Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Elijah Goodman April 12, 2016

‘Transitional Figures’ in the Conquest of the Americas: The Case of Lautaro

by

Elijah Goodman

Dr. Yanna Yannakakis
Adviser

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

Dr. Yanna Yannakakis

Adviser

Dr. Robert Goddard

Committee Member

Dr. Thomas Rogers

Committee Member

2016

‘Transitional Figures’ in the Conquest of the Americas: The Case of Lautaro

By

Elijah Goodman

Yanna Yannakakis

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

2016

Abstract

'Transitional Figures' in the Conquest of the America: The Case of Lautaro
By Elijah Goodman

In recent decades, there has been a rise in revisionist history on the conquest of the Americas. The Conquests of Peru and Mexico, in particular, have seen reimaginations through a great deal of new academic sources. As the histories of these conquests have become revised, many figures, especially those in a transitional role where they participated on both sides of the conquest, see their legacies revisited. While this has created new attention for figures such as Malintzin and Manco Inca, characters from less popular conquests, such as the Conquest of Chile, have not received a revival in interest through the academic arena.

This thesis focuses on revisiting the image of one of these neglected characters of the conquest, Lautaro. Lautaro was born into a native tribe in central Chile but was kidnapped in adolescence. He spent approximately six years serving as a page under the Governor Pedro de Valdivia. During his service to the Spanish, Lautaro developed a relationship of *crianza*, a paternalist relationship of service and tutelage where he came to learn much about Spanish weaponry and military tactics. After escaping from the Spanish, Lautaro returned to the Araucanian tribes in order to defend his homeland. He brought with him this knowledge of Spanish military affairs that led to several Araucanian victories in battle.

These victories forced the cronsitas of the conquest to reconcile this success of an indigenous figure. As the Spanish Crown viewed natives as inferior and savages, the cronistas were forced to demonstrate how a barbaric native defeated their forces. To do so, the cronistas enlisted themes of treachery, violence, and heroism to define Lautaro. This thesis shows how the cronistas used these three themes in order to create Lautaro as a worthy adversary and explain his defeat of the Spanish.

‘Transitional Figures’ in the Conquest of the Americas: The Case of Lautaro

By

Elijah Goodman

Dr. Yanna Yannakakis

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to foremost thank my advisor, Dr. Yanna Yannakakis, for her unwavering support throughout the process of writing this thesis. I do not know where I would be without her advice and comments. Additionally, my other two committee members, Dr. Thomas Rogers and Dr. Robert Goddard, were incredibly helpful in guiding me through this project.

While not an official member of my committee, Chris Brown deserves acknowledgment for his feedback and support. I cannot thank him enough for taking time away from his dissertation to help me with my project.

Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge my friends and family for their support. My parents and family only gave me support in this endeavor and helped me push through during tough times. Lastly, I would be amiss to not recognize the constant encouragement that I received from the rest of the guys in the ZBT house, especially my roommate Elie Goldman. Rising and grinding was not always easy, but always having a friend with me made it a lot easier.

Table of Contents

Introduction:

"This Lautaro was industrious,
Wise and ready, shrewd and prudent,
Meek in manner, fair of gesture,
Neither stately nor enormous,
With a mind inured to greatness"[1]

With this statement, Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga, a 16th century Spanish conquistador and chronicler, described the Araucanian warrior, Lautaro. Despite reaching the status to receive these lofty praises from a Spaniard, Lautaro's youth is not widely documented. The exact date of his birth is unknown but believed to be in 1534. Born to an Araucanian *lonko,* a chief during peacetime, named Pillano,[2] Lautaro spent his childhood among his tribe in central Chile before being captured by Spaniards in his early teenage years.[3] Legends state that the young native, possibly with the advice of his father, voluntarily permitted his capture, but without any Araucanian sources, the story cannot be verified.

If the planned capture was true, it worked perfectly for the Araucanians. Lautaro became the page for the Captain General of Chile, Pedro de Valdivia.[4] Serving under Valdivia, who as Captain General was the highest-ranking military officer in Chile, Lautaro assisted the Spanish in their preparations for conquest as well in battle. While never involved in combat, Lautaro learned

[1] Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga, *The Araucanaid,* trans. Charles Lancaster and Paul Manchester (Nashville: University of Vanderbilt Press, 1945), 59
[2] Ercilla, 141
[3] "Lautaro." Encyclopedia of World Biography. 2004. *Encyclopedia.com.* (March 22, 2016). http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3404703749.html
[4] Ercilla, 54

greatly from his service to Valdivia, who would be named Governor of Chile in 1547.[5] By spending countless hours in the presence of the Spanish during their preparation and battles, Lautaro came to understand the military tactics employed by the Spanish. He saw how their use of cavalry and superior weaponry dominated the natives of northern Chile in battle.

After six years of observing the Spanish conquest of Chile, Lautaro, likely at eighteen years of age, fled from the Spanish and established his position as a traitor in the eyes of the Spanish by returning to the Araucanians in south central Chile.[6] The Araucanians and their chief, Caupolicán, eagerly welcomed the young man home. The Spanish had begun colonizing in the southern regions of Chile, and the Araucanians struggled to maintain their lands against the muskets and horses of the Europeans. Caupolicán embraced Lautaro's experience with the Spanish and placed considerable faith in Lautaro and endowed the young soldier with heavy responsibility. With the support of the chief, Lautaro organized the Araucanian army into a large, united force for the first time. The Araucanians, who came together from various tribes, previously fought one other, which prevented the creation of a cohesive force, but with the future of their homeland in jeopardy, the natives banded together behind the leadership of Lautaro to form the extensive army faced by Pedro de Valdivia.

Lautaro proved to be a paradox for the Spanish chroniclers. Despite the customary attributions of native as savage and barbarian, the cronistas also attributed to him heroic traits and compared him with legendary figures. Chroniclers expressed this ambivalence towards native figures in previous and better-known conquests, such as Malintzin in Mexico and Manco Inca in Peru, but Lautaro's case illuminates new aspects of "in-between-ness" in conquest history. While Manco Inca and Lautaro both came under Spanish supervision and rule, Manco

[5] Ida Stevenson Weldon Vernon. *Pedro de Valdivia, Conquistador of Chile* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1946), 125

[6] "Lautaro." Encyclopedia of World Biography

Inca's involvement as a puppet ruler differed greatly from Lautaro's experience as a page to Pedro de Valdivia. As a personal page to Valdivia, Lautaro was party to a relationship of *crianza* -- a paternalist relationship of service and tutelage -- in which the Spanish taught him the Spanish language and the Christian doctrine. James F. Brooks notes in his book *Captives and Cousins* that this relationship of *crianza* blurred the lines of kinship and captivity particularly on the borderlands regions of the Spanish Conquest.[7] Captive Indian children could become kin to their Spanish masters as they served as *criados*. As a *criado*, Lautaro received food and clothing from the Spanish. Additionally, they would have been responsible for acculturating, baptizing, and giving religious instruction to Lautaro. With this relationship, many *criados* came to see the Spanish as more of foster parents than masters.[8] Lautaro's status as a criado demonstrated how his relation with Valdivia differed from most native-Spanish relationships and permitted the cronistas to show Lautaro as such a treacherous character.

By comparison, Manco Inca faced mistreatment from the Pizarro brothers and his reign as puppet leader did not lead to positive relations with the Spanish. While both figures escaped from their service to the Spanish, Inca left mostly due to his mistreatment, but Lautaro, who received more favorable treatment as a page, returned to his roots in order to aid his fellow Araucanians in defending their homeland. Malintzin also developed a relationship of service and personal and affective ties to the Spanish after being gifted to Hernán Cortes, but given that she was a woman, sexuality played an important role in her relationship with the conquistadors; she bore Cortes children and married a Spanish conquistador. In addition, she never returned to her people in order to protect her homeland.

Lautaro's paradoxical identity as Spanish *criado* and military enemy has not been

[7] James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 6
[8] David J. Weber, *Bárbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 238

evaluated by historians. Furthermore, historians have yet to pay much attention to Lautaro's defeat of the Spanish on multiple occasions. These indigenous military victories forced the Spanish to portray and evaluate Lautaro with ambivalence. The cronistas' portrayals of Lautaro as savage, treacherous, and violent are standard fare and fits into the Spanish narrative of natives as barbarians. At the same time, his acts of savagery and violence also resulted in historic victories that situated him as a military hero. Lautaro's victories and heroism compelled the chroniclers to make sense of the stunning triumphs of a savage native.

Lautaro's in-between-ness positions him as a 'transitional' figure, which I define as someone who participated on both sides of the conquest. Examples include Manco Inca and Malintzin whose legacies scholars have reconsidered over the last few decades. Lautaro, another 'transitional' figure during the Conquest period, has received limited attention. This may result from the fact that the Araucanian tribes, to whom he belonged, were not comparable to the Inca or Mexica empires in the minds of the chroniclers or modern-day scholars. Unlike the Mexica and Inca who created economically and socio-politically complex empires, the Araucanians maintained a semi-nomadic lifestyle that kept tribes independent from one another, uniting only in times of war. While the well-developed Inca and Mexica empires ignited the imaginations of the Spanish conquistadors and generations of historians, the less complex society of the Araucanians has not created the same appeal. The fall of such established and complex civilizations as the Mexicas and Incans provides an intriguing story for historians. They have shown less interest in writing about the less understood, and in their eyes, uncivilized society that managed to hold off conquest and colonization until after Chile achieved independence in the nineteenth century. Lautaro's story is twice valuable, then, in opening new perspectives onto conquest-period native intermediaries and on the conquest of Araucania.

Lautaro, Manco Inca, and Malintzin -- all 'transitional' figures -- played roles on both sides of the conflicts involving Spaniards and indigenous groups. The images and legacies of each have been revisited over the last century, especially within academic circles in the cases of Manco Inca and Malinztin. Lautaro, on the other hand, has not been so popular among historians. Rather we have seen the revisiting of his image through literature. This can first be seen through Pablo Neruda's *Canto General,* in which the poet desires to sketch a new history of Latin America. His five poems covering Lautaro include fiction along with history, and as the poems develop, Lautaro emerges as a myth as much as a man. Undoubtedly, Neruda's work has influenced Lautaro's legacy as he emerges to be the protagonist of multiple plays and a novel titled *Lautaro, Joven Libertador de Arauco*. Despite these revisions and his developing legacy in Chile--Lautaro has a town, theatre, and even children named after him--it would be very challenging to review this type of literature alongside the academic works that have emerged on Manco Inca and Malintzin over the last few decades. Interestingly, however, the literature on Lautaro often evinces similar themes that we see in the academic writing on Manco and Malintzin, such as heroism, treachery and violence.

From John Hemming's *Conquest of the Incas* to Camila Townsend's *Malintzin's Choices,* the academic literature on transitional native intermediaries in the conquest of America is based on new interpretations of early primary sources that have been available for centuries. John Hemming's first book, *The Conquest of the Incas* was published in 1970. In the Preface, Hemming states that the book is concentrated on contacts between the natives and Spaniards at all levels of society in order "to refute some misconceptions and to reconstruct some gaps in the chroniclers' narratives."[9] It is without doubt a revisionist history of the Spanish conquest of Peru, but with the use of some sources that Gonzalo Lamana, another historian who reviews the

[9] John Hemming, *The Conquest of the Incas* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970), 17

conquest of Peru, would describe as "native-like."[10] Lamana describes native-like sources as often-dismissed or suppressed works written by either natives or those that sympathize with them during the colonial period.[11] He views them "to be situated interventions in the Spanish colonial order of things that try to reinsert different understandings and epistemologies."[12] Hemming relies on native-like sources, including Titu Cusi Yupanqui, friar Martín de Murúa, and Inca Garcilosa de la Vega, in order to identify dissonances in the Spanish sources and produce revisionist interpretations of them.

Hemming uses these sources to make the reader rethink and reevaluate in a positive light the actions of indigenous peoples. He details their fighting and rebellion against the Spanish to prove that the natives did not cede their lands without struggle. He points to the Conquest of Quito and Manco Inca's second rebellion as historical topics that have not received appropriate attention.[13] In addition, Hemming presents natives throughout his book as sympathetic and human(e) characters. Through his writing, he portrays the natives of Peru as men struggling against an unwanted invasion while refuting their reputation as barbarians and savages that had persisted in myth and legend.

Despite his valorization of native groups and use of native-like sources, Hemming relies heavily on W.H. Prescott and Spanish primary sources. Due in part to this, Hemming was unable to create an alternative view of Manco Inca. While Hemming demonstrates that Manco's rebellion caused the Spanish more trouble than has been admitted in previous works, he does not extend this revision to Manco's legacy. By displaying Manco's treasonous and violent activities, Hemming portrays Manco in a manner similar to that of the sixteenth century Spanish

[10] Gonzalo Lamana, *Domination without Dominance (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2008)*
[11] Lamana, 10
[12] Lamana, 10
[13] Hemming, 17

chroniclers.

