 145 y 145 bis del Código Penal Federal (delito de Disolución Social), 'instrumentos jurídicos de la agresión.' 5. Indemnización de las familias de los muertos y a los heridos que fueron 'víctimas de la agresión' desde el Viernes 26 de julio en adelante. 6. Deslindamiento de responsabilidades de los 'actos de represión y vandalismo' por parte de las autoridades a través de la policía, granaderos y Ejército. (Qtd in Álvarez Garín 1998: 52)

However, these demands were largely ignored by the government and the invitation to open a dialogue was left unanswered in the fourth presidential report.

On 1 September President Díaz Ordaz delivered his fourth report, in which he talked at length about the importance of the Olympic Games for the country's image, economic development, and position on the world stage. He also explored the 'recientes conflictos' in the capital, the aim of which, he suggested, was to discredit Mexico in the upcoming Olympics. Talking about the students' actions since 23 July, he implied that these actions were inspired by outsiders and that the students were only imitating what was happening elsewhere in the world:

- 1 The PRI was Mexico's ruling party from 1929, when it was established by Plutarco Elias Calles under the name Partido Nacional Revolucionario (see Hellman 1978: 33–54).
- 2 The CNH was formed in early August 1968. Its members were students and professors of several universities and colleges in Mexico City, including UNAM and IPN. With representation in schools and universities all over the country, the CNH was the organizing force of the student movement (see, for example, Álvarez Garín 1998: 110–14; Fournier and Martínez Herrera 2009: 149–51).

'el ansia de imitación se apoderaba de centenares de jóvenes de manera servil y arrastraba a algunos adultos' (Díaz Ordaz 2006: 255). The plot was supposed to be the work of 'manos no estudiantiles' (2006: 260) and external and internal forces 'que han seguido confluyendo para tratar de agravar el conflicto' (262). Finally, Díaz Ordaz affirmed that he would follow Article 89, Section VI of the Constitution in that he would be obliged to 'disponer de la totalidad de la fuerza armada permanente o sea del ejército [...] para la seguridad interior y la defensa exterior de la Federación' (264).

The standoff between the government and the students continued with the occupation of the UNAM campus on 18–30 September (Long 2010: 128), dispersion of a silent demonstration in Zócalo on 13 September (Williams 2011: 117–20), and finally, the attack on the demonstration in Tlatelolco.

On 2 October, ten days before the Olympic opening ceremony, the CNH organized a demonstration in La Plaza de las Tres Culturas, in the residential district of Tlatelolco, Mexico City. The original plan was for the demonstration to start in the square and continue to Casco Santo Tomás, a campus of the IPN. However, with the growing presence of police and army around the square, it was decided not to proceed with the second part of the demonstration. The demonstration started around 4pm; by 6pm the demonstrators were about to leave the square. At this point, a helicopter flew over the square and several fireworks were set off. This must have been the signal to the members of Batallón Olímpia, a special task force, whose members had mixed in with the CNH representatives on the third floor of the Chihuahua building and, according to most witnesses, opened fire on the police and army troops, thus provoking a retaliatory response.³

The response was well coordinated and severe. Armed troops entered the square along with police and opened fire on the demonstrators, bystanders and reporters. In an ensuing chaos that lasted anywhere from half an hour to several hours, according to multiple witnesses, many were killed or wounded. Official reports varied from 20 dead and 75 wounded (3 October), to 30 dead and 53 wounded (4 October); finally, on 5 October [AQ1] *El Excelsior* reported 33 dead and 62 seriously wounded and these numbers were not amended any further in the press or in official statements. Neither is there a popular consensus on how many died that night; estimates range from 50 dead and 1,000 wounded (Womack Jr. 1970: 684) to at least 500 dead and several thousand wounded (Hellman 1978: 205, n. 24), although the number of 267 dead and 1,200 wounded (reported by a *Guardian* sports correspondent, John Rodda (2010: 18) is generally accepted as reasonably accurate.

Octavio Paz summed up the massacre succinctly and bitterly in his letter to Antonio Carrillo Flores on 4 October 1968: 'Las fuerzas armadas dispararon

3 The members of Batallón Olímpia were wearing a white glove or had a white cloth wrapped around their arm. The image of a white glove appears in Tlatelolco poems and testimonials, including police reports (see, for example, Del-Río 1985: 274; Poniatowska 2008: 176, 182).

contra una multitud compuesta en su mayoría por estudiantes. El resultado: más de 25 muertos, centenares de heridos y un millar de personas en la cárcel. No describiré a Ud mi estado de ánimo. Me imagino que es el de la mayoría de los mexicanos: tristeza y cólera' (qtd in Sheridan 2011).⁴ The massacre soon became the subject of many passionate debates. The majority of texts produced outside the state discourse tried to establish 'what happened' and find out 'the truth' about the events in Tlatelolco (see Carpenter 2015); this, arguably, became the principal aim of 'la literatura de Tlatelolco' (see Leal 1979). Some texts went back to the times of the Spanish conquest to seek the explanation for the extreme violence of '2 de octubre' in Mexico's past. Among these texts is José Emilio Pacheco's poem 'Lectura de los "Cantares Mexicanos"', in which a narrative of the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire is used to tell the story of the 1968 massacre by metaphorically '[p]ledging history to serve the present' (Campos 2001: 56).

Pacheco released four versions of the poem 'Lectura de los "Cantares Mexicanos"' between 1968 and 2000. The first version ('Lectura de los "cantares mexicanos"') was published in the periodical *La cultura en México* on 6 November 1968. The second version ('Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos": Manuscrito de Tlatelolco (octubre 1968)') appears in the collection *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo* (1969), and is the one that most studies consider the definitive one (see, for example, Campos and Toledo 1996: 88–89; Friis 2000). The third ('Manuscrito de Tlatelolco') was included in a revised edition of *No me preguntes* (1980) included in the compilation *Tarde y temprano*. Now the poem comprised two distinct parts – 'Lectura de los "cantares mexicanos", Octubre 2, 1968' and 'Las voces de Tlatelolco, Octubre 2, 1978'. The second part, 'un poema colectivo e involuntario' (Pacheco 1980: 66), reproduces short quotations 'de las narraciones orales y, en menor medida, de las noticias periodísticas' (1980: 66) used by Elena Poniatowska in *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971; see Poniatowska 2008). The fourth and final version of the poem, 'Manuscrito de Tlatelolco (2 de octubre de 1968)' appears in the last, expanded edition of *No me preguntes* (2000) included in a new edition of *Tarde y temprano*. In this version, the first part ('Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos"') is significantly shortened and the second part ('Las voces de Tlatelolco (2 de octubre de 1978; diez años después)') is credited rather curtly to Poniatowska with a single phrase 'Con los textos reunidos por Elena Poniatowska en *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971)' (Pacheco 2000: [AQ3] 68).

This is not an isolated case of Pacheco rewriting his already published work; this has been noted by critics as evidence of his philosophy of authorship. Throughout his poetic career, Pacheco saw humanity as full of contradictions and imperfections; its history is full of complexities, injustices and ongoing conflicts. Pacheco assigns poetry the role of ordering the chaos, not by rewriting history, but by recording what happens and thus protesting against the chaos (see de Villena 1986: 30–31); this recording also reveals 'fatalidad histórica' as

4 For a detailed account of Octavio Paz's reaction to the Tlatelolco massacre and his resignation from the post of a cultural ambassador to India, see Sheridan 2004: 487–95.

part of Mexico's national identity (Ruiz-Pérez 2008: 40). Critics have noted the **changing** nature of Pacheco's poetry – both in the changes it expects from the world and in the changes it undergoes as the poet rewrites his work, arguably in response to the changing world around him. Intertextual influences on Pacheco's work, Friis argues, contributed to Pacheco's view of the author 'not as a creator of original works, but instead an arranger of textual collages' (Friis 2002: 20). The poststructuralist approach to authorship is evident in Pacheco's rewriting already published works, as is the case with the collection *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo*, which was published three times: in 1969 as a separate volume, and in 1980 and 2000 as part of the compilation *Tarde o temprano*.

