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BETWEEN ACCOMMODATION AND RESISTANCE:
MANUEL MANQUILEF AND MAPUCHE OPPOSITIONAL WRITING

Allison Ramay
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Within the past thirty years, the work of Mapuche poets in Chile has become increasingly visible, with numerous anthologies and individual publications circulating each year within the country and abroad.\(^1\) While the themes and styles of Mapuche poets vary, many use their writing to expose abuses carried out against the Mapuche during Spanish colonization which, they argue, have continued with Chilean governance. To denounce historical and present mistreatment, several poets incorporate official versions of the past within their poetry to emphasize the symbolic violence they constitute and to invite readers to consider alternative versions. Chilean critic and academic Mabel García Barrera observes that by incorporating dominant discourses in their poetry, some Mapuche poets “invert the immobilizing function with which European rationality sees ‘the other’” (177), thus becoming important sources of counter histories. This poetic technique forms part of a trajectory of Mapuche resistance through writing, and serves as one of the most effective ways to understand Mapuche writers as agents engaged in a centuries-long struggle rather than a phenomenon that began in the late twentieth century.\(^2\)

Manuel Manquilef (1887-1950), the first known literate Mapuche to publish texts for indigenous and non-indigenous readers (Huenún 18), offers an early example of this technique. In this article, through close readings of his first two publications, I will show that although Manquilef’s publications purport to be ethnographic descriptions of the Mapuche, they offer written strategies for resisting integration into Chilean society following a military campaign to eliminate their sovereignty. By analyzing Manquilef’s use of language in each publication, we may appreciate his specific strategies for gaining non-indigenous acceptance of his texts while simultaneously creating a model of discursive resistance for existing and future Mapuche writers in Chile.

---

\(^1\)This article is part of a research project funded by the “Creación artística UC” grant from the “Vicerrectoría de investigación” at Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile and the Interdisciplinary Center for Intercultural and Indigenous Studies-ICIIS (Código de Proyecto: CONICYT/FONDAP/15110006).

\(^2\)Together with other recent publications in Chile, this paper contributes to efforts to show that despite their recent increased visibility, Mapuche poets and intellectuals have participated in public discourse through written publications for over a century. See a recent anthology by Mapuche historians titled *Ta in fijke xipa rakizuameluwin: Historia, colonialismo y Resistencia desde el país mapuche* and another titled *Escucha winka! Cuatro ensayos de Historia Nacional Mapuche y un epílogo sobre el futuro*. See also the Introduction to the anthology of essays compiled by Claudia Zapata: *Intelectuales indígenas piensan América Latina.*
The Mapuche Indians of Chile maintained sovereignty over much of the southern part of the country for over 200 years after signing the Treaty of Quillin in 1641 with the Spanish. The treaty established the Bio Bio River as the border between Spanish jurisdiction, which began on the river’s northern shore, and Mapuche jurisdiction, which began on the southern shore and extended as far as the Toltén River. In the decades following Chilean independence from the Spanish in 1818, creole intellectual elite and government leaders faced internal and external pressures to modernize, and most believed that Mapuche sovereignty, established in the Quillin Treaty, was a threat to the country’s economic, political, and cultural unification. To eliminate that sovereignty, Chilean governments attempted to annex Mapuche lands in a military campaign officially and euphemistically called, at the time, the “Pacificación” (1861-83), in which thousands of Mapuche died and thousands of others were displaced onto reservations or reducciones (Bengoa 223). While some Mapuche groups supported inclusion into Chile’s nation, most participated in a final attempt to obstruct the Chilean military’s movement south into Mapuche territories in the 1881 Malón General on Chilean military forts. While the General Attack slowed the military, in 1883 it claimed victory and the successful annexation of Mapuche lands.