Gonzalo Lamana's *Domination Without Dominance*, published in 2008, covers well-known episodes and employs popular sources, while attempting to create an alternative understanding of the Conquest of Peru. He does this by focusing on the twenty-year transition period that began with contact and ended with visible subordination under a colonial regime.[14] The obvious bias of Spanish primary sources along with the problem of standardized historical narrative and the practice of forced congruity between historical accounts, leads him to rely on alternative sources. Lamana uses local documents such as reports or city council records whenever possible. In addition, he looks to *probanzas,* a form of legally recorded depositions by witnesses in a trial, "nativelike" sources, and lastly, lapses in conquerors' accounts.[15]

While Lamana's primary focus is a revision of the Conquest of Peru, he also manages to create a new perspective of Manco Inca. In the Spanish chronicles, Manco Inca appears as the ignorant, puppet leader. Lamana argues differently: Manco's uprising was a serious threat that wreaked havoc upon the Spanish, and despite his death and the uprising's failure, Manco helped to reinvent Incan power. He characterizes Manco's threat in terms of his violence and treachery, and like the Spanish chronicles, underscores how he employed savagery in order to achieve success.

In addition to Hemming and Lamana's work, there exist other recent revisionist histories of the conquest of Peru. Kim MacQuarrie's *The Last Days of the Inca,* published in 2007, attempts to provide a comprehensive history of the conquest by looking at both native and Spanish sources. MacQuirre cites early publications, such as Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala's

[14] Lamana, 1
[15] Lamana, 10

Letter to a King, as well as modern works such as Hemming's monograph.[16] Despite the discrepancy in sources for both sides (three native-like sources versus about thirty Spanish reports for the same time period), MacQuirre attempts to interpret the perspectives of both sides of the conquest, resulting in a positive portrayal of Manco Inca, including his impressive military strategy. MacQuirre posits that while the rebellion ultimately fails, Manco emerges as a great and honorable hero rather than a crude traitor.

Peter Henderson's *The Course of Andean History* (2013) provides a final example of the revision of Manco's image in recent decades. Unlike the three works discussed previously, this one details not just the history of the conquest of Peru, but also the history of the territory of the Peruvian nation from BCE to present day. As a result, Henderson provides relatively less detail about Manco, but still exhibits interest in the Inca and his rebellion.[17] His abbreviated tale of Manco's rebellion characterizes the Incan leader as "semidivine"[18] and heroic, but also notes that the natives still lost due to Spanish technological advantages. Ultimately, Henderson does not provide a revisionist history of Manco's rebellion or the conquest, but by defining Manco as semidivine, he accentuates Manco's heroic qualities.

Whereas new studies of the conquest of Peru have reconsidered the role of Manco Inca through his rebellion, the role of Malintzin has received renewed scrutiny not only in literature about the conquest of Mexico, but also in literature about "La Malinche" herself, pointing to the growing popular interest in her story. The literature reviewed here, Camila Townsend's *Malintzin's Choices,* Frances Kartunnen's *Revisiting Malintzin,* Cristian Gonzalez Hernandez's *Doña Marina y la formacion de la identidad mexicana,* and Anna Lanyon's *Malinche's Conquest*, all revisit the Conquest of Mexico, but Malintzin and her legacy provide their true

[16] Kim MacQuarrie. *The Last Days of the Incas*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007)
[17] Peter Henderson, *The Course of Andean History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2013)
[18] Henderson, 59

interest.

Frances Kartunnen focuses on Nahua sources to provide a new perspective on the life of Malintzin in her essay "Rethinking Malintzin," published in *Indian Women of Early Mexico* in 1997.[19] Rather than creating an alternative view of the conquest, Kartunnen posits a new perception of Malintzin. She does so by invoking images, often from indigenous sources, that portray Malintzin as a respected figure, often appearing in the middle of images, with elegant dress and a serious demeanor. She notes that the negative views that have arisen in the past centuries are due to the need of the Mexican state after independence to create a scapegoat for the success of the conquest.[20]

Malintzin provided an easy target with her purportedly treasonous act of aiding the Spanish. Kartunnen refutes this two hundred year old misconception by pointing to Malintzin's lack of choice in the matter. Malintzin helped the Spanish because it would put her in the best situation for herself. Though it must be said that this does not make her seem any less treacherous, Kartunnen concludes that Malintzin had no loyalties: "she was not Aztec, not Maya, not Indian."[21] With no allies, she had nowhere to run, nobody to turn to for help, so she used her asset of multilingualism to align herself with the Spanish captain Cortes, who would protect her from others.[22]

Anna Lanyon's *Malinche's Conquest* (1999) is a well-researched biography of Malintzin. The author's desire to learn more about Malintzin's life guides much of the book as she revisits the Conquest of Mexico.[23] Lanyon, like Kartunnen, points to Malintzin's circumstances when discussing her role and perception as a traitor during the Conquest. As a young woman trying to

[19] Frances Kartunnen, *Rethinking Malinche* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997)
[20] Kartunnen, 312
[21] Kartunnen, 311
[22] Kartunnen, 311
[23] Anna Lanyon, *Malinche's Conquest* (New South Wales, Australia: Allen and Unwin Academic, 1999)

place herself in the best situation, she found that translating put her in the most favorable position. What's more, she was not an Aztec and had no allegiance to break when she began helping the Spanish.[24] This is not new information, but Lanyon's constant speculation provides new interpretations, even if they lack strong evidence. Due to this absence of new information, *Malinche's Conquest* has not become very impactful in the historiography of La Malinche.

Cristina Gonzalez Hernandez' *Doña Marina y la formacion de la identidad mexicana* (2002) establishes multiple agendas. González explores the myth of Malinche in the discourse of Mexican nationalism while also discussing the transformation of the myth of Malinche in the context of Mexican national identity by analyzing historiographies, biographies, essays, novellas, and plays.[25] Finally, Gonzalez addresses the historic character of Malinche, clarifying confusing and controversial points in her life. In doing so, she details Malintzin's identity as a traitor and her role as a symbol for treason after Mexican independence. As malinchismo and malinchista became synonymous with traitors and treasonous behavior, the myth of Malinche deepened.[26] She concludes that the state of Mexico needed heroes as well as traitors to create a national identity, and while Miguel Hidalgo and José María Morelos became the heroes about whom parents told their children stories, Malintzin became Mexico's Benedict Arnold, a symbol of treason against her nation.[27]

Camila Townsend's *Malintzin's Choices* (2006) is one of the more recent pieces of scholarship on Malintzin. In this revisionist history, Townsend revisits the life and choices of a woman who she says has garnered an unfair reputation through unfortunate circumstances.[28] By

[24] Lanyon, 15
[25] Cristina Gonzalez Hernandez, *Doña Maria y la formacion de la identidad mexicana* (Madrid: Ediciones Encuentros, 2002), 17
[26] Hernandez, 17
[27] Hernandez, 18
[28] Camila Townsend, *Malintzin's Choices* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006)

using indigenous sources and questioning historically popular conceptions about Malinztin, Townsend reevaluates her legacy. Townsend focuses her attention at times exclusively on Malintzin, but more so than any other work, she explores the conquest of Mexico and the indigenous experience of that era. Her nine chapters are chronological yet offer interpretations of unique aspects of the conquest. She addresses the pre-Columbian Americas, contact, and conquest from indigenous perspectives.

This thesis brings together the literature on transitional figures in the Spanish conquest of America with literature on the Spanish borderlands, in particular, the practices of crianza and captivity that defined the constant warfare that these regions experienced during the Spanish colonial period. On the Spanish borderlands, the system of *crianza* permitted for a relationship between captive native children and the Spanish that could be characterized more as a foster or adoptive parent relation than that of a relationship between a master and servant. The law defined *crianza* as a temporary condition that separated it from slavery. While some *criados* still faced slavery through sale and purchase, they retained rights under Spanish law and could posit this power to change the master of their service if their treatment was deemed too egregious.[29] *Criados,* such as Lautaro, faced scrutiny in their service, but they received far superior treatment than black or native slaves.

Over the last few decades, scholars have revisited and scrutinized the roles and legacies of indigenous intermediaries in the conquest of America. While Lautaro has not been subject to this trend in academic writing, Manco Inca and Malintzin have seen their images revisited especially as new interpretations of the conquest emerge. These new interpretations have unquestionably changed our understandings of transitional figures and resulted in a change in our view of the conquest period.

[29] Weber, 239

In this thesis, I will reassess the image of Lautaro in the writings of Spanish cronistas in order to demonstrate how his role as a transitional figure further constructs our understanding of ambivalent native characters on the borderlands of the Spanish conquest. The cronistas addressed themes of treachery, violence, and heroism in order to explain Lautaro's victories and status as a worthy adversary. By demonstrating that Lautaro's military success came from his experiences with the Spanish, the cronistas exhibited how Lautao's treachery resulted in his success. They further define his image by pointing to his violent actions as an example of his barbarous roots, but also as a key to his achievements. With his spirit of violence that came from his Araucanian upbringing, Lautaro displayed gratuitous violence that led to victory while still establishing his savagery. Finally, the cronistas addressed Lautaro's heroic qualities such as oratorical ability, courage in battle, empathy and strong leadership in order to complete their construction of Lautaro as a worthy adversary. But despite highlighting these heroics and his years serving under the Spanish, the cronistas posit that Lautaro's nativeness remained intact and resulted in savagery and barbarism that fueled his violence and treachery.

My thesis draws primarily from Spanish chronicles of the conquest of Chile. Native or native-like sources do not exist for the case of the conquest of Chile as they do for the conquests of Mexico and Peru. In order to analyze the figure of Lautaro, I focus on five specific chronicles. Written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they all concentrate on the Conquest of Chile and feature the Arauco War, the 300 plus year conflict between the Araucanian tribes and colonizing Spanish, prominently. While all of these texts include passages involving Lautaro, two works, *La Araucana*[30] written by Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga and *Cronica del Reino de Chile* written by Pedro Mariño de Lobera, paid particular attention to discussing the young warrior. Ercilla and Lobera both fought against the Araucanians during the middle of the 16th century,

[30] Known in English as *The Araucaniad*

and due to this experience, they wrote in great detail of the encounters between the Spanish and natives.

Ercilla arrived in Peru in 1556 where he joined forces with García Hurtado de Mendoza, the Governor of Chile at the time.[31] With Mendoza, he travelled to Chile to quell the Araucanian rebellion, which was a continuation of Lautaro's uprising. Ercilla learned of the legacy of Lautaro as he fought the natives. After his participation in the Conquest, Ercilla returned to Spain where he published *La Araucana* in three parts. In this paper, I will only cite the first part, published in 1569, as it contains all the events that include Lautaro. This first part, like the other two, is an epic poem. The poem portrays Lautaro as an incredible hero that led the Araucanians to victory. Despite noting Lautaro's treachery and barbarism throughout the text, Ercilla created a generally positive image of Lautaro. He illustrated his admiration of Lautaro's abilities in battle through explicit descriptions, but it must be noted that great exaggeration exists in Ercilla's poem. Ercilla, like many Spanish writers of the time, used Classical motifs to embody his characters. In order to discuss Lautaro alongside classical legends such as Leonidas and Horace, Ercilla often amplified events in his passages. While this exaggeration created some falsehoods, for the most part *La Araucana* portrayed the battles and encounters between the natives and Spanish with a degree of historical accuracy, correctly representing the dates and battle results.[32] Ercilla's work came to be considered one of the great works of the Spanish Golden Age[33] and influenced later publications on the Conquest of Chile.

Lobera, like Ercilla, participated in the Conquest of Chile. He served under Pedro de Valdivia during his governorship and fought against Lautaro and his troops at the Battle of

[31] Encyclopædia Britannica (11th ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911) 735
[32] Encyclopædia Britannica, 735
[33] The Spanish Golden Age defined the period from the end of the Reconquista in 1492 until the middle of the 17th century where Spanish literature and arts prospered.

Mataquito.[34] Lobera greatly admired Valdivia and placed the blame for his death[35] on Lautaro and his treachery against the Spanish. This blame drove Lobera to affix a firmly negative attitude towards Lautaro in his work that did not appear among the other four chronicles. Lobera constantly remarked on Lautaro's treachery, but like all the other cronistas, credited Lautaro with heroic qualities. Similar to Ercilla, he portrayed Lautaro with heroic archetypes applied to Classical Greek and Roman legends. By understanding these archetypes, we can see how Spanish chroniclers looked to these classical legends in order to construct Lautaro in a heroic manner. Applying classical heroic archetypes that were usually reserved for legendary figures, such as Achilles and Odysseus, upon Lautaro allowed the reader to see the honor and heroism of Lautaro despite his inferior status as a native. Despite drawing comparisons between Lautaro and David the Israelite, Lobera ultimately demonstrated that Lautaro's heroics could not displace his treachery. While Lobera concluded his writing before his death and gave the manuscript to a friar for editing, the publication of *Cronica del Reino de Chile* did not occur until 1865. Since the manuscript remained unpublished for centuries, it appears unlikely that other cronistas could have read and been influenced by Lobera's account. Similarities between Lobera and other texts can be attributed to Lobera's citing of Ercilla's work. Lobera claimed that while Ercilla's poetry came with great exaggerations, it told the same history as his work. This acknowledgement of his use of *La Araucana* permitted for a very similar plot line across the two chronicles.