This study offers a posthegemonic reading of the four versions of Pacheco's poem 'Lectura de los cantares mexicanos' from the point of view of the theories of habit (Bourdieu 1990) and affect (Deleuze and Guattari 1988). I argue that, in the case of 'Lectura', an affective event from the nation's distant past imprints itself onto the collective conscience and is kept **in collective memory** by affective frameworks so that it becomes habit. The emotions associated with the fall of Tenochtitlán have long since subsided into low-level anxiety (the principal characteristic of habit – see Beasley-Murray 2010: 168–70), but the massacre stirs up those emotions again – this time through Pacheco's reframing of the event in 'Lectura' – and what has been familiar for many years is once again poignant. The old memory **is also imbued** with new images and new affect, different from the original in content but similar in the resulting emotions.

Habit, affect and memory

First, I would like to explore the concept of habit in relation to the theory of posthegemony. Posthegemonic order is seen as an extension of hegemony, arising at the point when hegemony no longer functions as an effective tool of social organization or as a single, all-pervading and successful power mechanism (Franco 1997: 270; Yúdice 1995: 4; Moreiras 2001: 285–92). Briefly, posthegemony is 'the shift from a rhetoric of persuasion to a regime in which what counts are the effects produced and orchestrated by affective investment in the social' (Beasley-Murray 2003: 120). Posthegemony represents the relationship between affect, habit, and multitude.

Under posthegemonic conditions, affect forces the interaction of social bodies to go beyond the production of feelings: 'Affect is the active discharge of emotion, the counterattack [...]. Affects are projectiles just like weapons; feelings are introceptive like tools' (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 400). Affect is the essence of primacy and excess and emotions are its aftermath. Emotions lead to the change in the securing of social order, or what Pierre Bourdieu calls habit (Bourdieu 1977: 72; Bourdieu 1990: 53), and unite the populace into a cogent social unit. This unit, or the multitude, is 'an internally different, multiple social subject whose constitution and action is based not on identity or unity (or, much less, indifference) but on what it has in common' (Hardt and Negri 2004: 100). The

multitude is then guided into action by a shared emotional sphere rather than a single locus of power external to the multitude. However, a shared emotional sphere is difficult to sustain without affect reigniting it.

When affect subsides, habit restores itself; emotional residue experienced as low-level anxiety (Beasley-Murray 2010: 168), keeps us safely ensconced in a familiar routine. Bourdieu extends the idea of habit to habitus, ‘a product of history’, and posits that ‘[Habitus] ensures the active presence of past experiences, which, deposited in each organism in the form of schemes of perception, thought and action, tend to guarantee the “correctness” of practices and their constancy over time’ (Bourdieu 1990: 54).

Beasley-Murray sees affect and habit as opposite (and conflicting) conditions of social order: ‘rather than the violence and social intensity of affective experience emphasized by Deleuze, an intensity incarnated in nomadic escape or in terror, Bourdieu points to a low-intensity resonance that tends to preserve, transmit, and reproduce social order in everyday life’ (Beasley-Murray 2010: 201). I would argue, however, that they both refer to the same ‘order of bodies’ but from two different points: Deleuze focuses on the moment of initial interaction (affect), while Bourdieu highlights the aftermath (habitus). I would also posit that if the affective resonance at the moment of interaction is sufficiently strong (emotions produced are shared by all and persist over time), social order will be reproduced not with ‘a low-intensity resonance’ but with a strong emotional foundation which will be influencing those coming into contact with it. In the case of the reproduction of the 1521 discourse, this emotional foundation is replicated in the Tlatelolco 1968 poetry rather faithfully: the same emotional resonance appears in Pacheco’s poems not only in direct quotations from the originals but also in the fact that the quotations selected contain the strongest expressions of these emotions and that all the quotations share the same emotions of anger, grief, and shame. This emotional triangle is the enduring resonance that keeps the Tlatelolco discourse from sliding completely into habitus and helps it remain within the affective sphere (Carpenter 2015: 42–44). Even if sometimes it moves to the margins of low-level anxiety, an anniversary will help resurrect it closer to the affective epicentre.

The nature of habitus is ingrained in enduring social practices, which represent logical and practical durability. We can see the connection between social practices and the need for remembering the past. In order to react to the past (emotionally or otherwise), humans involve memory and imagination: ‘The desire to know the past [...] is ... served by imagination, which supplements or takes the place of memory when the latter fails’ (Shils 1981: 52). I would argue that imagination is used not to recreate a fading memory accurately, but to restore the affective aspect of the events being remembered. How does this affective aspect demonstrate itself in collective memory? I have argued previously that it becomes the driving force behind remembering and retaining an event (Carpenter 2015: 40) in the form of a cultural product, which ‘should be taken as rhetorical artifices and not as depositories of data from which a factual truth

may be construed' (Rabasa 1993: 9). Thus, in the relationship between affective endurance and factual accuracy, the re-establishment of the original emotional reaction to the event is more important than an accurate retelling of the event.

Maurice Halbwachs' theory of collective memory introduces the notion of social memory networks as a necessary condition of remembering: 'there exists a collective memory and social frameworks for memory; it is to the degree that our individual thought places itself in these frameworks and participates in this memory that it is capable of the act of recollection' (Halbwachs 1992: 38). These frameworks are formed as a result of social interactions: 'it is in society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in society that they recall, recognize, and localize their memories. [...] most frequently, we appeal to our memory only in order to answer questions which others have asked us, or that we suppose they could have asked us' (1992: 38). The frameworks sustain themselves through multiple recurring recollections of the past: 'various capacities for memory aid each other and are of mutual assistance to each other. But what we call the collective framework of memory would then be only the result, or sum, or combination of individual recollection of many members of society' (39). The events that might destroy the continuity of a particular group (or society as a whole) are erased from the collective memory: 'society, in each period, rearranges its recollections in such a way as to adjust them to the variable conditions of its equilibrium' (183). We could also argue that these recollections are adjusted to restore some of the original affect of the event in order to strengthen the group to which the event belongs. Would, in the case of Tlatelolco, such strengthening damage the rest of society? The emotions created by the original affect are so fundamental to human condition (compassion for the weaker, the need to protect children, the sorrow of loss) that the fabric of society would only strengthen if they were evoked. The part that would be damaged is the corrupt government, whose actions caused the original affect – and one might argue that this is indeed an alien inclusion in the body of society and should therefore be removed.

Forgetting is the erasing of social memory frameworks when they are no longer applicable or worthy of retaining: '[forgetting] is explained by the disappearance of these frameworks or of a part of them, either because our attention is no longer able to focus on them or because it is focused somewhere else' (Halbwachs 1992: 172). The change of frameworks determines the nature of remembered events and this can change as society changes: 'society represents the past to itself in different ways: it modifies its conventions. As every one of its members accepts these conventions, they inflect their recollections in the same direction in which collective memory evolves' (1992: 173). As our analysis of Pacheco's poems will show, the placement of old memories into new contexts does not necessarily erase old frameworks but rather replaces them with an updated version, once again imbued with affect.

Of course, Halbwachs' ideas drew their measure of criticism. Holtorf does not see Halbwachs' theory as applicable to the reading of history because, as he states,

'Halbwachs excepts the academic study of history from such social influences and thus maintains a strong division between history and memory. According to Halbwachs, it would, in principle, be possible to distil accurate memories of the past by removing the social layers of individual accounts, thus bringing to light the originally archived item' (Holtorf 2007: n. p.). However, I would argue that Halbwachs' social frameworks of memory are very similar to Bourdieu's view of the endurance of habitus through the replication of social practices. Halbwachs' study also echoes Bartlett's idea of 'schemata': 'social conventions, institutions and traditions formed by persistent group tendencies constitute "group schemata"; just as the individual images, ideas and trains of thought formed by persistent personal interests constitute "individual schemata"' (Bartlett 1932: 299). I propose that the emotional triangle of anger, grief, and shame appears in the colonial texts and is therefore ingrained in the collective memory as one of the 'group schemata'.