Jeronimo de Vivar, who wrote *Crónica y relación copiosa y verdadera de los reinos de Chile* after participating in the Conquest of Chile during the middle of the sixteenth century, gave less attention to Lautaro in his chronicle than did Ercilla and Lobera. He portrayed Lautaro impartially, in contrast with the two other sixteenth century chronicles. Vivar's account defines

[34] Pedro Mariño de Lobera, *Cronica del Reino de Chile* (Madrid: Atlas, 1960), 358

[35] Valdivia died after a battle in which he was captured by Araucanian troops led by Lautaro. We will see a further development of this scene in Chapter II.

Lautaro as a talented warrior, but neither a hero nor a traitor. Vivar's work was published in 1966, nearly 400 years after it's writing, but his manuscript may have been accessible to other chroniclers in the colonial period.

The final two narratives that I will use are Diego de Rosales's *Historia General del Reino de Chile and* Alonso de Ovalle's *Historica relacion del Reyno de Chile y de las missiones y ministerios que exercita en él la Compañía de Jesus*. Written in the seventeenth century, these cronistas did not have the same access to eyewitness accounts of events involving Lautaro, but they had the advantage of looking at some of the earlier works, such as Ercilla's and Vivar's. Rosales' account evinces the influence of both Vivar and Ercilla. He claimed to write as truthful an account as possible, and his use of Vivar's work exhibited his desire to avoid bias. While trying to remain impartial, Rosales still cited and quoted from Ercilla's text. As the first publication on the Conquest of Chile, *La Araucana* influenced subsequent writings on the topic, and Rosales needed Ercilla's account to provide the best detail of the conquest. A member of the Society of Jesuits, Rosales served in the Arauco War as a chaplain, but his participation occurred decades after Lautaro's death. Without eye witnesses to detail the early parts of the Conquest, Rosales depended on second hand accounts of events.

Alonso de Ovalle also relied on earlier accounts to write his chronicle on the history of Chile. Writing in the seventeenth century, *La Araucana* assuredly influenced his work. While Lautaro's involvement only lasts seven pages, Ovalle showcases Lautaro's heroics and skilled abilities in this short narrative. Born in Chile and a Jesuit priest, Ovalle's favorable bias towards the natives appeared through his text, and Lautaro received support from the chronicler.

This thesis consists of three chapters that appear in chronological order. The first chapter, titled "The Rise of Lautaro", details the Battle of Tucapel that occurred on December 25, 1553.

The battle occurred between the Araucanians, led by Lautaro, and the Spanish, guided by Pedro de Valdivia, Lautaro's former master. This chapter analyzes the cronistas' accounts of a speech by Lautaro to his troops along with his actions in battle that immediately followed. By looking at how the cronistas documented these events, I determine how the cronistas, despite variation in their text, used themes of violence, treachery, and heroism to define Lautaro's character. Through the themes of violence and treachery, the cronistas demonstrated that in spite of the time he spent with the Spanish, Lautaro was a barbaric, savage native. As they noted Lautaro's relationship with Valdivia and discussed the wild actions of Lautaro in battle, these writers established a reputation for Lautaro as a murderous traitor. While the chroniclers evoked examples of Lautaro's acts of violence and treachery through this battle scene, they also showcased aspects of Lautaro's heroism. By documenting Lautaro's oratory abilities, they attributed him with characteristics, such as courage, logic, and leadership, not typically assigned to natives. The cronistas further underscored these characteristics by detailing Lautaro's actions in battle. Despite highlighting acts of overt violence, the cronistas demonstrated how these actions led the Araucanians to victory in the battle. Along with showing how Lautaro's bravery resulted in Spanish defeat, some of the chroniclers related Lautaro's effort in battle to those of classic Greek and Roman legend. They exemplified these comparisons by attributing to Lautaro the same characteristics of a hero as those of Hector and Leonidas. I discuss in this chapter why the cronistas affixed Lautaro with heroic qualities while still defining him as a barbarian and traitor. I conclude that Lautaro's victory forced the chroniclers to portray him as a worthy adversary who nonetheless retained the barbarism that the Spanish Crown assumed of the Araucanians.

In Chapter II, titled "Promotion Through Death," I continue to explore how the cronistas

demonstrated the themes of violence, treachery, and heroism in order to define Lautaro. This chapter picks up immediately from where Chapter One ends with Lautaro's final charge on the Spanish leading to victory. The tale resumes with a focus on Valdivia who counted among the few remaining Spaniards. I detail Valdivia's capture by the Araucanians and how he came to be brought forth in front of Chief Caupolicán, leader of the Araucanians, and other tribal leaders. While uncertainty reigns over the events leading up to Valdivia's death, the natives killed the Spaniard despite his pleas for clemency. After Valdivia's death, the Araucanians began their customary celebration of victory where Caupolicán, chief of the Araucanian tribes, named Lautaro as his second in command. By highlighting these events, I argue that the cronistas continued to attribute the three primary characteristics of violence, treachery and heroism to the figure of Lautaro. Their ambivalent treatment reconciles savagery with heroism. During the sequences discussed in this chapter, I look at how the cronistas described interactions between Lautaro and Valdivia, the former's erstwhile mentor, in order to allude to his treachery and barbarism. While they used Valdivia's death scene to demean Lautaro, the chroniclers, especially Ercilla, used the sequence following the death of Valdivia to further Lautaro's reputation as a worthy adversary. By additionally highlighting Lautaro's oratory abilities, obedience of his troops, and promotion to second in command, Ercilla displayed how Lautaro proved to be an admirable opponent of the Spanish.

After Lautaro's promotion, the war between the Araucanians and Spaniards continued to rage on with Lautaro's leadership guiding the natives to several victories. As he desired to remove the Spanish from Araucania, the region populated by the Araucanians located south of the Itata River in what is present-day south central Chile,[36] Lautaro and his troops marched north

[36] Gomez de Vidaurre, Historia Geografica, Natural y Civil Del Reino de Chile, Tomo II; Coleccion de historiadores de Chile (Santiago: Imprenta Ercilla, 1889)

towards Santiago, the most fortified Spanish settlement in Chile. Chapter III, titled "A Fitting End," opens by summarizing the events that occurred from 1554 to 1557. It then moves to the focus of the chapter, the events leading up to the death of Lautaro. As in the previous two chapters, I concentrate on the cronistas' descriptions of specific encounters to define the themes that they used to portray Lautaro. In Chapter Three, I first underscore Lautaro's interaction with a former acquaintance, Marcos Vaéz, who he knew from his time as a Spanish page. I detail how the cronistas used this interaction to demonstrate the extent of Lautaro's treachery before his death. His demands for Spanish goods and promise of additional violence proved the cronistas' case that Lautaro was a savage barbarian.

The cronistas defined native savagery and barbarism throughout their texts by pointing to their lack of civility. They demonstrated their uncivilized manner through examples of gratuitous violence, such as the natives acts of cannibalism, decapitation, and creation of instruments out of their dead victims' limbs, their lack of education, and the absence of Christianity. By showing the natives as uneducated pagans who consumed their opponents' dead bodies, the cronistas established the tropes of savagery and barbarism that characterized Lautaro throughout their texts.

Despite these barbaric actions, the cronistas demonstrated Lautaro's heroic qualities through his interaction with the Spaniard. Lautaro showed bravery and courage by seeking out Marcos for a conversation while also continuing to display his oratory abilities, presumably in Spanish this time. Like many scenes involving Lautaro, this one attempted to demean the barbarian while maintaining his status as a qualified opponent. The chronicles close in on Lautaro's death from this point forward. Lobera and Ercillá detailed a dream of Lautaro's. They stated that he awoke next to his lover, Teresa Guacolda, and claimed to have dreamt that the

Spanish killed him. Guacolda then claimed that she too had dreamt of Lautaro's death at the hands of the Spanish. As one of the last passages before Lautaro's death, this dream scene demonstrated a foreshadowing of Lautaro's death. By showing Lautaro's mortality, the chroniclers easily sequenced into Lautaro's underwhelming death. After hearing of the Spanish surprise attack, the warrior left his room with no armor or weaponry. As soon as he approached the scene of battle, a Spanish arrow struck his heart, killing him immediately. This quick death finally demonstrated for the cronistas that Lautaro was just another savage whose life the Spanish claimed.

Chapter I: The Rise of Lautaro

"What is this, brave Araucana? Do you turn your backs when your liberty is concerned, your country, your children, your posterity? Either recover your liberty or lose your lives; for it is less a misfortune to die than to live as slaves."[37] Alonso de Ovalle , a seventeenth century Spanish cronista, stated that with these words, Lautaro opened his speech, directed toward the Araucanian troops, that helped to change the course of the Arauco War.[38] As the sole native credited with spurring the Araucanian army to victory, Lautaro became a popular figure in Spanish literature on the Chilean Conquest. From 1553 to 1557, he troubled the Spanish, and the cronistas used themes of violence, honor, and treachery to portray him as both a hero and a

[37] Alonso de Ovalle, *An Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Chile* (London: A. and J. Churchill, 1703), 144

[38] The Arauco War describes the nearly 300 year conflict between the Araucanian tribes and the Spanish. The conflict started in 1536 and continued until the Chilean War of Independence, which brought new struggles to the region as Chileans, Araucanians, and Spaniards all fought for control of the area.

traitor. The question that I will look at in this chapter is why the chroniclers worked to create a heroic image of Lautaro while also demeaning him for being a savage native and a traitor to the Spanish.

The speech cited above, while depicted differently among the sources, undoubtedly marked the turning point in the Battle of Tucapel. This battle on Christmas Day 1553 pitted the former slave of the Spanish, Lautaro, against his old master, Pedro de Valdivia. Valdivia had left the Spanish stronghold in southern Chile, Concepción, in December of 1553 in order to tour other forts across southern Chile.[39] While Valdivia was traveling, Lautaro led an Araucanian army of several thousand warriors in an attack on the Spanish fort at Tucapel,[40] which was located about 75 miles east of Concepción. Lautaro and his troops overwhelmed the Spanish using military tactics that he learned serving under Valdivia, and the Spanish were forced to retreat. Valdivia continued on his tour as the Araucanians worked to disturb any correspondence between the Spanish. Despite not receiving any word from his troops at Tucapel, Valdivia decided to continue onto the fort.[41]

On December 25, 1553, Valdivia arrived at the fort hoping to find his troops awaiting him. Rather he found the fort in complete ruins and not one remaining conquistador. Lautaro had planned on his old master's arrival, and not long after Valdivia began to set up his camp among the ruins, Lautaro and his Araucanian followers launched an attack on the Spanish.[42] Valdivia organized his men, numbering about 55 Spaniards and between 2,000 and 5,000 native allies,[43] in time to repel the first Araucanian wave of attack with limited casualties, but the Araucanians,

[39] Jeronimo de Vivar, *Crónica y relación copiosa y verdadera de los reinos de Chile* (Sanitago: Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico José Toribio Medina, 1966), CXV
[40]Vivar, CXV
[41]Vivar, CXV
[42]Vivar, CXV
[43] Vivar, CXV

totaling an estimated 10,000 native warriors,[44] did not allow the Spanish time to savor their victory as a second wave of natives attacked. While the natives were more successful in dismounting and maiming the Spanish troops and their native allies during this wave, the group led by Valdivia managed to fend off the natives.[45] Despite his implementation of Spanish tactics in battle, Lautaro now faced defeat and humiliation against the man that he used to serve.

With his first two waves repelled, Lautaro had only one last group to send against the Spanish. According to the cronistas, retreat was not an option for the warrior. They highlight instead his courageous action in battle and a famous speech intended to encourage his warriors. In these dramatic scenes, the cronistas associated Lautaro simultaneously with honor, violence, and treachery. As the Araucanians prepared for their final charge, Lautaro stood in front of his troops and addressed them with confidence and bravado. Despite Lautaro's youth, the troops listened attentively while he spoke to them of the importance of this final charge. The future of their homeland depended upon their success, and his promise of slavery and death if victory was not obtained, reinvigorated the troops. The chroniclers' emphases on Lautaro's oratory skills imbued him with honor that other native leaders had not received. In Spanish military culture, oratory was identified with education and ability, and as such, native dialogue was rarely portrayed with the sophistication of Lautaro's speech. By demonstrating the ability to encourage and influence his troops through his voice, Lautaro garnered honor that was not typically given to the natives who were generally portrayed as savages.

All of the chroniclers quoted Lautaro's speech except for Vivar, who provided the most impartial image of Lautaro. Even Lobera, who fought against Lautaro and whose narrative

[44] Estimates of the number of Araucanian troops varies wildly. Vivar guessed more than 50,000 while Lobera stated that they had 150,000 soldiers. Modern estimates usually list the number at 10,000 which appears the most likely scenario.

[45] Pedro de Lobera, 335

carried the heaviest anti-Lautaro bias, spent over 20 lines depicting the speech. Vivar introduced Lautaro as a "bad indian,[46]" and stated that he encouraged his troops as the Spanish and their horses tired before picking up his lance and joining the fight. While Vivar demonstrated the courage and leadership of Lautaro by encouraging his troops to fight, he referred to Lautaro as a "bad indian" in order to create the image of a savage native that the Spanish Crown had come to accept. This attempt to introduce the honor and military proficiency of Lautaro while also invoking the standard image of a native warrior demonstrated how Vivar tried to remain impartial throughout his text. While his European roots showed at times, Vivar's lack of romanticization of Lautaro fell in line with the rest of his chronicle and explained his neutrality towards the speech.

While Vivar did not emphasize Lautaro's speech, Ercilla, Ovalle, Lobera, and Rosales all quoted the speech in its entirety. Their descriptions have similarities, such that all four chroniclers believed Lautaro started his speech questioning his men, but from the start we see variations in their texts. Ovalle and Rosales, both seventeenth century chroniclers whose writings were based off sixteenth century sources such as Ercilla's *La Araucana*, began with more or less the same line of questioning on the part of Lautaro that opened this chapter, "What is this, brave Arauca?"[47] Ercilla, the author of the epic poem *La Araucana* that featured Lautaro as a protagonist, opened similarly with, "Oh blind people, terror-guided, Where are turned your breasts so fearful?[48]" And finally Lobera, the Spanish soldier and chronicler who wrote so negatively of Lautaro, started his quote with, "What cowardice is this, valorous Araucanos?"[49] This language appears quite similar, but the difference in vocabulary and tone showed how the

[46]Vivar, CXV. "mal indio"
[47]Ovalle, 147 and Rosales, 497. Translated from "Que es esto, valerosos Araucanos y Tucapeles?"
[48]Ercilla, 55
[49]Lobera, 355. Translated from "Que cobardía es ésta, valerosos araucanos?"

chronicler saw Lautaro and how the rest of the speech proceeded. Lobera's representation of Lautaro as calling the actions of his troops "cowardice" exemplified his attempts throughout his text to portray Lautaro as arrogant and pompous. Through the implication that Lautaro demeaned his men by calling them cowards, Lobera diminished the image of Lautaro and reminded the reader of his barbarous roots. While all of the chronicles demeaned Lautaro and his native allegiance, Lobera did so most. This negative attitude can be explained by the fact that Lobera and Lautaro battled against each other. Having stood across the battlefield from Lautaro, and also having seen him slay Spanish men, Lobera demeaned Lautaro more than any other cronistas, none of who had ever fought against Lautaro.

This image of Lautaro demeaning his men appeared minimally in the narratives of Ovalle, Rosales, or Ercilla. Ercilla depicted Lautaro, after his initial question, as encouraging his troops to find the honor of their ancestors and "flee the heavy yoke of serfdom."[50] He concluded the speech,

"What I tell you fix in memory:
Leaden, eyeless fears unman you.
To the world leave storied record
how you freed your hopeless homeland.
Turn, not spurning victors' laurels,
To which smiling Fortune beckons
Stay your feet, now poised for fleeing.
Look how I for you will perish.[51]"

Ercilla's poetic description of this oration is similar to Ovalle's more concise version of Lautaro's speech, and Ovalle emphasized similar themes as Ercilla and Rosales, the other seventeenth century cronista featured in this text alongside Ovalle. Ovalle acknowledged the influence of Ercilla's work, and it can be seen in his version of the speech. According to Ovalle,

[50]Ercilla, 54
[51]Ercilla, 54

Lautaro urged his soldiers to remove themselves from the possibility of slavery and remember the honor and success of their ancestors.[52] His version of the speech's conclusion -- "Drive away all fear, generous soldiers, and either live free or die"[53] -- differed from that of other cronistas, yet it shared with them the theme of heroism and highlighted Lautaro's respect for his men as seen in the narratives of both Rosales and Ercilla.

This theme of heroism in Rosales' work appears to be influenced by the other three sources explored here. Rosales finished his work in the second half of the seventeenth century unlike Ercilla, Lobera, and Ovalle who wrote their chronicles in the sixteenth century or first half of the seventeenth century. With this, the other three cronistas provided ideas to draw from for Rosales. While his access to the other works can be questioned, his similarities to their work indicate that Rosales read some of the other cronistas texts. His opening mirrored that of Ovalle's chronicle, but he continued in further detail. He noted the weakness of the Spanish men as Ercilla and Lobera both did, but he did not use it as a way of questioning his troops' fortitude like Lobera attempted. He interestingly concluded in a new manner, stating that Lautaro told his men that he formerly served with the governor, Valdivia, and he was just as much a man as they were. It appears as if Rosales wanted to humanize Lautaro and avoid creating too much of a larger-than-life legacy for him. At the same time, his portrayal evinced the influence of Ercilla and Ovalle who portrayed Lautaro as honorable and worthy of respect. These examples of heroic activity by Lautaro litter the texts, and we will see later in the chapter why the cronistas applied this theme of heroism to Lautaro.

While the cronistas used Lautaro's speech and valor in battle to display his traits as an honorable hero, they demeaned him as a savage barbarian throughout their texts. Lobera

[52] Ovalle, 147
[53] Ovalle, 147

referenced the "indian Lautaro"[54] as arrogant and pompous in order to demonstrate his negative attributes. By highlighting these unfavorable qualities, Lobera advanced his argument that even with his oratory skills and valor, Lautaro was a savage from the woods of Chile. The chronicler wanted to create a divide in civility between Lautaro and the Spaniards and did so by demeaning him as a pompous Indian. Ercilla, after gushing about Lautaro's bravery, described him as greedy and barbaric.[55] These negative references appeared while Ercilla boasted of Lautaro's heroics, which seemed almost contradictory. Why would Ercilla spend so much time praising Lautaro yet continuously call him a barbarian? In the conquest period, Spaniards imbued natives with a reputation as savages. The conquests of Peru and Mexico occurred decades before the Conquest of Chile began, and the representation of natives as savages became established before the natives in Chile even faced the Spanish.

By declaring the natives as an inferior group, the Spanish gave themselves a moral and legal imperative to conquer this new land. The Spanish looked to the Pope for legal authority, but as Francisco de Vitoria argued, "even in the spiritual realm, the Pope lacks jurisdiction over the unbelievers. The Pope's authority is partial, limited to the spiritual dimension of the Christian world."[56] Rather than using divine law, Vitoria applied natural law and in particular the doctrine of jus gentium as a justification for the conquest. Jus gentium emerged from Roman law, and the characterization of the natives as humans with reason put the conquests of Mexico and Peru under this jurisdiction. Under jus gentium, keeping certain people outside of a town or city could be seen as acts of war, and since the natives in Mexico and Peru demonstrated manners of civility in their resistance of Spanish infiltration, the Spanish retaliation was legal. Entitled to

[54] Lobera, 335
[55] Ercilla, 55
[56] Francisco de Vitoria, *De Indis et de ivre Belli Relectiones* (Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Institute, 1557/1917)

defend themselves, the Spanish justified their aggression. In the case of the conquest of Chile, this recognition of civility and reason did not exist. The Araucanians faced the portrayal of a savage tribe that lacked civility. Outside of the cronistas demonstration of Lautaro's logic and intelligence, the image construed of the Araucanians is barbaric and unrefined. While jus gentium could not rationalize the conquest of Chile, the conquistadors were relatively unconcerned with Vitoria's natural law as they saw religion and the discretion of the Pope as the only necessary justifications of their invasion.

While the Pope lacked true legal power according to Vitoria, religion provided the moral rationale to condone conquest. Catholicism played a large role in Spanish society, and it spurred much of the conquest.[57] John Schwaller states in his book, *The History of the Catholic Church in Latin America,* that, "While the conquerors unquestionably sought personal gain, they also believed that they were participating in a divinely inspired adventure to bring all of the world's population to the Gospel of Christ."[58] This spreading of the gospel and evangelization of the natives rationalized the Spaniards violent attacks upon the Americas, even in areas where the natives did not demonstrate the civility necessary to fall under the jurisdiction of jus gentium. By bringing along priests and setting up missions, the Spaniards answered their obligation of spreading the Christian gospel and thus justified their invasion.

The peoples of the New World often practiced their own forms of religion, but they did not observe Christian rituals. Due to this, the Spanish saw them as pagans who needed Christ in order to be civilized humans. With this rationale that the natives were barbarians without Christ, the Spanish created a reason to invade the land. By conquering these pagans, they would provide them a better life. No matter their skills or abilities, even those of the honorable Lautaro,

[57] Samuel G. Payne, *A History of Spain and Portugal* (New York: Harper, 1860) Vol.1, Chapt. 10
[58] John Schwaller, *The History of the Catholic Church in Latin America* (New York: NYU Press, 2011) 52

conquest provided the best possible life for these savages.

To further cast Lautaro as a barbarian, the cronistas addressed his violent actions. While his violence was often glorified to project his heroism, it also demonstrated his savagery. Ercilla, in his chronicle *La Araucana,* stated of Lautaro entering battle,

Wild, he slashed another soldier
In the thigh, and broke his spear-point,
Left a hideous wound to fester
Casting down the jagged javelin,
Seizing from the sword a hatchet,
He would smite and maim and butcher,
Widening swaths with shortened scythe stroke[59]

This passage identified Lautaro as a great warrior fighting to save his homeland, but by introducing his violence as "wild" along with detailing him as smiting, maiming, and butchering, Ercilla created the image of a savage in the battlefield. By portraying him as out of control, he cannot be classified alongside the sophisticated leaders of the Spanish. Lobera continued in this vein stating that Lautaro's actions during the final charge at Tucapel were that of an "uncontrolled lion."[60] Lobera asserted that the Araucanian people possessed a special spirit of violence. He believed this love of violence extended across their population, but Lobera stated that Lautaro in particular typified this spirit of violence. He even claimed that this sense of violence had led to the total destruction of Chile and the death of millions A civilized human would not cause death and destruction, so by showing that Lautaro accomplished these things; we associate Lautaro with violence and savagery.

While the cronistas worked to depict Lautaro as another savage native, they also admitted to his heroic qualities because on this occasion he defeated the Spanish. The cronistas could not

[59] Ercilla, 55
[60] Lobera, 335

write back to the king that a savage from Chile led a poorly equipped army of natives to victory over the almighty Spanish. Due to these high expectations from the Crown, the cronistas depicted Lautaro as a worthy adversary in order to justify their losses. By invoking themes of heroism including his oratory skills and skill in battle, these sources transformed the image of Lautaro from brave soldier to one of the greatest military heroes ever.

Although Lautaro had displayed his physical skills in battle, his oratory skills proved to be the other necessary key to command the respect and obedience of his soldiers. This attribution of oral skills by all sources, including Lobera, did not come as coincidence. In Conquest literature, the natives received a perception as ignorant, barbarous savages that needed the help of the Spanish. Detailing Lautaro's speech separated him from this Euro-centric perception of native people. By highlighting his speech, the chroniclers demonstrated that Lautaro could invoke intellect and logic, showing to the Spanish Court that Lautaro differed from the natives that they conquered with such ease in Peru and Mexico. This exhibited the broader narrative strategy seen throughout the texts to depict Lautaro as an adversary with valor and intelligence and demonstrated the unique "in-between-ness" that Lautaro presented.

The theme of natives' oratory abilities appeared in other conquest narratives as well. In Tzvetan Todorov's *The Conquest of America,* originally published in French in 1982, the author looks at how communication shaped the conquest of Mexico. Although many have taken issue with his argument, including Inga Clendinnen,[61] Todorov usefully highlights the importance of communicative practices and the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of intra and cross-cultural communication in the conquest, a theme that other scholars have developed with greater depth and rigor.[62] Todorov points out that one of the reasons that the chroniclers of the conquest

[61] Inga Clendinnen, *Aztecs: An Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
[62] Tzevetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America,* trans. Richard Howard (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press)

portrayed Moctezuma as a weak leader was his failure to maintain the allegiance of his people through oratory; in particular, he highlights the narrative of Moctezuma's death at the hands of his discontented compatriots as he addressed them from in the plaza of Tenochtitlan.

By contrast Malinztin's ability to communicate effectively prompted her favorable portrayal by cronistas.[63] Despite her prior status as a slave, chroniclers and natives alike noted her superior aptitude in translation and communication. This example of how a slave girl came to receive a more respectable reputation than the leader of the Aztec empire demonstrated the importance of communication skills for the Spanish and their chroniclers.

Along with demonstrating Lautaro's heroism and valor through his oratory abilities in his famous speech, the cronistas furthered Lautaro's case as a worthy adversary by comparing him to ancient military legends. Lobera, despite his clear dislike of Lautaro, compared Lautaro and the Araucanians to David and the Israelites. He stated,

> And who encounters the arrogant Lautaro, so pompous with his illustrious victories, and so dear and beloved by his fellow Araucanians that they put in their eyes all of the glory of their liberator, not of another luck than the Israelites eternal love of David for removing his people from the oppression of the superb Goliath.[64]

In this quotation, Lobera continued to demean Lautaro, but in order to create a worthy adversary, he compared the arrogant savage with the beloved figure of David. A popular historical figure in Europe, David drew particular reverence in Spain for being an ancestor of Jesus Christ. Lobera knew the reputation that David held for the Spanish Crown. Thus, he would not have compared someone that he saw as a savage with a relative of Jesus without good reason. Placing such honor and prestige on a native was unheard of, but Lautaro's domination in battle forced admittance from even Lobera that he deserved the status of a worthy adversary.