The relationship between affect and collective memory offers an interesting perspective for our analysis: 'When a group is faced with a threat of sudden crisis it often seems to adopt a form of response which runs counter to its recent social history, but is at the same time closely related to a more distant past' (1932: 297). This is what Pacheco's poems suggest in their texts (as does Octavio Paz's *Posdata* of 1970 (see Paz 1972)): the Tlatelolco massacre is remembered as an event similar to the Conquest, even though there have been many other violent events in Mexico's past.

However, remembering an event is not as straightforward as simply calling it up from the depths of the collective memory: 'Even at the moment of reproducing the past our imagination remains under the influence of the present social milieu' (Halbwachs 1992: 49). When texts construct the Tlatelolco massacre narrative shortly or immediately after the event, they automatically place it in the familiar/ accepted social context (or habit): the state is evil, the press is lying, the students are either troublemakers or *crème de la crème* of our hopes for a better future, evil (outside or inside) forces infiltrated the movement to destroy it or Mexico, there is an outside threat to Mexico, etc. This milieu is the habit. When affect arises it gets wrapped up in this habit, which then breaks under the force of affect, releases emotions, and changes. So habit contributes to the social memory frameworks but the contribution is coloured by the emotions released when affect happens: the government is evil and we are angry; the press is lying and we are angry; many innocent people are dead and we grieve. Emotions and habit combine to form a social memory framework; neither emotions nor the 'present social milieu' context can be removed without destroying the framework and forgetting the event.

In earlier studies of the Tlatelolco poetry I have identified an emotional cycle of anger/ disbelief/ shame which supplements (or, at times replaces) the description of the massacre (Carpenter 2005: 504, 510); later, the cycle was amended to include grief in place of disbelief (Carpenter 2015: 41). This cycle is the defining feature of the Tlatelolco public discourse. Affect creates a permanent foundation

of social memory frameworks if it produces the anger/ grief/ shame cycle. The texts evoking these emotions will be deemed the most reliable or believable and are more likely to remain in the centre of public attention even if they carry fragmented or incomplete information about the massacre (or even no factual information about the massacre at all). We shall address this hypothesis as we analyse the four versions of 'Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos"' and sixteenth-century accounts of the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire.

Origins of 'Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos"'

First, we will examine the sources of the texts used by Pacheco in the poems. In the first edition of *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo* (where the second version of the poem appears), he cites the origin as follows: 'Con los textos traducidos del náhuatl por el Padre Ángel María Garibay' (Pacheco 1969: AQ3 22). We expect these to be direct translations from AQ5 Náhuatl⁵ to Spanish; however, no single text matches this criterion. Instead, there are two separate collections of texts brought together in the titles of the three poems: *Cantares mexicanos* and *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco* (also known as *Manuscrito anónimo de Tlatelolco*).

The most definitive collection of *Cantares mexicanos* was published in 1904 as a folio of copies of Náhuatl manuscripts. The songs included in the volume represent pre-Conquest and Conquest periods and are taken from several codices, such as *Códice Borgia*, compiled by Padre José Lino Fábrega (Fábrega 1890), and *Códice Florentino* (also known as *La Historia Universal de las Cosas de Nueva España* or *La Historia General de las Cosas de Nueva España*), written by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún (Sahagún 2008). Among the songs included in *Cantares mexicanos*, there are 20 ritual poems extolling various deities; these were dictated to Fray Bernardino de Sahagún by a number of local elders (Garibay 1962: ix). Rather than being just about the Conquest, these songs were sung for generations before Hernán Cortés arrived in Mexico: 'Por medio de esos cánticos, aprendidos de memoria hasta por los pequeños en los colegios, se trasmitían de padre á hijo las más antiguas y minuciosas tradiciones' (Fábrega 1890: 12). Daniel Brinton's study (one of the first contributions to the study of Náhuatl poetry and the first attempt at translating *Cantares* into English) suggests that they were recorded shortly after the Conquest, although some of them are much older (Brinton 1887: 49–51). González Cosío and Peñafiel support Brinton's findings in the introduction to their edition of *Cantares mexicanos* (1904: 16); Garibay also confirms that *Cantares mexicanos* is a collection of songs from different periods, both pre- and post-Conquest (Garibay 1962: ix).

The texts were translated by Garibay into Spanish and first published in 1940 in a collection *Poesía indígena de la altiplanicie: divulgación literaria*. The authorship

5 Náhuatl is a language of the Aztecs or Mexicas. It belongs to the Uto-Aztec language family (one of the largest families of North American languages) along with Comanche, Shoshone, Tarahumara, Cora, and other languages spoken in the USA and Mexico. Náhuatl is still spoken in Central and Southern Mexico (Dakin 2001; also see Welker 2014).

of these poems is unclear: even if a poem is titled ‘Canto de [name]’, it can be read as a song both about and by someone. Garibay concludes that ‘de los labios de la colectividad los recogió la escritura’ (1962: xviii). Some poems in *Cantares mexicanos* are often attributed to Nezahualcōyotl, although this authorship can be contested (xviii). Nezahualcōyotl (1402–1472) was a warrior and a ruler (*tlaoani*) of Texcoco; having received excellent education as a child, he wrote poems and philosophical texts (see Brinton 1887: 35–47; León-Portilla 1975: 39–56; 1979; 2000). His poems combine elation and doom in a way that is suggestive of affective experiences. He also wrote extensively about searching for ‘el Dador de la Vida’, an elusive deity of life and death (León-Portilla 1979: 40). The reference to this deity appears in the first two versions of Pacheco’s poem.

Garibay expanded the collection later and released it as *Poesía Náhuatl: Cantares mexicanos* in 1965. In the introduction, Garibay makes a statement that will be pertinent to our analysis of Pacheco’s poems: ‘Hubo manifestaciones del sentimiento personal, ya no colectivo. [...] La visión del conjunto y el sentido de la colectividad ahogaban la expresión personal, pero debemos pensar que no hubo medio de conservación de poemas que directamente no interesaran a la comunidad’ (Garibay 1965: viii). We can draw a parallel between this statement and the way social memory frameworks are created and maintained, according to Halbwachs’ theory. These songs form collective habit; individuals’ personal feelings are not kept in the collective memory even though most songs are written in the first person singular. In other words, there is a shared emotional sphere created in these texts. The events which are deemed important to the nature of society are protected in the collective memory; I would add that the importance of these events will be linked to the power of the emotional context in which the events are placed. The stronger the emotions, the more enduring the memory of the event.

The second text, *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco*, has a more complicated history. The first translation of the manuscript from Náhuatl was to German. The translation by Ernst Mengin, published in 1939 (*Anales de Tlatelolco* 1939–40), was adopted by scholars as the single definitive version and used as the foundation for later translations into Spanish. The first such translation is by Heinrich Berlin and Robert H. Barlow, published in Mexico in 1948 (*Anales de Tlatelolco* 1948): ‘asumió con ello la mayoría de las divergencias del texto de Mengin’ (*Anales de Tlatelolco* 1999: 7). Then Garibay amended the translation of the part which told the story of the Conquest; this version is now referred to as ‘Códice de Tlatelolco’. In 1999, a new interpretation of Mengin’s translation was released by Suzanne Klaus. Although the two translations carry the same information, the language varies. Affective immediacy of the events of 1521, while part of the collective memory of the event, is subjective in the way it is phrased by the individuals recording it. We will explore this in more detail later in the study.

In the third version of the poem, published in 1980, Pacheco edits the reference to the Náhuatl texts: ‘Con los textos que tradujo del náhuatl el padre Ángel María Garibay y Miguel León-Portilla dio a conocer en *Visión de los vencidos*

(1959)' (Pacheco 1980: 65). *Visión de los vencidos* was first published in 1950 as León-Portilla and Garibay's translation and interpretation of *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco*. The preface to the 29th edition quotes Pacheco's description of the book: 'un gran poema épico de los orígenes de nuestra nacionalidad... un libro clásico y una obra indispensable para todos los mexicanos' (León-Portilla 2007: 3). *Visión* combines excerpts from *Cantares mexicanos* and various codices (including *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco* and *La relación de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl*, included in *Códice Florentino*) to produce the story of the Conquest as told by the 'vencidos' – the Mexicas (Aztecs). We will note the irony of seeing the Mexicas, themselves conquerors of many local tribes, as victims of the merciless Spanish sword, to use González Cosío's and Peñafiel's metaphor (1904: 16), and move on to the exploration of the way one of the accounts of the Conquest is used to tell the story of the 1968 Tlatelolco massacre.