[63] Todorov, 101
[64] Lobera, 335

While Lobera limited splashing honor upon Lautaro, Ercilla created Lautaro as a protagonist for his chronicle and first established his valor through the demonstration of his oratory skills in his speech to his troops. Ercilla's effort to install heroism upon Lautaro after the battle indicated his attempt to create the image of Lautaro as a worthy adversary. Ercilla made a clear attempt here to create a heroic figure whose actions created legendary tales. After exclaiming what validation this victory provided for Lautaro, Ercilla stated,

"Not two Decii, who bartered
Life away to save their homeland,
Curtius, Scaevola, nor Horace,
Not Leonidas nor peers like
Philo, Fulvius, Cincinnatus,
Marcus, Sergius or Marcellus,
Furius, Scaeva, or Dentatus
Match these redskins as fanatics.
Tell me what they did that equalled
E'er the deed of this barbarian?
What emprise assumed? What battle
Fought that seemed so sure of failure?
And was not their risk and peril
Braved for thirst they had of ruling?
Were they prodded not by interest,
which makes heroes of the craven?"[65]

Ercilla's comparison of Lautaro to legends from Greek and Roman history came with little surprise. The classical Roman model that created the men with whom Lautaro had come to be compared also constructed his image as a hero. Ercilla employed the same archetypes used to create the legends of Leonidas, Hercules, Furius, etc. to describe Lautaro.[66] The classical models of literature used by the Greeks and Romans greatly influenced sixteenth century Spanish writers. Due to this, they created their heroes in a similar way as writers in those ancient civilizations did. A multitude of archetypes existed that could be associated with a hero, and

[65]Ercilla, 55
[66] Diego Javier Luis, "*Historia de la conquista de México*: Grand Narrative of a New World Alexander" (Honors Thesis, Emory University, 2014)

additionally, each hero story had different or new specificities that challenged the homogeneity of the heroic archetype, but while Lautaro served as a different example of hero than those usually presented by these Spanish writers, Ercilla managed to create the legend of Lautaro using many of the same archetypes that date back to the Illiad.[67]

The cronistas reimagined Lautaro as a hero through the use of a few archetypes. Diego Luis explained these archetypes as triumph in single combat, survival against odds, outnumbered in battle, manipulation of fear, and "only a great leader can be victorious."[68] We have seen how Ercilla in just one battle scene demonstrated the archetypes of triumph in battle, survival against odds, and the argument that only a great leader can win. His poetry imagined a fading force that rose up in a final push behind the leadership of their commander. They faced a technologically superior group that had swept through South America with few setbacks. The Spanish conquered most of the areas that they desired, and no native leader demonstrated an understanding of their military tactics needed to consistently defeat them. Lautaro's heroics imparted the first example of a native leader to rise up against the insurmountable odds of defeating the Spanish. The Araucanians gained victory behind Lautaro's cunning speech and whirlwind of activity in battle. By exemplifying these actions of heroics by Lautaro, Ercilla exhibited the classical archetypes seen in hero stories for centuries.

Invoking examples of Lautaro as a singular force that wrought havoc among his enemies helps the reader imagine comparisons of him to Leonidas and Achilles. The creation of these comparisons further aided Ercilla and the other chroniclers with the establishment of Lautaro as an accomplished adversary. The King of Spain would have been more likely to have some

[67]Luis, 60
[68] Luis, 60

sympathy towards the conquistadors' failures if he read that the opposition contained a leader with bravery seen only in ancient legends.

The discussion of Lautaro's association with the Spanish provided another strategy used by the cronistas to demonstrate Lautaro as a worthy adversary. The cronistas all acknowledged that Lautaro encountered Valdivia as he charged into the battle at Tucapel. Accounts of the interaction differ: Ercilla stated that Lautaro thrust his lance a few times toward Valdivia but they exchanged only a glance, not words. Meanwhile Lobera and Rosales claimed that Valdivia called Lautaro a traitor. However, the significance of this sequence does not come from the dialogue. Rather by asserting his relationship to Valdivia, the cronistas remind the reader that Lautaro served once as a Spanish page, further demonstrating his unparalleled "in-between-ness" and explaining his ambivalent treatment from the chroniclers.

While serving as a page may appear menial, Lautaro learned personally from Pedro de Valdivia during his tenure with the Spanish. As a *paje de lanza* or *paje de armas,* Lautaro aided Valdivia by bringing him lances, swords, and other necessary equipment.[69] This position may have been dull, but in order to gain the profession of a soldier, young men, slaves or free, learned from experienced soldiers through their service as a page.[70] Service as a page taught the young men about Spanish military tactics, use of weaponry, and handling of horses. Valdivia must have seen something special in Lautaro to allow him to serve him personally. With this relationship, Valdivia molded Lautaro into an excellent soldier. The governor probably saw Lautaro, with his strong military education, helping to lead the Spanish conquest through his native lands. Lautaro's escape from the Spanish thwarted those plans, and now with his kin, Lautaro employed the strategies taught to him by Valdivia to defeat his old master. This illustration of Lautaro's use

[69] Enciclopedia universal ilustrada (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1905) Volume 40, p. 1581
[70] Enciclopedia universal ilustrada, Volume 40, p. 1581

of Spanish military tactics demonstrated how his treachery resulted in his status as a worthy adversary.

Lautaro's knowledge of Spanish strategies seems to help the cronistas, especially Lobera, rationalize Lautaro's success. It became more acceptable for Lobera to admit defeat when someone who Valdivia trained caused the loss. What's more, Lautaro instilled the use of Spanish weapons and horses to counter their opponents' superior technology. When Lobera came to understand Lautaro's tactics and his use of multiple charges and flanking against Valdivia, he must have recognized how Lautaro had turned the Spaniards' own ideas against them. As Lautaro continued in future battles to use the Spaniards' own military tactics against them with high degrees of success, Lobera admitted Lautaro's ability to lead his men against a very capable military leader such as Valdivia. Lobera conceded to Lautaro's success with his David and Goliath comparison, but he did so while emphasizing that the success came from his violent actions and from his treachery towards the Spanish. Lobera could not deny that Lautaro won illustrious battles and united a group that had great differences, so he created an ambivalent attitude towards Lautaro by making sure that the reader knew that the knowledge needed for victory came from his Spanish experiences while the brutal violence, looked down upon in European society, materialized from Lautaro's Araucanian origins.

Chapter II: Promotion Through Death

In Chapter I, we saw how the cronistas used Lautaro's speech and actions in battle to evoke themes of heroism, violence, and treachery. In this chapter, I will continue to explore the emergence of these themes as the Battle of Tucapel came to a close with Valdivia's death and the promotion of Lautaro to captain of the Araucanian army. Valdivia's death received great attention from the chroniclers, especially Lobera. As they looked to implicate Lautaro's treachery, the cronistas detailed the events leading up to the death of their honorable governor. While the cronistas used Valdivia's death to expand on the themes of Lautaro's savagery and violence, their ambivalence towards him remained as the cronistas described how his victory at the Battle of Tucapel resulted in a promotion for the young Araucanian warrior. Chapter I concluded with Lautaro's heroic run into battle leading to an imminent victory. This chapter will begin by picking up Alonso de Ercilla's account of the battle as it neared its end.

As Lautaro continued dominating the Spanish, Governor Pedro de Valdivia found himself among just a handful of remaining Spaniards. Ercilla, the author of the epic poem *La Araucana,* described him as "aptly dueling,"[71] but that his presence alone was insufficient to recover from the heavy losses already sustained.[72] Seeing the imminent defeat of his squadron, Valdivia turned to a friar, who was one of the few remaining Spaniards, and stated, "Excused are we from fighting. Other lanes of life are left us."[73] After this statement, Valdivia and the friar hopped upon their horses and fled, but their retreat did not succeed. The two became bogged down in the weeds and mud of the Chilean forest and while the natives killed the friar, they captured Valdivia

---

[71] Ercilla, 57
[72] Ercilla, 57
[73] Ercilla, 57

and brought him in front of the Araucanian senate.[74] The Araucanians only united to form council in times of war, and the assembly or parliament consisted of the chieftains of various clans. They elected a *toqui,* the military leader of the united tribes who at this time was Chief Caupolicán, to preside over the council.

Standing humbled, but still alive, in front of Chief Caupolicán, Valdivia obeyed his captors and answered to questions proposed by the chief. He begged for his life and promised peace and freedom in the future for Araucania, the region of Chile populated by the Araucanians. Caupolicán reportedly weighed his options and was closing in a decision when a burly Araucanian came forth and questioned, "Why waste occasion lending credence to a prisoner?"[75] As soon as he finished posing this question, he took his cleaver and smashed it against Valdivia's temple. The blow sent Valdivia to his death, and Caupolicán into a rage of anger. His rage would be short lived as the Araucanians began their customary celebration of victory. Araucanian tradition prescribed great drunken feasts after victory, even if quick military action would be beneficial. Lautaro did not engage in the festivities. Having seen the benefits of swift action from his time with the Spanish, Lautaro made another speech to his men. Rather than encouraging them as in his first speech, Lautaro warned his warriors of the inevitable return of the Spanish for vengeance.[76] The troops received the speech with great attention and approval, and Caupolicán called Lautaro to join him. With Lautaro by his side, Caupolicán showered congratulations upon the young soldier. Due to his accomplishments on the battlefield, Caupolicán's decision to appoint Lautaro as vice *toqui*, or lieutenant,[77] came with rousing support from the troops.

Ercilla's plot line of the events leading up to Valdivia's death is fairly consistent with the

---

[74] Lobera, 336
[75] Ercilla, 57
[76] Ercilla, 59
[77] The vice toqui was the captain of the Araucanian troops. Essentially, Lautaro was Caupolican's number two and would be the field general for the Araucanians.

other sources. Valdivia remained on the battlefield with only a few men left, became captured whilst with a friar, and was brought before Caupolicán where he met his demise. Differences between the texts emerge in the details, however. All of the accounts vary, with no two texts detailing events exactly the same way. How the cronistas described Lautaro's involvement during the events leading up to Valdivia's death provides one of the most intriguing discrepancies. Ercilla did not mention Lautaro at all between his final charge and Valdivia's death. This varied from the majority of other sources that mentioned Lautaro during that time span, but only Diego de Rosales's account included an interaction involving Lautaro and Valdivia.

Rosales, the seventeenth century chronicler and author of the fairly impartial *Historia General del Reinode Chile,* stated that Valdivia stood on the battlefield among his few remaining men, when a brash Lautaro confronted him by placing his lance on Valdivia's chest. Lautaro had already lost all respect for his former master and yelled at him, exclaiming, "Flee, Valdivia, if you don't want to pay for those whippings that you all gave me in your home."[78] A defeated Valdivia replied to his former page, "Everything is already lost, and God has ordered it this way."[79] The natives brought him before Caupolicán and the senate. Interestingly as Valdivia faced the Araucanian senate, Lautaro redeveloped some compassion for his old master as he begged for his life. Rosales believed that Caupolicán and Lautaro were inclined to spare Valdivia, but his promises did not inspire the rest of the Araucanians. They decided to kill him along with the other remaining Spaniards and natives allies as the senate decided to spare no men associated with the Spanish The portrayal of the deaths came with great violence as many died of beheading while others had their limbs cut off and eaten in front of them while they bled to death. While there was some certainty about the troops deaths, Rosales narrated Valdivia's death

[78]Diego de Rosales, *Historia general de el reino de Chile* (Valparaiso: Impr. Del Mercurio, 1877), 499. Translated from "Huye, Valdivia, si no quieres pagar a mis manos los azotes que en tu casa me dieron."

[79]Rosales, 499. Translated from "Ya todo está perdido y Dios lo ha ordenado assi"

with less certitude. He first presented the scenario that the Araucanians poured molten gold down Valdivia's throat to kill him.

This death by molten gold appeared in Alonso de Ovalle and Pedro de Lobera's texts as well, and while Rosales possibly drew his interpretation from their works, his access to the two chronicles may have been limited. The publication of Lobera's chronicle, *Cronica del Reino de Chile,* which carried favorable bias toward the Spanish*,* occurred in the 19th century, and Ovalle's publication*, Historica relacion del Reyno de Chile* which favorably portrayed Lautaro and the natives, only appeared after 1646. Theodor de Bry's engravings of copper plates in the late 16th century included a portrayal of natives pouring molten gold down a Spaniard's throat.[80] His multi volume work *Grandes Voyages* spread across Europe and likely would have been an available source for Rosales. De Bry never visited the New World, so he based his engravings on accounts written by others. His lack of visual evidence resulted in natives appearing similar to Mediterranean Europeans. Despite these misinterpretations, the engravings became the first visual documentation of the indigenous people in the Americas. As such they greatly influenced how many Europeans saw the American natives. Before arriving in the Americas, Rosales likely based much of his assumptions of New World natives on the visual depictions created by de Bry. While his time in the Americas likely changed some of his views on the native people, his initial impression of the indigenous – likely influenced by De Bry's images -- might have lingered.

Despite the inclusion of the molten gold story, Rosales believed that Valdivia's death probably materialized in customary Araucanian fashion. In this scenario, captains of the Araucanian army surrounded him before one of them took a club to his head. After the clubbing,

[80] Theodore de Bry, *The Indians, to satisfy their wickedness, pour molten gold in the mouths of the Spaniards* (University of Houston Digital Collection, 1594)

the rest of the captains joined in with lances to stab the Spaniard to death.[81] This uncertainty regarding the manner of Valdivia's death can be seen in Lobera and Ovalle's texts as well.