Pacheco's readings of 'Cantares mexicanos'

The four versions of Pacheco's poem contain quotations from León-Portilla's and Garibay's 1950 adaptation of *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco* and Garibay's 1940 translation of *Cantares mexicanos*. The texts are not quoted verbatim; this is done, arguably, 'con el fin de condensar e intensificar la tensión poética' (Soto-Duggan 1983–84: 248). Pacheco's rereading of *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco* later led to him write about the Conquest in more detail. In a later collection, *Islas a la deriva* (1976), a section titled 'Antigüedades mexicanas' is inspired by Book XII of *Códice Florentino*, which tells the story of Hernán Cortés laying siege to Tenochtitlán and conquering the Aztec empire.

Surprisingly, 'Lectura' has not been studied much. There are only a few analyses which explore the poem as an example of intertextuality in Pacheco's poetry. Critics acknowledge the multiplicity of voices and the cyclic nature of history in 'Lectura' (see, for example, Dorra 2006; Friis 2000; Friis 2002: 89–108), but none of the critiques go beyond this predictable conclusion. Nor do the studies of Pacheco's poetry compare the four versions of the poem; most analyses concentrate on the second version (published in 1969). Some critics note the fact that none of the versions have Pacheco's own words in it; all agree that this is done to give the reader a first-hand account of what happened, complete with the emotions felt by the eyewitnesses at the time (see de Villena 1986: 33–34; Aguilera 2013: 213–14). María Luisa Fischer's analysis posits that the narrative of the two massacres creates 'un tiempo que circula libremente entre el pasado y el presente, en que los textos de los otros, recogidos, citados y pegoteados en los poemas aluden simultáneamente al pasado de la conquista española y al presente de la escritura' (Fischer 1990: 132–33). A notable exception is Carmen Dolores Carrillo Juárez's study, which describes 'Lectura' as 'un poema polifónico tejido con testimonios de las víctimas de las matanzas ocurridas en Tlatelolco, espacio en el que tuvieron lugar la perpetrada por Pedro de Alvarado y la consumada por el ejército durante la presidencia de Gustavo Díaz Ordaz' (Carrillo Juárez 2009: 146).

To make the following analysis easier to navigate, we include full texts of the four versions of the poem below:⁶

1. LECTURA DE LOS ‘CANTARES MEXICANOS’

El llanto se extiende
 gotean las lágrimas
 allí en Tlatelolco,
 (Porque ese día hicieron
 una de las mayores crueldades
 que sobre los desventurados mexicanos
 se ha hecho en esta tierra.)
 Cuando todos se hubieron reunido,
 los hombres en armas de guerra,
 los hombres que hacen estruendo,
 ataviados de hierro
 fueron a cerrar las salidas.
 las entradas, los pasos.
 (Sus perros van por delante,
 los van precediendo.)
 Entonces se oyó el estruendo,
 entonces se alzaron los gritos,
 Muchos maridos buscaban a sus mujeres.
 Unas llevaban en brazos a sus hijos pequeños.
 Con perfidia fueron muertos,
 sin saberlo murieron.
 Y el olor de la sangre mojava el aire
 Y el olor de la sangre mojava el aire.
 Y los padres y madres alzaban el llanto.
 Fueron llorados.
 se hizo la lamentación de los muertos
 Los mexicanos estaban muy temerosos:
 miedo y vergüenza los dominaban.
 Y todo eso pasó con nosotros.
 Con esta lamentosa y triste suerte
 nos vimos angustiados
 En la montaña de los alaridos,
 en los jardines de la greda
 se ofrecen sacrificios
 ante la montaña de las águilas
 donde se tiende la niebla de los escudos.
 Ah yo nací en la guerra florida,
 yo soy mexicano.
 Sufro, mi corazón se llena de pena.
 Veo la desolación que se cierne sobre el templo,
 cuando todos los escudos se abrasan en llamas.
 En los caminos yacen dardos rotos.

6 In the text we refer to different versions as ‘first version’ (for Pacheco 1968), ‘second version’ (for Pacheco 1969), and so on.

Las casas están destechadas.
 Enrojecidos tienen sus muros.
 Gusanos pululan por calles y plazas,
 Golpeamos los muros de adobe
 y es nuestra herencia
 una red de agujeros.
 Esto es lo que ha hecho el Dador de la Vida
 allí en Tlatelolco.
 (Pacheco 1968: vi)

2. LECTURA DE LOS 'CANTARES MEXICANOS':
 MANUSCRITO DE TLATELOLCO (OCTUBRE 1968)

Cuando todos se hubieron reunido,
 los hombres en armas de guerra
 fueron a cerrar las salidas.
 las entradas, los pasos.
 Sus perros van por delante,
 los van precediendo.

Entonces se oyó el estruendo,
 entonces se alzaron los gritos.
 Muchos maridos buscaban a sus mujeres.
 Unos llevaban en brazos a sus hijos pequeños.
 Con perfidia fueron muertos,
 sin saberlo murieron.

Y el olor de la sangre mojaba el aire
 Y el olor de la sangre manchaba el aire.

Y los padres y madres alzaban el llanto.
 Fueron llorados.
 Se hizo la lamentación de los muertos.
 Los mexicanos estaban muy temerosos:
 Miedo y vergüenza los dominaban.

Y todo eso pasó con nosotros.
 Con esta lamentable y triste suerte
 nos vimos angustiados.

En la montaña de los alaridos,
 en los jardines de la greda
 se ofrecen sacrificios
 ante la montaña de las águilas
 donde se tiende la niebla de los escudos.

Ah yo nací en la guerra florida,
 yo soy mexicano.
 Sufro, mi corazón se llena de pena.
 Veo la desolación que se cierne sobre el templo,
 cuando todos los escudos se abrasan en llamas.

En los caminos yacen dardos rotos.
 Las casas están destechadas.
 Enrojecidos tienen sus muros.
 Gusanos pululan por calles y plazas.

Golpeamos los muros de adobe
 y es nuestra herencia
 una red de agujeros.

Esto es lo que ha hecho el Dador de la Vida
 allí en Tlatelolco.
 (Pacheco 1969: 21–22)

3. MANUSCRITO DE TLATELOLCO

1. Lectura de los ‘cantares mexicanos’ Octubre 2, 1968

Cuando todos se hallaban reunidos
 los hombres en armas de guerra
 cerraron salidas, entradas y pasos.
 Entonces se oyó el estruendo,
 Se alzaron los gritos.
 Los maridos buscaban a sus mujeres.
 Llevaban en brazos a sus hijos pequeños.
 Con perfidia fueron muertos.
 Sin saberlo murieron.

Y el olor de la sangre manchaba el aire.

Y los padres y madres alzaron el llanto.
 Fueron llorados.
 Se lloró por los muertos.
 Los mexicanos estaban muy temerosos.
 Miedo y vergüenza los dominaban.

Y todo esto pasó con nosotros.
 Con esta lamentable y triste suerte
 nos vimos angustiados.

En los caminos yacen dardos rotos.
 Las casas están destechadas.
 Enrojecidos tienen sus muros.
 Gusanos pululan por calles y plazas.
 Golpeamos los muros de adobe
 y es nuestra herencia una red de agujeros.
 (Pacheco 1980: 65–66)

4. MANUSCRITO DE TLATELOLCO (2 DE OCTUBRE DE 1968)

1. Lectura de los ‘Cantares Mexicanos’

Cuando todos se hallaban reunidos
 los hombres en armas de guerra cerraron
 las entradas, salidas y pasos.
 Se alzaron los gritos.