While Lobera's account did not involve any interaction between Lautaro and Valdivia, it did develop the theme of violence that Rosales presented. Before Lobera addressed two possible scenarios for Valdivia's death, he explained to the reader that there could not be true certainty about Valdivia's death as no Spaniards lived to tell the tale. With only the word of natives, Lobera questioned the validity of their stories. Despite this uncertainty, he presented the first scenario of Valdivia's death, and it followed Ercilla's example closely. As the senate began to ponder Valdivia's fate, an Araucanian rose up and clubbed Valdivia over the head, sending him to a quick death. At this point, Lobera's version departs from Ercilla's narrative. Rather than present Lautaro speaking to his men and being promoted, Lobera noted that as soon as the Araucanian clubbed Valdivia, Lautaro put his lance through the body of the interpreter, Agustín.[82] Agustín played a small role throughout the chronicle, just being described as Valdivia's interpreter. The young man probably was a captured native who learned Spanish serving under Valdivia, similar to Lautaro, but their similarities drew no sympathy from Lautaro as his lance killed the innocent interpreter. While Lobera confided that he believed in this version, he wanted to share a second scenario. The second version is the same as Rosales's example with the molten gold being poured down Valdivia's throat. Like Rosales, Lobera did not have much faith in this version, but the allusion to such a painful death furthered the theme of violence and savagery.

Ovalle's version of Valdivia's death contained similarities to the other texts, such as the theme of violence, but brought a new interaction with Lautaro. Ovalle stated that with defeat

[81] Rosales, 501
[82] Lobera, 336

certain, Valdivia stepped aside with the Spanish chaplain to say his final prayers. His prayer lasted just a short time as the natives captured him and killed the chaplain. From here, the natives brought him before Caupolicán where Valdivia begged for his life. He looked toward Lautaro with the hope of his former page interceding to save his life before continuing to plead for mercy. Caupolicán leaned toward sparing Valdivia, and Ovalle noted that Lautaro would have undoubtedly been inclined to show mercy for his old master. Lautaro fought against his master not out of hate for him but for love of his homeland.[83] The desire for liberty outweighed the gratitude that he owed Valdivia. Despite Lautaro and Caupolicán's interest in mercy, the other natives forced a pronouncement of death for the governor. Ovalle, like Rosales and Lobera, presented multiple versions of Valdivia's death. He first noted the tale of Valdivia drinking the molten gold that Rosales and Lobera both introduced. He followed with the version where a native clubbed Valdivia over the head as the senate pondered his fate, but Ovalle preferred a third version that he presented. Ovalle firmly believed that the Araucanians chopped off Valdivia's thighs and legs and turned the bones into flutes and trumpets before chopping off his head. They kept the head to celebrate their victory and to encourage their youth to participate in similar actions.[84]

By detailing three vicious methods of Valdivia's death, Ovalle not only continued the theme of violence seen among the chronicles; he established this violence as gratuitous and excessive. The Spaniards believed that violence could be justified, one can see that through their invasions of the Americas, but by displaying the grotesque details of the Araucanians violence, Ovalle demonstrated the savagery of Lautaro's violent actions. Spaniards saw the natives' practice of chopping off their enemies' limbs and turning them into musical instruments as

[83] Ovalle, 145
[84] Ovalle, 145

particularly barbaric and as a form of violence not seen in European warfare. By demonstrating that the Lautaro and his troops' violence emerged in such a gratuitous manner, Ovalle placed the Araucanians' violence on another, more uncivilized level than the violence practiced by the Spanish.

This insinuation of cruel violence also advanced the trope of native barbarism via the distinction between barbaric enemy natives and Christianized or allied natives. While the Spanish considered all natives inferior, they classified groups as *nativos amigos* or *nativos barbaros*. In this sequence, Ovalle clearly demonstrated that the Araucanians fell in the latter category. By depicting the Araucanian tribes as especially barbaric in their violence, Ovalle alluded to the uncivilized manner of the natives. Lautaro, through his time with the Spanish, gained some 'civil habits,' such as speaking Spanish, but this demonstration of the tribes' dedication to barbaric activity showed that Lautaro lost his civility by returning to the savage natives. In order to fulfill his allegiance to his tribe, Lautaro returned to the methods of gratuitous violence that the Spanish saw as so egregious and savage. For the cronistas, this return to barbarism exhibited Lautaro's fundamental essence as a savage. Despite his training by the Spanish and heroic actions, Lautaro's violent actions showed how his savage roots remained intact.

This relation of Lautaro's fundamental essence as a savage and his treachery can also be seen in Lobera's work. While variation in the narrative of Valdivia's death existed across the texts, Lobera created a clear connection between Lautaro's violence and treachery with his first example of Valdivia's death. While another Araucanian delivered the deathblow to Valdivia, Lautaro reacted instantly by killing Agustín, the interpreter. While Agustín appeared in a nominal role, his death showed Lautaro's treachery and lack of sympathy. Agustín, as mentioned

earlier, likely became captured by the Spanish at a young age and learned the Spanish language well enough to serve as Valdivia's interpreter. His capturing and serving of Valdivia generated a connection between the two men from Araucania, but this similarity did not affect Lautaro's decision-making. Rather than spare a young man who served his old master, Lautaro demonstrated his complete allegiance to the Araucanians by killing Agustín. Lautaro needed to show the senate that he had no fidelity for the Spanish, and by exhibiting violent behavior against the interpreter; he displayed the aggressive nature that the senate desired from its military leaders. By exposing Lautaro's aggressive actions, Lobera evinced Lautaro's violence and treachery in one passage.

Rosales also facilitated the connection between violence and treachery in his text. Rosales presented Lautaro confronting Valdivia with his lance drawn and all respect lost for his "amo."[85] By insinuating that Lautaro had lost his deference toward Valdivia and would dare to confront him with a lance pointed at his chest, Rosales demonstrated that Lautaro's spirit of violence transcended any relationship that he built with the Spaniards. While it appeared that Lautaro presented Valdivia the opportunity to flee, his statement that he would make Valdivia pay for all of the whippings that he received during his servitude promoted the connection between treachery and violence. In their interaction, Lautaro made it clear that when Valdivia was captured, there would be no sympathy, only more violence. Rosales, as we will see later in the chapter, portrayed some of Lautaro's actions sympathetically, but before then, he clearly exhibited that Lautaro no longer wanted any association with the Spanish and was willing to use violence to display his allegiance to the Araucanians.

Violence came to symbolize not only Lautaro's treachery, but also his loyalty. While Rosales, like the other chroniclers, never explicitly deduces that Lautaro must express his

[85] Rosales, 499

allegiance to the Araucanians in order to gain the trust of his troops, it can be assumed that after six years with the Spanish, Lautaro wanted to prove to his comrades that his commitment lay with the Araucanians. There existed no better way to demonstrate his devotion to his homeland than invoking violence upon his former master and his troops.

Rosales portrayed Lautaro's actions of violence against the Spanish as treason, but by doing so, he alluded that Lautaro displayed his dedication to his fellow Araucanians by leading the charge against the Spaniards. By demonstrating Lautaro's loyalty to the natives, his acts of violence also enhanced his reputation as a hero. With his violence rationalized as a demonstration of allegiance, it came to represent heroism alongside treachery. While he committed gratuitous violence against the Spaniards, he did so to exhibit his faithfulness toward the troops from his homeland. To display this loyalty, Lautaro needed the heroic traits of bravery and courage in order to confront the Spaniards. His violent acts exhibited his use of these heroic traits in order to prove his complete devotion to Araucania and his troops.

Rosales and Lobera used violence to allude to Lautaro's treachery, but Ercilla took another approach. Rather than represent Lautaro as overly violent towards captured Spaniards, Ercilla essentially left Lautaro out of the sequences leading up to Valdivia's death. While he excluded Lautaro from the passages on Valdivia's death, Ercilla introduced Lautaro, stating,

Who as page once served Valdivia,
Long caressed by him, and favored
In the time of peaceful service[86]

This quotation established an endearing relationship between the two soldiers, which made

[86] Ercilla, 54

Lautaro's lack of aid or protection toward his former beloved master such a treasonous act. By emphasizing the old rapport between the two men alongside the absence of Lautaro in Valdivia's death scene, Ercilla implied Lautaro's betrayal toward the Spanish. While Ercilla did not emblazon Lautaro as a traitor through violence, his subtle mention of a strong relation between Valdivia and Lautaro alluded to the larger theme of treachery by Lautaro.

The cronistas developed the theme of treachery by emphasizing Lautaro and the Araucanians' desire for Spanish goods. Lobera, Ovalle, and Ercilla all mentioned the Araucanians' love of Spanish clothes and weapons. Ercilla did not address Lautaro specifically but noted how the natives fought over helmets and breastplates. During a celebration after a victory over the Spanish, the natives made Spanish treasures the prizes for a variety of competitions that they undertook. The excitement over these Spanish prizes caused great excitement and a greater number of competitors than expected.[87] Lautaro, as the second in command, did not participate but having enjoyed some Spanish pleasures in his years serving Valdivia, surely shared the same enthusiasm as his fellow warriors for the "lustrous cutlass", "lively dappled greyhound," and "bow of taut-strung sinews."[88] Ovalle also explained this desire for Spanish goods in his chronicle. He noted how when Lautaro returned from battle, he, along with all 130 other caciques, wore Spanish clothes that they stripped from Spaniards killed in battle. What's more, Caupolicán sported Valdivia's green and gold-laced clothes along with his back and breastplate and helmet. Lobera continued addressing the natives' desire for Spanish clothes, weapons, animals, etc. After the Battle of Tucapel, the natives looted the dead and captured Spaniards, taking their jewels, weapons, and horses. They even captured Valdivia's pack mule and dinner set.

[87] Ercilla, 110
[88] Ercilla, 110

These examples of Lautaro and his fellow Araucanians looting the Spanish for their goods solidified the portrayal Lautaro as treacherous and advanced his rare case of "in-between-ness." Lautaro's experience with the Spanish introduced him to some of the luxuries the Spanish afforded, and so even after returning to the Araucanians for the love of his homeland, he appreciated the Spaniards' superior dress and weaponry. By fostering this connection between Lautaro and Spanish goods, the chroniclers built on their theme of treachery. The cronistas often detailed how Lautaro's departure from the Spanish was for the love of his nation, but by showing that he still wanted Spanish clothes and other goods, they demonstrated how the Spanish civilized Lautaro during his service to them, and this desire for Spanish culture despite his move to the Araucanians exemplified his treasonous action. Ovalle and Lobera acknowledged the use of Valdivia's personal items by Caupolicán and other Spaniards, and this also showed Lautaro's treachery. If he truly loved his former master, he would not have allowed the looting and use of Valdivia's goods. By allowing Caupolicán to wear Valdivia's armor and clothes, the cronistas demonstrated Lautaro's full allegiance to the natives and his treason towards Valdivia and the Spanish. Furthermore, this demonstration continued the exhibition of Lautaro's unprecedented "in-between-ness" that arose after his return to the Araucanians.

Despite the cronistas efforts to demonstrate Lautaro as a traitor, their ambivalence towards him endured as aspects of Lautaro's heroism and status as a worthy adversary continued to be displayed through this part of the narrative. We see in Ovalle and Rosales's texts some compassion towards Lautaro that helped to negate some of the negativity created with his treason. Rosales first presented Lautaro as without love for his former master, but once Valdivia stood before Caupolicán, Lautaro showed empathy towards his former master.[89] He could not enjoy seeing Valdivia in such a humbled state and was inclined to spare his life. Ovalle presented

[89] Rosales, 500

Lautaro in a similarly compassionate manner when he saw his former master facing the Araucanian senate. Lautaro certainly desired mercy for Valdivia, as he still showed gratitude towards the Governor.[90]

These demonstrations of compassion humanized Lautaro. Humanizing Lautaro encouraged his theme of heroism, as it demonstrated him as someone with empathy, love and reasoning. These attributes allowed Lautaro to be shown in a civilized manner, contrary to typical tropes of native savagery and barbarism. Other cronistas showed Lautaro as a worthy adversary through his knowledge of Spanish military tactics, violence in battle, and oratory abilities, but these admissions of human qualities permitted Lautaro to be seen as comparable to the Spaniards that he faced. As a man affected by emotion, the cronistas portrayed Lautaro as someone with similar qualities to theirs, and as such, a worthy opponent.

What's more, they reinforced that Lautaro fought against the Spanish out of love for his homeland, not for a hate of Valdivia or the Spanish. This perception that Lautaro fought not for his distaste of the Spanish, but rather for the independence of his nation, added to his heroism and his recognition as a worthy adversary. By demonstrating that logic and reason stood behind his violence, the cronistas underscored Lautaro's heroics.

Lautaro's heroics endured in the sequences immediately following Valdivia's death in the texts of Ercilla and Ovalle. After Valdivia's clubbing to death, the Araucanians began their traditional post-victory celebration. As the natives whooped, hollered, drank, and ate, Lautaro sat at the back awaiting the end of the feast.