Fue escuchado el estruendo de muerte.
 Manchó el aire el olor de la sangre.
 La vergüenza y el miedo cubrieron todo.
 Nuestra suerte fue amarga y lamentable.
 Se ensañó con nosotros la desgracia.

Golpeamos los muros de adobe.
 Es toda nuestra herencia una red de agujeros.
 (Pachecho 2000: 67–68)

The main difference between the four versions of 'Lectura' is the amount of quoted material from *Visión de los vencidos*. The first version, published on 6 November 1968, is the longest. Unbroken into stanzas, it delivers a continuous 'llanto', mourning the day when 'hicieron / una de las mayores crueldades / que sobre los desventurados mexicanos / se ha hecho en esta tierra' (Pachecho 1968: ll. 4–7). This quotation, included in the parenthesis at the start of the poem, comes from *La relación de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl* about the fall of Tenochtitlán. The quotation is probably the strongest indication of the link between the fall of Tenochtitlán and the 1968 Tlatelolco massacre. In the *relación*, the unity of 'los mexicanos' is not what the 1968 narrative would refer to – 'los mexicanos' in the 1521 texts are a single tribe (albeit the most powerful in the region), not the whole country. The *relación* then proceeds to tell how 'Los tlaxcaltecas y otras naciones que no estaban bien con los mexicanos, se vengaban de ellos muy cruelmente de lo pasado, y les saquearon cuanto tenían' (León-Portilla 2007: 126), so the unity suggested by the context of 1968 is not present in the 1521 narrative. This implies that the link between the two events is more symbolic than factual: we should rely on the 1521 texts for the emotional impact of the massacre rather than an explanation of why the massacre happened. The first line of the first (1968) version of 'Lectura' is a telling example of this emotional impact: 'El llanto se extiende'. The emotional sphere created by the poem is that of grief ('El llanto se extiende', 'Y los padres y madres alzaban el llanto', 'Sufro, mi corazón se llena de pena'), fear ('Muchos maridos buscaban a sus mujeres' and 'Los mexicanos estaban muy temerosos'), and bitter resignation ('Esto es lo que ha hecho el Dador de la Vida / allí en Tlatelolco'). We should note that grief is the strongest emotion in this version.

In the second (1969) version, the omission of the first seven lines of the first version creates a different atmosphere. Rather than grieving from the start, the poem sets out a much more tense scene: 'Cuando todos se hubieron reunido, / los hombres en armas de guerra / fueron a cerrar las salidas' (Pachecho 1969: ll. 1–3). The confrontation implied in the juxtaposition of 'todos' and 'los hombres en armas de guerra' connotes anger rather than resignation or grief. We would expect a fight (however one-sided) instead of a 'llanto'; the possibility of a different outcome (by miracle, since 'todos' are encircled by 'hombres en armas de guerra' accompanied by dogs) does exist, whereas in the first version 'el llanto' opening the poem precludes any outcome other than death. The new opening lines also imply the suddenness of the event because the outcome is unclear; in the first version, there is a sense of *fait accompli*, which is absent from all the

other versions. So rather than the massacre being predetermined and therefore something to resign oneself to, it becomes a shock and, therefore, an emotional reaction to it should be different. In other words, the first version is an example of habit: the massacre is presented as inevitability, which is now part of the nation's identity. The second version is an example of affect: it recreates the moment the conflict unfolded, thus stirring the original emotions associated with the massacre. The similarities between the two versions suggest that affect and habit are the two equally strong components of the social memory framework preserving the two massacres in the collective memory.

In the second version, the first three stanzas create an atmosphere of increased tension and anger in the images of dogs chasing people, people screaming and running in search of their families. References to women and small children appear in all Tlatelolco 1968 narratives; the reaction to this image is, predictably, anger and grief that the most vulnerable (along with old women) suffer unnecessarily. The moment when anger turns to grief is marked by two lines with a similar rhythm and wording: 'Y el olor de la sangre mojava el aire. / Y el olor de la sangre manchaba el aire' (Pacheco 1969: II, 13–14). The repetition of most of the line, with the exception of the verb ('mojava' vs. 'manchaba') is like the beating of a drum: it breaks the poem in two, with the second section revealing the extent of the massacre. The verb 'mojava' shocks the reader because of the amount of blood it would take to make the air wet. The poem then evokes shame through grief and pain: the smell of blood suggests many casualties for whom the narrator grieves; the atmosphere is besmirched by the bloodshed and those causing the bloodshed should be ashamed of their actions. Grief continues to dominate the second part of the poem, as the narrator joins those who witnessed the massacre of 1968 ('y todo eso pasó con nosotros'). Interestingly, in the third version of 'Lectura', the line is 'Y todo esto pasó con nosotros' (Pacheco 1980: I, 16); the line is absent in the fourth version of the poem. The distancing of the event in the first two versions ('eso') suggests that the memory of the original event (the fall of Tenochtitlán in 1521) is what affects the perception of the 1968 massacre. On the other hand, the close proximity of the event in 'esto' in the third (1980) version indicates that the present event affects the memory of the earlier one, as discussed in Halbwachs 1992: 49.

Stanzas six and seven of the second version do not appear in *Visión de los vencidos*; judging by the imagery of sacrificial practices and 'guerra florida', the stanzas are from *Cantares mexicanos*. The following seven lines are from 'Canto de danza' (Garibay 1962: 90–92):

En la montaña de los alaridos,
 en los jardines de la greda
 se ofrecen sacrificios
 ante la montaña de las águilas
 donde se tiende la niebla de los escudos.
 Ah yo nací en la guerra florida,
 yo soy mexicano.

(Pacheco 1968: II, 32–38; Pacheco 1969: II, 23–29)

The images of 'montaña de los alaridos' and 'los jardines de la greda' are metaphors for the battlefield (see Garibay 1962: 137). The next three lines ('Sufro, mi corazón se llena de pena. / Veo la desolación que se cierne sobre el templo, / cuando todos los escudos se abrasan en llamas', Pacheco 1968: ll. 39–41; Pacheco 1969: ll. 30–32) are from Song III of 'Cantos de primavera' (Garibay 1962: 108). Both sources are included in the section 'Poemas de carácter lírico' of Garibay's collection *Poesía indígena de la altiplanicie*, mainly because they express more emotions than the poems in the 'Poemas de carácter heroico' (narratives of historical or mythical events) or 'Himnos rituales' (written for religious celebrations). It is very likely that the two poems describe pre-Conquest battles ('donde hacen estruendo los variados Águilas y Tigres' (1968: ll. 107), even though a reference to Oquitzin, king of Azcapotzalco, who ruled when the Spaniards arrived (1969: ll. 160), suggests that the five poems grouped under the title 'Cantos de primavera' were written during or shortly after the Conquest. On the other hand, Brinton, referring to Fray Diego Durán's *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España* (1867: 233), postulates that the songs combine actual events with idiosyncratic metaphors, local dialects, and renditions of ancient myths (Brinton 1887: 27). Therefore, it is understandable why 'Cantos de primavera' deliver a narrative about the Conquest, a battle between local tribes and a religious celebration of Xippe Totec as a single cohesive narrative. It should also be noted that, for the Mexicas, war was 'una institución sagrada y el ápice supremo de la oblación religiosa' (Garibay 1962: xiii); hence there would not be the same reaction to death in battle as to an attack on unarmed civilians.

So the above stanzas are definitely out of place in 'Lectura': they are about a ritual practice that does not give rise to anger and grief (even though it does arouse emotions – pride, for one, for being able to experience 'muerte florida en la guerra florida'), but the rest of Pacheco's poem is about an act of violence that is not ritual, so it provokes anger and grief. As a result, the inclusion of the two stanzas interferes with the building up of an emotional sphere of grief transforming into shame. The subsequent separation of 'nosotros' and 'yo' threatens the unity of 'los mexicanos' and ostensibly distracts the reader from experiencing (or, at least, identifying with) the grief and shame of the fall of Tenochtitlán. This, in turn, makes the return to the unity of 'nosotros' contrived and the reader is left doubting the authenticity of emotions in the remainder of the poem.