Ercilla presented Lautaro as wise and superior here before launching into Lautaro's second speech within just five pages. Ercilla’s five paragraph narrative of the second speech highlighted Lautaro’s oratory skills, with Lautaro advising his men that the fight was not over. In

[90] Ovalle, 148

the third paragraph, Lautaro exclaimed,

Ye have bludgeoned bluff Valdivia,
And destroyed his men and fortress.
They will surely come for vengeance
When the news pervades the cities.
Give the foe an open passage.
Let them come loose-reined and frothing;
They shall not return thereafter[91]

Lautaro appears intelligent and logical due to his oratory skills and reasoning. The speech provides evidence of the valor and courage that defined a hero. While the rest of the army celebrated traditionally, Lautaro already thought ahead to the future of the war. He focused on how his troops could put away the Spanish for good. While it was one thing to think ahead, Lautaro had the bravery to stand in front of a large, drunken contingency of Araucanian warriors and speak confidently of his plan. Just as he commanded his troops' attention during his speech before the final charge at the Battle of Tucapel, Lautaro's oration was met with great attention and widespread approval.[92] Lautaro received the respect that a hero deserved from his troops, and Caupolicán saw this honor that the troops placed upon the young warrior.

With the rowdiness subdued and readiness for war renewed behind Lautaro's speech, Caupolicán took control of the conference. He turned toward Lautaro and showered him with praise. The general said to the young man,

You have clipped the tyrant's talons!
You alone procured the triumph
Worthy of reward and memory!
Lords, it is now clear and patent,
that Lautaro gat this outcome.
I for fit remuneration,
Dub you captain, my lieutenant,
Paying back the power you saved me,

[91] Ercilla, 59
[92] Ercilla, 59

though I am your debtor always.[93]

Through Caupolicán's words, we see how important Lautaro's heroic actions in battle had been. The leader of the great Araucanian army credited him solely with the victory over Governor Valdivia. By becoming Caupolicán's second in command, Lautaro enhanced his reputation and status. Ovalle did not go into as much detail concerning Lautaro's promotion, but his and Ercilla's inclusion of Lautaro's new position validated their arguments of his heroism and status as an admirable adversary. By giving Lautaro a valuable title, they could show how among the natives Lautaro was viewed as a superior. Ercilla contributed to enhancing this argument with his exhibition of Lautaro's speech and describing Lautaro as, "industrious, wise and ready, shrewd and prudent, … , with a mind inured to greatness."[94] Just as we saw in Chapter I, Ercilla continued creating a heroic figure to fit the archetypes of the ancient Greek literature. By having Caupolicán state that Lautaro "alone procured the triumph,"[95] Ercilla exemplified the archetype that victory is only possible due to a great leader. Lautaro's great mental heroism made him a worthy adversary.

Through the description of the events leading up to and following Pedro de Valdivia's death, the themes of violence, treachery, and heroism continued to merge in order to define Lautaro. The variety in the chronicler's descriptions of this passage allowed for different viewpoints, but despite their differences, they all managed to demonstrate violence and treachery in the events surrounding Valdivia's death. While Lobera did not use this scene to continue pursuing Lautaro's heroism and stature as a worthy adversary, Rosales, Ovalle, and especially Ercilla managed to further their arguments by exemplifying Lautaro's compassion, oratory abilities, and archetype as a leader that his army could not win without. These cronistas

[93]Ercilla, 59
[94]Ercilla, 59
[95] Ercilla, 59

continued their demonstration of ambivalence towards Lautaro as his unique case of "in-between-ness" and success versus the Spanish forced them to show Lautaro's honorable traits in an effort to explain the Araucanians' victory.

Chapter III: A Fitting End

Having covered Lautaro's rise to *toqui* and his qualification as a worthy adversary, this final chapter will detail the events leading up to the young warrior's death. This chapter focuses especially on two encounters involving Lautaro. The first is his meeting with a former Spanish comrade, Marcos Vaéz, while the second details a dream had by Lautaro just hours before his death. These events further demonstrate how the cronistas affix Lautaro with themes of treachery, violence and heroism in order to create a chronicle that explained the success of the barbarian from Chile. By illuminating these themes, the cronistas showed the special aspects of Lautaro's "in-between-ness," such as his relationship with Marcos Vaéz, the Spanish soldier, and the heroic tropes assigned to him.

The chronicles concur that after Valdivia's death and Lautaro's promotion to *toqui*, skirmishes continued between the Spanish and Araucanians with Lautaro leading his troops to

multiple victories. “Los lautorinos”[96] routed Concepcion twice before heading north to Santiago. Lautaro and his troops, many of whom had recently been recruited by Lautaro as the army moved north, crossed the Maule River in 1556. They established camp at a location known as Peteroa,[97] about twenty leagues from the city of Santiago,[98] but a group of twenty Spaniards attacked the Araucanians upon hearing of their position. Lautaro and his troops repelled this first attack, but knowing that another larger contingent would return, the Araucanian leader and his men constructed a fort and flooded the surrounding land to hinder their opponents.[99]

Lautaro's prediction of the Spaniards’ return proved to be accurate as a larger Spanish contingent aided by native allies arrived to clash with Lautaro's troops. Despite the new contingency of Spanish soldiers, the Araucanians managed to maintain their position. The natives success against all odds aroused the grudging admiration of the cronistas, however they note that losses of around 200 Araucanian soldiers forced Lautaro's retreat. The Araucanians moved southward and refortified themselves beyond the Itata River.[100]

While the Araucanians established a new fort after their retreat, the Spanish sent out expeditions to keep an eye out for their foes. However, since the Araucanians had thorough knowledge of their land, the Spanish were unable to find any trace of the natives. Pedro de Lobera and Alonso de Ercilla stated in their chronicles that Marcos Vaéz, a captain for the Spanish forces, was concluding a search with another Spaniard, when he “heard a voice behind the ramparts call: 'Approach for sanctuary.'”[101] Upon hearing his name announced, Vaéz approached the promise of safety alone. As he grew closer, Vaéz recognized the voice of a man with whom he had spent much time with in the past. Vaéz approached Lautaro, whom he

[96] Lobera, 349
[97] Vivar, CXXVIII
[98] Vivar, CXXVIII
[99] Vivar, CXXVIII
[100] Lobera, LIV
[101] Ercilla, 124

formerly "treated once as kith and brother."[102]

Despite their formerly close relationship that stemmed from Lautaro's time as a *criado*,, Lautaro did not greet Marcos as a friend. Rather he entered into a monologue that questioned the Spanish invasion. He warned the Spanish soldier that the Araucanians would wreck havoc until the Spaniards left their land. He followed that the Araucanians would only accept surrender from the Spanish under specific terms. Lautaro demanded,

Thirty virgins, fair and shapely,
You'll agree each year to send us,
Blonde, genteel, milk-white, and lovely,
Hostages, all Spanish women,
Ranging fifteen years to twenty;
Thirty shawls of fine green linen,
Thirty other capes of purple,
Trimmed with threads of gold, rich-woven;
Twelve, young horses from your stables,
Full caparisoned with harness,
Tamed, though fiery brutes of swiftness,
well controlled by bit and bridle;
Six fleet greyhounds, you'll deliver,
Ravenous in chase and venery.[103]

Marcos met these outlandish demands with a smile. He warned Lautaro to limit his pride and prepare to pay the tribute of death to the Spanish.[104] Ercilla and Lobera sustained the theme of Lautaro's treachery by portraying the encounter between Lautaro and Marcos who once considered each other kin, in such a hostile manner.

Despite variations across the chronicles in the details of Lautaro's confrontation with Marcos Vaéz, both Lobera and Ercilla underscored Lautaro's treachery through their representation of his relationship with Marcos as well as by illustrating his extravagant demands

[102] Ercilla, 124
[103] Ercilla, 125
[104] Ercilla, 125

from the Spanish. Ercilla and Lobera introduced Marcos by addressing his relation to Lautaro. Lobera stated that Lautaro and Marcos knew each other well as they had previously stayed together in Pedro de Valdivia's home and spent significant time together.[105] Ercilla did not convey in detail how the two knew each other, but by claiming that Lautaro was "treated once as kith and brother"[106] by Marcos, one can assume that they met and became acquaintances while serving under Governor Valdivia. This establishment of at least a nominal friendship between Lautaro and a Spaniard lends additional detail into Lautaro's time with the Spanish, reminding the reader that Lautaro left Valdivia and their relationship of *crianza* , which allowed him to once be considered kin to the Spaniards, in order to return to the barbaric natives.

The interaction between Lautaro and Marcos demonstrates Lautaro's integration into the Spanish ranks. Neither Lobera nor Ercilla mentioned the language used in this interaction, however it can be assumed that Marcos did not speak Mapudungun, the language spoken by the natives of south central Chile. Their interaction must have occurred in Spanish, signaling Lautaro's assimilation into Spanish culture. Ercilla's emphasis on Lautaro's knowledge of Spanish ways of life suggested that the Spanish civilized Lautaro to a certain degree, making his treachery more blatant and disrespectful.

The cronistas tightened the association of Lautaro with disrespectful treachery through a scene in which Lautaro greeted his old acquaintance. Rather than receiving a warm greeting, Marcos "was greeted with frank hauteur"[107] by Lautaro. Lobera claimed that Lautaro launched into an argumentative defense of his treason upon hearing the first words out of Marcos's mouth.[108] These acts of hostility towards Marcos illuminate Lautaro's treachery. By presenting

[105] Lobera, 356
[106] Ercilla, 124
[107] Ercilla, 125
[108] Lobera, 357

Lautaro as boorish towards a Spaniard, the cronistas illustrated Lautaro's complete loss of allegiance to the Spanish. Despite years of serving and learning civilized manners under Valdivia, Lautaro told Marcos that he would drive him and the rest of the Spaniards back to Europe. By constructing the dialog in this way, the cronistas inferred that Lautaro did not extend the same sympathy to the rest of the Spaniards as he did towards Valdivia during the scene of the governor's death, as seen in Chapter II. Ovalle claimed that Lautaro did not leave the Spanish out of disdain for them, but the Araucanian warrior's interaction with Marcos indicated that any love that he had for the Spanish, no longer existed.

Lobera and Ercilla's narratives asserted that although Lautaro lost all of his affection towards the Spaniards, he still longed for Spanish luxuries, further highlighting his treachery. Lautaro exhibited his unwavering allegiance to his countrymen while speaking to Marcos, yet his identification with Araucanian culture were tempered by his preference and demands for Spanish comforts. Lautaro's continuing appetite for Spanish-style opulence suggests a continued connection between Lautaro and the Spanish. Although he wanted to cut off his allegiance to the Spanish, his craving of their goods shaped his lasting relation to them inflected by treachery and betrayal.

Furthermore, Lautaro's uncontrollable desire for these Spanish goods evinced his savagery by demonstrating that he could not control his impulses. Despite having now spent years back with the Araucanians, Lautaro's appetite for Spanish luxuries remained strongly intact. By displaying this craving of his former masters goods, the cronistas showed that Lautaro's innate savagery outweighed the impact of his Spanish education and assimilation. With this establishment of Lautaro's inability to control his impulses, the cronistas exhibited the idea that the "savage" could never become fully civilized.

Ercilla's chronicle develops the tension between Lautaro's assimilation and his unbridled desire in a scene in which Lautaro trotted out six young soldiers riding fine horses. Lautaro attempted to intimidate Marcos through this military pageantry: the soldiers sported coats-of-mail and impressive lances.[109] The spectacle did not impress Marcos, but it showed that Lautaro depended on Spanish armor and tactics to defend his homeland. As much as Lautaro tried to distance himself from the Spanish, he owed his success in battle to the knowledge that he had gained under Spanish tutelage. In order to continue his success, he needed the weaponry, horses, and armor that the Spanish employed. While this tactic of using the Spaniards' goods against them brought victory to Lautaro, it also provided evidence of Lautaro's treason. In this way, the cronistas conveyed the notion that without the education that Lautaro received from Valdivia, his homeland would be in ruins. By exemplifying how Lautaro's success was predicated on his past experiences with the Spanish, the cronistas demonstrated that only through Lautaro's treachery could the Araucanians achieve victory.

Through their portrayal of Lautaro's encounter with Marcos, the cronistas not only painted Lautaro with the brush of treachery, but also related it to his barbarism and violence. After Lautaro's horsemen failed to impress Marcos, the Araucanian warrior proposed a duel between their lancers. He exclaimed, "Let it be disarmed or armored, Punching, biting, kicking, clawing."[110] Marcos quickly rejected this form of dueling[111], providing additional proof of Lautaro's barbarism and hunger for gratuitous violence. Having left the Spanish several years back, Lautaro lost the civilized manners that he had gained while serving under Valdivia. By spending his last few years with the natives, Lautaro regained the desire for barbaric violence that defined the Araucanian people. Civilized soldiers, such as the Spaniards, condoned violence

[109] Ercilla, 126
[110] Ercilla, 126
[111] Ercilla, 126

in battle, but biting, clawing, and kicking served as cruel actions performed by savages. For Lobera and Ercilla, Lautaro's concept of a duel clearly made clear his transition – and declension -- from a Spanish page to an Araucanian warrior.

According to the cronistas, while he mastered Spanish battle tactics against the Spanish troops, Lautaro deployed forms of violence that the Spaniards saw as superfluous and inhuman. His use of Spanish military tactics combined with excessive, barbarous violence amounted to treachery, the theft of Spanish ideas, and treason. His treachery led to a desire for victory no matter the cost, and Lautaro willingly abandoned the civilization that he learned from the Spanish to adopt the spirit of violence that enveloped the Araucanian people.