There is one more point to consider regarding the origins of the quotations in 'Lectura'. In *Manuscrito de Tlatelolco* there are eight stories from which Pacheco draws the quotations for 'Lectura': 'La matanza de Cholula', 'Los españoles atacan a los mexicas', 'La reacción de los mexicas', 'El llanto por los muertos', 'Los mexicas sitian a los españoles', 'La gente mexicana se refugia en Tlatelolco', 'Descripción épica de la ciudad sitiada', and 'Se ha perdido el pueblo mexicana'. However, the poem presents them as a single, coherent text. It could be suggested that the creation of a particular emotional sphere in the text is more important than historical accuracy, but this would imply that León-Portilla's version is factually accurate. Considering that it is an adaptation of a translation of a trans-

lation, we cannot assume that it relates the events of 1521 faithfully; instead, León-Portilla's text creates an emotional sphere in which the Mexicas become a symbol of the fracture of the habit that the Conquest brought to the region. In short, the affect of the Conquest caused an enduring emotional reaction: grief, anger, and shame. The same three emotions appear in the 1968 Tlatelolco massacre narratives. I do not posit that the emotional triangle is the product of the Conquest – instead, the Conquest and the Tlatelolco massacre are two examples of the same process of affective interaction of **bodies: posthegemonic order**. The manipulation of *Visión de los vencidos* in 'Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos"' (as *Visión* did with *Cantares mexicanos*, *Manuscrito anónimo de Tlatelolco*, and other texts) creates a particular **affective context** that would contribute to the social memory framework of the event. As *Visión* adapted to the changing environment, so did the reading of it in 'Lectura'.

We will proceed with the above hypothesis, exploring the remaining two versions of 'Lectura'. They present a much shorter reading of *Visión de los vencidos*. In the third (1980) and fourth (2000) versions, the reading of the Conquest texts is supplemented by a longer reading of excerpts from Elena Poniatowska's *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971). For the purpose of this paper, we will focus on the quotations from *Visión de los vencidos*, reserving the analysis of the quotations from Poniatowska's work for a later study.

The last two versions of 'Lectura' paint a rather different emotional picture to the first two. The third version is slightly shorter than the second one; the two most notable omissions are the line 'y el olor de la sangre mojava el aire' and two stanzas which do not appear in *Visión de los vencidos* ('En la montaña de los alaridos' and 'Ah yo nací en la guerra florida'). The omission of the first line is surprising, as the two lines about blood create the most striking image in the poem – while not as graphic as 'gusanos pululan por calles y plazas', the degree of bloodshed suggested by the all-pervading smell of blood is staggering. The two stanzas left out of the third version carry less shock value; they are rather subdued compared to the rest of the poem and we could argue that they distract the reader from the horror of the massacre, be it in 1521 or 1968. The grief and anguish of the preceding stanza ('Y todo esto pasó con nosotros. / Con esta lamentable y triste suerte / nos vimos angustiados' (Pacheco 1969: II. 20–22)) and the graphic aftermath of violence of the following stanza ('En los caminos yacen dardos rotos. / Las casas están destechadas. / Enrojecidos tienen sus muros. / Gusanos pululan por calles y plazas' (1969: II. 33–36)), are in stark contrast to the melancholy of the habitual sacrifice ('En la montaña de los alaridos, / en los jardines de la greda, / se ofrecen sacrificios' (II. 23–25)) and the narrator's soulful resignation to the scene of the battle ('Sufro, mi corazón se llena de pena; veo la desolación que se cierne sobre el templo' (II. 30–31)). In short, the affect of the massacre does not match the habit of ritual violence and the end result is a fracture in the emotional sphere created by the rest of the poem.

The image of bloodstains does not remain in the final version of the poem, which is arguably the most poignant of the four: 'Mientras en la versión anterior

se logra intensidad lírica con repeticiones, en la actual Pacheco apuesta –nos parece–, a la precisión e intensifica el dramatismo en la segunda parte' (Carrillo Juárez 2009: 150). The anger/ grief/ shame cycle is best visible in the final version of the poem, with both parts following this emotional route. The last sentence of the second part ('¿Qué va a pasar ahora, / qué va a pasar?' (Pacheco 2000: 71) suggests a complete change of habit – nothing will be as it was before. At this point in posthegemonic order, there is a strong possibility of the multitude forming and acting upon the shared emotional sphere. Considering that the last emotion in the poem is shame leading back to anger ('insultante'), the multitude could attack not only those responsible for the massacre but also the apathetic majority. However, this does not happen – not directly, anyway. In 2000, the PRI lost presidential elections for the first time since coming into power in 1929; some argue that Tlatelolco was the breaking point in the PRI's long-lasting rule of the country (see, for example, Agustín 1990: 264–70; Volpi 2006: 417–34), so Pacheco's inadvertent prediction of a change of habit (the PRI's domination) comes true, if only for 12 years.

The stanza that endures almost unchanged in three out of the four versions of the poem is 'En los caminos yacen dardos rotos'. The image of the fallen capital of the Aztec empire is heartbreaking both in Berlin's translation ('En los caminos yacían huesos rotos, cabellos revueltos, los (techos de las) casas están descubiertos, las viviendas están coloradas (de sangre), abundaban los gusanos en las calles. Los muros están manchados de sesos, el agua era como rojiza, como agua teñida. Así la bebimos' (*Anales de Tlatelolco* 1948: 71), and in Klaus' rendition ('Y en el camino había huesos quebrantados, cabezas espaciadas' [footnote: 'literalmente: cabellos espaciados'], 'casas destechadas, casas enrojecidas [de sangre]. Gusanos hormigueaban en el camino. Y [las paredes de] las casas estaban embadurnadas de seso. Y el agua era roja, toda colorada. Así bebimos agua de salitre' (*Anales de Tlatelolco* 1999: 145). The image of brain matter splattered across the walls appears in *Visión de los vencidos*: 'y en los paredes están los sesos' (León-Portilla 2007: 143), and 'y en los paredes están salpicados los sesos' (2007: 152). The shock value of this image is very high and it is therefore not surprising that it appears in several Tlatelolco poems, along with the image of blood-soaked shoes strewn across the square.⁷

The third version of 'Lectura' reveals the immediacy of affect, as did the first two versions. However, versions one and two also try to unite affect and habit from two different spheres of social body interaction – the Conquest (affect) and the ritual sacrifice (habit). There is a distinct dissonance between the shock of an unexpected massacre and the tradition of human sacrifices: the massacre was not carried out to appease the gods (Abeyta 2000: 182). This counteracts Octavio Paz's often quoted essay 'Crítica de la pirámide', which notes that the Tlatelolco 1968 massacre echoes the sacrificial practices of the pre-Conquest times (see Paz

7 One of the examples is Juan Bañuelos' poem 'No consta en actas' (Campos and Toledo 1996: 62–75), where the line 'y en los paredes están salpicados los sesos' is reproduced verbatim.

1972: 103–55). A similar view is expressed by Gordon Brotherston, although he notes that Pacheco unites the pre-Colombian times and the Conquest; this unity ‘is as unrelenting, necessary and continuous as Pacheco’s sense of heritage’ (Brotherston 1975: 145). I posit that the first two versions of the poem were edited to remove this clash between affective and habitual experiences, thus painting the Tlatelolco massacre as an affective rather than habitual event. In other words, the 1968 massacre was an exercise of hegemonic power resulting in a posthegemonic change of social habit; it was not an act of recognition of ritual violence as Mexico’s long-lasting national trait. The massacre at Tlatelolco in 1968 is similar to the slaughter of unarmed dancers in Cholula in 1521; Abeyta argues that the reader is enraged because ‘los conquistadores aprovecharon la vulnerabilidad de los indígenas durante una celebración pacífica’ (Abeyta 2000: 184). Ritual sacrifices would not have been shocking to the Aztecs or other tribes because it was part of their habit to ensure a continuous life cycle (see Carrasco 1990: 85–91; Carrasco and Sessions 1998: 56–58). Ingrained in social practices, organized and predictable, ritual sacrifice is different from an attack by the Spaniards on unarmed dancers and worshippers at a temple in Cholula. The massacre at Cholula was a rupture of the locals’ habit. The memory of this attack is ingrained in the collective conscience and associated with strong affect; thus, it endures through time and resurfaces when a similar event happens.