Lobera and Ercilla used the interaction between Marcos and Lautaro to expose Lautaro's treachery and barbarism, but in doing so, they also highlighted the heroic qualities that made Lautaro a worthy adversary. Lautaro exuded confidence and pride throughout his meeting with Marcos despite less than positive reactions from the Spaniard. While his harsh greeting of Marcos showed his loss of allegiance to the Spanish, it also exhibited Lautaro's poise. Lautaro faced a man that likely served as a superior to him for years. Rather than show fear or deference towards his former mentor, Lautaro acted as if Marcos was inferior to him. Lautaro opened the monologue courageously -- "What mad aspirations drive you To become this proud land's tyrants"[112] – and concluded it pridefully: "Naught the world holds will appease us save alone this lavish tribute."[113] Courage, pride, and confidence correspond with the archetype of the "hero" across many historical and cultural contexts. Lobera and Ercilla juxtaposed Lautaro's heroic qualities with his barbarous and treacherous behavior throughout their texts, which taken together defined Lautaro as a worthy adversary. With his confidence, the cronistas demonstrated

[112] Ercilla, 125
[113] Ercilla, 131

that while Lautaro betrayed his former masters, he also had the qualities necessary to earn victory against the Spanish.

Earlier in the chapter, we saw how the use of Spanish language by Lautaro in his reunion with Marcos Vaéz exposed the Araucanians' treachery, but his understanding of the Spanish language also exhibited the acumen necessary to be a worthy adversary. Lautaro not only participated in conversation with Marcos, but also engaged in negotiations and crafted specific demands. These actions demonstrated Lautaro's intelligence and sophistication, qualities that were absent in the portrayals of other Araucanians. The intelligence and logic deployed by Lautaro added to his status as an adept opponent, but ultimately, as they did throughout their texts, the cronistas emphasized that Lautaro gained these qualities only because of his experience with the Spanish. Without the traits that he learned from his time with the Spanish, Lautaro was just another savage native.

After Marcos Vaéz's encounter with Lautaro, Pedro de Villagra, a Spanish military leader and cousin of the new governor of Chile, Francisco de Villagra, decided to aggressively move against the Araucanians.[114] Lautaro, with his knowledge and use of Spanish military tactics, had proven to be a troublesome adversary over the past few years. Hence, the Spanish quickly grabbed the opportunity to end his army's advance. In Ercilla, Ovalle, and Lobera's accounts, as the Spanish turned the tide on the Auracanian advance, Lautaro proved himself an adversary worthy of admiration. With the onset of impending battle, in which the Spanish moved "to crush Lautaro,"[115] the cronistas reshaped Lautaro into the mold of a hero. By equating the defeat of the Araucanian army with that of Lautaro, the cronistas sent the message that victory was impossible without a great leader. Ercilla, Lobera, and Ovalle wanted to demonstrate that Lautaro's actions

[114] Ercilla, 131
[115] Ercilla, 131

explained the Araucanians' success. The Spanish struggled against these natives because of their leader's skills, which according to the chroniclers came from Lautaro's experience with the Spanish. As the cronistas defined Lautaro's remarkable "in-between-ness," they were able to explain their ambivalence towards him. By crediting Lautaro's success to his Spanish tutelage, the cronistas showed how a savage acquired heroic qualities necessary to trouble the Spanish in battle.

While Ercilla and Lobera affixed Lautaro with heroic qualities that provoked comparison with Leonidas and David, they foreshadowed his mortality. As Villagra and his men marched towards the Araucanian encampment with the aid of a native ally, Lautaro slept with his lover, Teresa Guacolda.[116] The warrior awoke in the middle of the night to the conclusion of a bad dream. He explained to Guacolda that he dreamt of his death at the hands of the Spanish, and she frighteningly responded that she dreamt of a similar death for Lautaro.[117] After illustrating Lautaro's heroic qualities in prior passages, the chronicles foreshadowed the death of the great warrior, another heroic trope. By depicting Lautaro as a worthy adversary, the cronistas assigned him traits that proved his heroism; however, as the scene of Lautaro's death approached, the chroniclers underscore his weakness through his fear of mortality. Through this tempering of Lautaro as a hero, the cronistas could now address his death.

The time frame between Lautaro's dream and Villagra and his troop's arrival at the fort vary slightly between Lobera and Ercilla's accounts, but they clearly launched their attack the same night that the dream occurred.[118] Lautaro awoke to the Spaniard's assault and quickly left his room to begin the fight. Ercilla detailed Lautaro's last living moments,

[116] Lobera, 358
[117] Lobera, 358
[118] Ercilla, 140 and Lobera, 358

Bare his body, bare his rapier.
Ran the savage to the portal,
For he had no time for arming
…
From their midst Pillano's offspring
Stepped to meet the dart that sought him.
On the left, oh Luck accursed!
Tore the arrow so directed
that it pierced the heart most noble
E'er contained in human bosom[119]

With the strike of an anonymous arrow, Lautaro was dead. While Ercilla affixed Lautaro with a "heart most noble," in order to maintain his status of protagonist in the poem, the description of such a simple death aligned with the chronicler's demonstration of Lautaro's mortality through his dream. As the Spanish finally put Lautaro to rest, they wanted to show that Lautaro died just like any other native. There was no epic battle between Lautaro and the Spanish. Rather, he died unremarkably by a stray arrow. Ultimately with Lautaro's death, the chroniclers demonstrated that Lautaro may have acquired some heroic qualities through his tutelage under Pedro de Valdivia, but in the end, he was just another savage who died at the hands of the Spanish.

Throughout the events leading to Lautaro's death, the chroniclers, especially Lobera and Ercilla, continued to demonstrate Lautaro's "in-between-ness" through themes of treachery, violence and heroism. While his encounter with Marcos Vaéz reminded the reader of Lautaro's treacherous and violent qualities, it also illuminated the confidence and pride that shaped Lautaro's heroism. Lautaro gained a reputation through his victories that forced the Spanish to treat the great leader as a worth adversary. Despite this leadership and reputation, Lautaro's demise appeared imminent. Through his dream of death, Lobera and Ercilla foreshadowed Lautaro's impending death. By underscoring Lautaro's weakness – his fear of mortality -- they prepared the way for a simple death scene that obscured Lautaro's heroism. Lautaro died by the

[119] Ercilla, 141

strike of a Spanish arrow, just like thousands of other natives before and after him.

Conclusion

The paradox that the figure of Lautaro presented to the cronistas ended with his death. No longer faced with explaining his domination of Spanish troops, the chroniclers left the figure of Lautaro behind. While their narrative of Lautaro demonstrated that he was just another mortal native, their accounts of his actions throughout their texts portrayed him as a unique 'transitional' character whose "in-between-ness" created angles of ambivalence that were previously unseen. While revisions of the 'transitional' figures of Manco Inca and Malintzin have resulted in changes in their images, the tale of Lautaro has remained mostly untouched in the academic community. By studying the available primary sources, I was able to demonstrate that the cronistas created an ambivalent character out of Lautaro in order to reconcile his success against the Spanish troops with his native identity. In the chronicles, Lautaro's "in-between-ness" came to explain his ability to defeat the Spanish. Despite his native background and return to the barbaric Araucanians, the cronistas often reminded the reader of Lautaro's experience with

the Spanish. These reminders illuminated how Lautaro's experiences as a *criado* created his unique aspects of "in-between-ness." By doing so, the cronistas demonstrated how they needed Lautaro, as an insider and outsider, to define the boundary between themselves and savagery and nativeness.

While examples of the cronistas demeaning Lautaro as a barbarian occurred throughout the chronicles, we also saw how the cronistas featured Lautaro's oratory abilities, courage, and bravery among other characteristics to legitimize their claims regarding his heroism, and ultimately used these claims to underscore the superiority of Spanish over native culture. By displaying Lautaro's ability to rally his troops through speech, the cronistas attributed him with intellect and logic unseen among the other Araucanians. His call to arms at the Battle of Tucapel resulted in a native victory, but Lautaro's oratory ability stretched further than just inspiring his troops. We saw with his speech after that battle that Lautaro's words commanded respect from his troops and resulted in an obedience unseen previously among a united Araucanian army. The chroniclers further legitimized Lautaro's role as a hero by demonstrating his bravery in battle. By displaying his violent actions as the necessary tool for Araucanian victory, they allowed for comparisons between Lautaro and Classical Greek and Roman legends, such as Leonidas and Horace. Lautaro's resemblance to the archetype of the classical hero permitted the cronistas to paint him as a qualified opponent.

To rationalize how a so-called savage obtained these heroic archetypes, the cronistas harkened back to Lautaro's experience with the Spanish and his treachery. They argued that had he not spent over five years serving under Pedro de Valdivia, Lautaro would not have possessed the characteristics necessary to defeat the Spanish. Foremost, he retained knowledge of Spanish tactics and used them against his old compatriots to defeat them. By demonstrating that Lautaro

only knew how to mitigate the Spaniards' advantages through his time with them, the cronistas showed how his success was based on his treachery. The trope of treachery explains Lautaro's achievements, but also demeans his image and reminds the reader of his barbarous roots.

Lautaro's treachery bridged his native barbarism, heroic qualities, and experience with the civilized Spanish. While Lautaro proved to be a worthy adversary, the Spanish Crown could not accept a native as superior or even equivalent to its vassals. Due to this, the cronistas, even Lautaro's biggest supporter Ercilla, demeaned Lautaro as barbaric, pompous, greedy, and traitorous. By illuminating the savagery of the Araucanians, the cronistas further establish that Lautaro must have been a brute to leave the civilized Spanish for the crude indigenous, suggesting that Spanish tutelage could not erase the stain of native barbarism.

Given the cronistas' ambivalent portrayals of Lautaro as barbaric traitor and hero, defining his legacy as a figure of conquest literature can be difficult. Some chroniclers, such as Ercilla and Ovalle, portrayed him as a positive protagonist in their chronicles of the conquest while Lobera portrayed him almost wholly negatively. This variation among the chroniclers further muddles our attempt to define Lautaro's legacy, but by looking at the common themes of treachery, violence, and heroism, we can discern a coherent image of Lautaro. Lautaro's heroism elevated him to a leadership position where his spirit of violence was necessary to achieve success. His heroics in battle cannot be discounted, and the Spaniards' claims of treachery can be opposed by the fact that Lautaro left a group that was invading his homeland, where he spent his entire adolescence, in order to return to protect his kin's land and legacy.

Bibliography

Brooks, James F. *Captives and Cousins* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002)

Bry, Theodore de. *The Indians, to satisy their wickedness, pour molten gold in the mouths of the Spaniards* (University of Houston Digital Collection, 1594)

Clendinnen, Inga. *Aztecs: An Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Enciclopedia universal ilustrada (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1905) Volume 40

Encyclopædia Britannica (11th ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911) 735

Ercilla y Zúñiga, Alonso de. *The Araucanaid,* trans. Charles Lancaster and Paul Manchester (Nashville: University of Vanderbilt Press, 1945)

Hemming, John. *The Conquest of the Incas* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970)

Gonzalez Hernandez, Cristina. *Doña Maria y la formacion de la identidad mexicana* (Madrid: Ediciones Encuentros, 2002)

Henderson, Peter. *The Course of Andean History* (Albuquerque.: University of New Mexico Press, 2013)

Kartunnen, Frances. *Rethinking Malinche* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997)

Lamana, Gonzalo. *Domination without Dominance* (Durham and London: Duke Univeristy Press, 2008)

Lanyon, Anna. *Malinche's Conquest* (New South Wales, Australia: Allen and Unwin Academic, 1999)

"Lautaro." Encyclopedia of World Biography. 2004. *Encyclopedia.com.* (March 22, 2016). http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3404703749.html

Lobera, Pedro Mariño de. *Cronica del Reino de Chile* (Madrid: Atlas, 1960)

Luis, Diego Javier. "*Historia de la conquista de México*: Grand Narrative of a New World Alexander" (Honors Thesis, Emory University, 2014).

MacQuarrie, Kim. *The Last Days of the Incas*. (New YorkN: Simon & Schuster, 2007)

Ovalle, Alonso de. *An Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Chile* (London: A. and J. Churchill, 1703)

Payne, Samuel G., *A History of Spain and Portugal* (New York: Harper, 1860) Vol.1, Chapt. 10

Restall, Matthew. *The New Conquest History* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2012)

Rosales, Diego de. *Historia general de el reino de Chile* (Valparaiso: Impr. Del Mercurio, 1877),

John Schwaller, *The History of the Catholic Church in Latin America* (New York: NYU Press, 2011)

Stevenson Weldon Vernon, Ida. *Pedro de Valdivia, Conquistador of Chile,* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1946)

Todorov, Tzevetan. *The Conquest of America,* trans. Richard Howard (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999)

Townsend, Camila. *Malintzin's Choices* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006)

Vidaurre, Gomez de. Historia Geografica, Natural y Civil Del Reino de Chile, Tomo II; Coleccion de historiadores de Chile (Santiago: Imprenta Ercilla, 1889)

Vitoria, Francisco de. *De Indis et de ivre Belli Relectiones* (Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Institute, 1557/1917)

Vivar, Jeronimo de. *Crónica y relación copiosa y verdadera de los reinos de Chile* (Sanitago: Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico José Toribio Medina, 1966)

Weber, David J. *Bárbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)