The fourth version of ‘Lectura’, on the other hand, is about a complete change of habit rather than an emotional reaction to the affect of an unprovoked attack. It makes no references to these images; it further depersonalizes the event by using true passive structures: ‘fue escuchado el estruendo de muerte’ (Pacheco 2000: I. 5) was ‘entonces se oyó el estruendo, / se alzaron los gritos’ in the third version (Pacheco 1980: II. 4–5). As a result, it is hard to empathize with the events described in the fourth version because there are barely any emotions shown in the text. Even ‘la vergüenza y el miedo cubrieron todo’ fails to make the reader respond to the feelings described because the surrounding text is a list of informative statements with no emotional investment. The last line is the only one that betrays any emotion – grief and bitterness: ‘Es toda nuestra herencia una red de agujeros’ (Pacheco 2000: I. 11). Yet this cataloguing of events keeps affect high and destroys the habit without allowing emotions to be released, thus stopping the habit from being fully changed. The inclusion of ‘toda’ in the fourth version of the poem (this is the only version where ‘toda’ appears) fuses the events of 1521 and 1968. It also suggests that violence and destruction are the only enduring memories of the past, a ‘fatalidad histórica’ (Ruíz-Pérez 2008: 40) of both the Conquest and the Tlatelolco 1968 massacre.

Of the four versions, this version runs the full course of posthegemonic condition because it ends with the hint of the multitude forming, although it is uncertain what it is going to do. The last two lines of the poem, ‘¿Qué va a pasar ahora, / Qué va a pasar?’ (Pacheco 2000: 71), leave the possibilities wide open and this scares the reader: what would stop the multitude from starting a revolution or the government from retaliating with more violence? This, as Sorensen argues,

is 'one of the paradoxes that haunt the study of some of the writings on the massacre of Tlatelolco ... [:] the violence it unleashed entailed the possibility of a revelation. [...] [V]iolence may unmask not only its foundational presence, but also the fact that its power may yield epiphanic results' (Sorensen 2002: 305).

Conclusion

In the above reading of the four versions of Pacheco's poem 'Lectura de los "Cantares mexicanos"', we have considered whether the affective nature of a violent event helps create and maintain the social memory networks which retain the event in the collective memory. We have discovered that the event is more likely to be preserved in the collective memory if the networks supporting it contain the emotional cycle of anger, grief, and shame.

Social memory networks need to have a sustainable emotional character to make them last. These networks become stronger when the affective aspect of the event is restored. I would argue that the most successful ones are built on the emotions released **immediately when** the affect wave 'crests', so that those emotions are the strongest and the most relevant to the moment of affect and the subsequent change of habit. The second version of 'Lectura' is an example of strong emotions being protected in the social memory network: the reader is confronted with high tension of a violent conflict from the start of the poem. **When** a tragic event that came out of an internal conflict in the country is remembered, social memory frameworks recreate the emotional cycle of anger, grief, and shame. The four versions of Pacheco's 'Lectura' contain this emotional cycle: the first version emphasizes grief, the second and third focus on anger, and the fourth presents the full emotional triangle but without allowing the reader to experience these emotions. We can argue that of the four versions, the fourth is the best example of a posthegemonic text: it encompasses affect, destruction of habit, and the formation of the multitude.

All versions of 'Lectura' manipulate the texts they quote from to achieve a powerful representation of strong emotions associated with the affect of the 1521 and 1968 massacres and the ensuing habitual view of the two. However, none of the four versions aim for an accurate representation of the massacres. Considering previous studies of the relationship between an accurate representation of the massacre and the affective nature of the Tlatelolco discourse (see, for example, Carpenter 2015), we posit that the factual accuracy of the memory of a violent event is secondary to what I would term its symbolic value.

Symbolic value contributes to the social memory frameworks that keep an event alive in collective memory. Symbolic value is the product of affect: 'Affect gathers up singularities and partial objects, bodies of all shapes and sizes, and redistributes and recomposes them in new, experimental couplings and collectivities' (Beasley-Murray 2010: 132) – this redistribution is what colours 'la literatura de Tlatelolco'. The symbolic value of the Tlatelolco massacre is constructed by retelling 'what happened', each time within a particular emotional context

produced by the initial affect. The massacre becomes associated more and more firmly with this context; the audience views the event as logically and clearly representing the context. As a result, the images associated with the massacre are highlighted if they match this emotional **context**. These images then form a believable and accepted version of ‘what happened’ by recreating the cycle of anger, grief, and shame, as Pacheco has done in the four versions of ‘Lectura de los “Cantares mexicanos”’.

Works Cited

- Abeyta, Michael, 2000. ‘Un cuadro sincrónico del cuerpo en La noche de Tlatelolco y en Visión de los vencidos’, *Relaciones: Estudios de Historia y Sociedad*, 82: 177–98.
- Aguilera, Jorge, 2013. ‘José Emilio Pacheco: las sutiles huellas de la inconformidad’, in *Pasión por la palabra: homenaje a José Emilio Pacheco*, ed. Edith Negrín and Álvaro Ruiz Abreu (Mexico City: UNAM, UAM), pp. 207–220.
- Agustín, José, 1990. *Tragicomedia mexicana 1: La vida en México de 1940 a 1970* (Mexico City: Planeta).
- Álvarez Garín, Raúl, 1998. *La estela de Tlatelolco* (Mexico City: Grijalbo).
- Anales de Tlatelolco*, 1939–40. *Unos anales históricos de la nación mexicana*, ed. and trans. Ernst Mengin (Berlin: Baessler Archiv).
- Anales de Tlatelolco*, 1948. *Unos annales históricos de la nación mexicana y Códice de Tlatelolco*, ed. and trans. Heinrich Berlin and Robert H. Barlow (Mexico City: Antigua Librería Robredo, de José Porrúa e hijos).
- Anales de Tlatelolco*, 1999. Los manuscritos 22 y 22bis de la Bibliothèque de France, ed. and trans. Suzanne Klaus (Markt Schwaben, Germany: A. Saurwein).
- Balam, Gilberto, 1969. *Tlatelolco: reflexiones de un testigo* (Mexico City: Talleres Lenasas).
- Bartlett, Frederick Charles, 1932. *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Beasley-Murray, Jon, 2003. ‘On Posthegemony’, *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 22: 117–25.
- , 2010. *Posthegemony: Political Theory and Latin America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- , 1990. *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Polity).
- Brinton, Daniel G., 1887. *Ancient Nahuátl Poetry, Containing the Nahuátl Text of XXVII Ancient Mexican Poems* (Philadelphia).
- Brotherston, Gordon, 1975. *Latin American Poetry: Origins and Presence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Campos, Marco Antonio, and Alejandro Toledo, 1996. *Poemas y narraciones sobre el movimiento estudiantil de 1968* (Mexico City: UNAM, Coordinación de Humanidades, Dirección General de Publicaciones).
- Campos, Victoria, 2001. ‘Toward a New History: Twentieth-Century Debates in Mexico on Narrating the National Past’, in *A Twice-Told Tale: Reinventing the Encounter in Iberian / Iberian American Literature and Film*, ed. Santiago Juan-Navarro and Theodore Robert Young (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press), pp. 47–64.
- Carpenter, Victoria, 2005. ‘The Echo of Tlatelolco in Contemporary Mexican Protest Poetry’, *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 24: 496–512.
- , 2015. ‘“You Want the Truth? You Can’t Handle the Truth”: Poetic Representations of the 1968 Tlatelolco Massacre’, *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research*, 21: 35–49.
- Carrasco, David, 1990. *Religions of Mesoamerica: Cosmivision and Ceremonial Centers* (San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco).
- Carrasco, David, and Scott Sessions, 1998. *Daily Life of the Aztecs: People of the Sun and Earth* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).

- Carrillo Juárez, Carmen Dolores, 2009. *El mar de la noche: intertextualidad y apropiación en la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco* (Mexico City: Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana).
- Castillo García, Gustavo, 2008. 'El 68, del pleito callejero a la lucha por las libertades democráticas', *La Jornada*, 23 July. Available at: [AQ9] <<http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2008/07/23/index.php?section¼politica&article¼012n1pol>> [accessed 16 January 2018].
- Dakin, Karen, 2001. 'Nahuatl', in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures*, vol. 1, ed. David Carrasco (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 363–65.
- Del-Río, Marcela, 1985. *Temps en paroles (1960–1983)* (Paris: Caracteres).
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari, 1988. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (London: Athlone).
- De Villena, Luis Antonio, 1986. *José Emilio Pacheco* (Madrid: Ediciones Júcar).
- Díaz Ordaz, Gustavo, 2006 [1968]. 'IV Informe de Gobierno del Presidente Constitucional de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos Gustavo Díaz Ordaz 1º de septiembre de 1968', in *Informes Presidenciales: Gustavo Díaz Ordaz* (Mexico City: Dirección de Servicios de Investigación y Análisis), pp. 202–308.
- Dorra, Raúl, 2006. 'Pacheco se pregunta cómo pasa el tiempo', in *José Emilio Pacheco: Perspectivas críticas*, ed. Pol Popovic Carric and Fidel Chávez Pérez (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno), pp. 53–70.
- Durán, Fr. Diego, 1867. *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España*, vol. 1 (Mexico City). [AQ1] *Excélsior*, Mexico City, 1968, 3–5 October. [¿Title of article?]. Available at: [URL] [accessed 00 [Month] 2018].
- Fábrega, Padre José Lino, 1890. *Interpretación del Códice Borgia* (Mexico City: Edición del Museo Nacional).
- Fischer, María Luisa, 1990. 'Presencia del texto colonial en la poesía de Antonio Cisneros y José Emilio Pacheco', *Inti: Revista de Literatura Hispánica*, 32: 127–37.
- Fournier, Patricia, and Jorge Martínez Herrera, 2009. "'Mexico 1968": Among Olympic Fanfares, Government Repression and Genocide', in *Memories of Darkness: Archeology of Repression and Resistance in Latin America*, ed. Pedro Funari, Andrés Zarankin and Melisa Salerno (New York: Springer), pp. 145–74.
- Franco, Jean, 1997. 'Latin American Intellectuals and Collective Identity', *Social Identities*, 3: 265–74.
- Friis, Ronald, 2000. 'The Postmodern Twists of José Emilio Pacheco's No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo', *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos*, 34: 27–46.
- , 2002. *José Emilio Pacheco and the Poets of the Shadows* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press).
- Garibay, Ángel María (ed.), 1962 [1940]. *Poesía indígena de la altiplanicie: divulgación literaria*, trans. Ángel María Garibay (Mexico City: UNAM).
- , 1965. *Poesía Náhuatl: Cantares mexicanos*, vol. II. (Mexico City: UNAM).
- González Cosío, Manuel, and Antonio Peñafiel (eds), 1904. Introduction, in *Cantares en idioma mexicano: manuscrito original existente en la Biblioteca Nacional* (Mexico City: Oficina Tipográfica de la Secretaria de Fomento).
- Halbwachs, Maurice, 1992. *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. L. A. Coser (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri, 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: Penguin).
- Hellman, Judith A., 1978. *Mexico in Crisis* (New York: Holmes & Meier).
- Holtorf, Cornelius, 2007. 'Social Memory'. Available at: <<https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/citd/holtorf/2.7.html>> [accessed 27 January 2018].
- Leal, Luis, 1979. 'Tlatelolco, Tlatelolco', *Denver Quarterly*, 14: 3–14.
- León-Portilla, Miguel, 1975. *Trece poetas del mundo azteca* (Mexico City: UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas).
- , 1979. *Nezahualcóyotl: poesía y pensamiento, 1402–1472* (Mexico City: Biblioteca Enciclopédica del Estado de México).
- , 2000. 'Pensamiento de Nezahualcóyotl', *Humanistas de Mesoamérica*, vol. I. [Online – Fondo 2000.] Available at: <<http://bibliotecadigital.ilce.edu.mx/sites/fondo2000/vol1/mesoamerica-i/html/4.html>> [accessed 15 January 2018].

- , 2007. *Visión de los vencidos: relaciones indígenas de la conquista*. 29th ed. (Mexico City: UNAM, Coordinación de Humanidades, Programa Editorial).
- Long, Ryan, 2010. 'Traumatic Time in Roberto Bolaño's *Amuleto* and the Archive of 1968', in *Reflections on Mexico '68*, ed. Keith Brewster (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell), pp. 128–43.
- Meyer, Michael, William Sherman and Susan Deeds, 2007. *The Course of Mexican History*. 8th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Moreiras, Alberto, 2001. *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).
- Pacheco, José Emilio, 1968. 'Lectura de los cantares mexicanos', *La Cultura en México*, 351: vi. **AQ11** Available at: <[INSERT URL]> [accessed 00 [Month] 2018].
- , 1969. *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo* (Mexico City: Joaquín Mortiz).
- , 1976. *Islas a la deriva* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI).
- , 1980. *Tarde o temprano* (Mexico City: FCE).
- , 2000. *Tarde o temprano (poemas 1958–2000)*, ed. Ana Clavel (Mexico City: FCE).
- Paz, Octavio, 1972 [1970]. *Posdata*. 7th ed. (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores).
- Poniatowska, Elena, 2008 [1971]. *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Mexico City: Biblioteca Era).
- Rabasa, José, 1993. *Inventing A-M-E-R-I-C-A: Spanish Historiography and the Formation of Eurocentrism* (Norman, OK, and London: University of Oklahoma Press).
- Rodda, John, 2010. "'Prensa, Prensa": A Journalist's Reflections on Mexico '68', in *Reflections on Mexico '68*, ed. Keith Brewster (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell), pp. 11–22.
- Ruiz-Pérez, Ignacio, 2008. *Lecturas y diversiones: La poesía crítica de Eduardo Lizalde, Gabriel Zaid, José Carlos Becerra y José Emilio Pacheco* (Xalapa: Universidad Veracruzana).
- Sahagún, Fray Bernardino de, 2008. *Historia general de las cosas de la Nueva España*. 2 vols. (Barcelona: Linkgua).
- Sheridan, Gilberto, 2004. *Poeta con paisaje: ensayos sobre la vida de Octavio Paz* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era).
- , 2011. 'Octavio Paz: cartas tlatelolcas', *El minutario* [Online – blog]. Available at: <<http://www.letraslibres.com/blogs/el-minutario/octavio-paz-cartas-tlatelolcas>> [accessed 27 January 2018].
- Shils, Edward, 1981. *Tradition* (London: Faber and Faber).
- Sorensen, Diana, 2002. 'Tlatelolco 1968: Paz and Poniatowska on Law and Violence', *Mexican Studies/ Estudios Mexicanos*, 18: 297–321.
- Soto-Duggan, Lilvia, 1983–84. 'Realidad de papel: Máscaras y voces en la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco', *Inti: Revista de Literatura Hispánica*, 18: 245–54.
- Volpi, Jorge, 2006 [1998]. *La imaginación y el poder: Una historia intelectual de 1968* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era).
- Welker, Glenn, 2014. 'The Náhuatl Language of the Aztecs'. Available at: **AQ12** <<http://www.indians.org/welker/nahuatl.htm>> [accessed 00 [Month] 2018].
- Williams, Gareth, 2011. *The Mexican Exception: Sovereignty, Police, and Democracy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Womack Jr., John, 1970. 'The Spoils of the Mexican Revolution', *Foreign Affairs*, 48: 677–87.
- Yúdice, George, 1995. 'Civil Society, Consumption, and Governmentality in an Age of Global Restructuring: An Introduction', *Social Text*, 13.4: 1–25.
- Zolov, Eric, 1999. *Refried Elvis: The Rise of the Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press).