During and following the military incursion, also known as the “Ocupación,” the government increased efforts to consolidate jurisdiction over Mapuche lands and incorporate Mapuche people into Chile’s nation by investing in public schools where Spanish literacy was a priority (Donoso 47). As Chilean historian José Bengoa states:

En prueba de paz y como testimonio de alianza, se acostumbraba que los caciques entregaran un hijo para ser educado en Concepción, Chillán o Santiago. Se los mantenía como rehenes y se los educaba de modo que adoptaran las costumbres criollas, para que—se pensaba—al volver a su rehue “civilizaran” a sus hermanos de raza. (78)

As Bengoa’s quotation shows, the intended purpose and eventual uses of Chilean education were contradictory. On one hand, military and government leaders believed they could enforce assimilation through education, and on the other, many Mapuche leaders believed education would allow them to assert their place within Chile’s nation without necessarily giving up Mapuche practices. In fact, the first Mapuche political leaders to participate in Chilean politics, including those who argued in favor of maintaining Mapuche traditions in the post-Ocupación era, had been educated by missionaries or in Chilean schools (Foerster 14, 17).

This was the case for Manuel Manquilef, whose father sent him to a Chilean boarding school where he would learn his first “Chilean words.” Born in 1887 to a Mapuche father, Fermín Trekaman, and a Chilean mother, Trinidad González, Manquilef recalls learning how to read and write fluently in Spanish at a public school in Temuco. In 1909, after several years of schooling, he was hired to teach writing in Spanish at the very same school. Recent publications have highlighted that Manquilef was different because, he was motivated to collaborate with non-Mapuche intellectuals who were studying Mapuche culture and language. These non-Mapuche intellectuals actively sought collaboration with bilingual Mapuche such as Manquilef who could facilitate their access to indigenous oral texts. Manuel Manquilef collaborated with two such non-indigenous intellectuals: Tomás Guevara and Rodolfo Lenz, both of whom

---

Indigenous and non-indigenous writers who understand the Chilean military incursion as highly problematic, and as the primary source of present-day cultural, social, economic, linguistic, and political tensions between Mapuche and non-Mapuche, refer to the military incursion as the Ocupación. See the first two anthologies mentioned in the previous note. For the purposes of this paper I will refer to the era in which Manquilef lived as the Post-Ocupación period.
contributed to formulating a public discourse that argued Mapuche assimilation was not only possible, but already in progress.

Tomás Guevara, a historian and ethnographer, wrote prolifically about Mapuche cultural practices, while Rodolfo Lenz, a German linguist, published lengthy volumes about Chilean and Mapuche folklore, as well as the Mapuche language (Mapudungun). In Psicología Araucana (1908), Tomás Guevara states, “We wish to gather new data for the study of our indigenous peoples, and test it against a plan and methodology that could allow us to identify the chasm between the thoughts and feelings of barbaric and civilized people” (3-4). One of the primary motivations of Guevara’s studies is to identify the divide or chasm between “civilized” people and “barbarians,” which explains his interest in tracking interracial marriages, welcoming European immigrants to Chile, and documenting Mapuche sexual practices. Like Guevara, Rodolfo Lenz’s approach also reveals an ethos that places indigenous cultures at the bottom of a cultural hierarchy, which can be seen in his interest in comparing and contrasting the language of an “inferior culture” to that of a “superior culture.” In an article titled “El arte de la traducción,” which is also the preface to one of Manquilef’s texts, he likens Mapudungun to the “balbuceo de su hijo” and Spanish and other European languages as “un discurso académico de su padre.” As a conclusion Lenz states, “Pero ninguna poesía de Goethe, ni aun la prosa de Cervantes, ni siquiera el lenguaje relativamente sencillo de la Biblia, pueden traducirse fielmente a una lengua de un pueblo de baja cultura” (79).

Manquilef’s relationship with Guevara and Lenz led to different types of publications. Manquilef was Guevara’s student at the Temuco School, and after graduating, Guevara hired him at the Liceo, where they published several books together that included testimonies Manquilef had acquired. Manquilef gradually voiced his disapproval of Guevara’s evolutionist approach to studying Mapuche people, however, and even accused him of publishing some of his material without proper recognition. Lenz, on the other hand, was interested in the fact that Manquilef could write in both Spanish and Mapudungun and that he was capable of carrying out what Lenz considered “literary translations,” meaning non-literal, cultural translations. In 1911, Lenz supported the publication of Manquilef’s individual work in Chile’s oldest and most prestigious academic journal of the time: Anales de la Universidad de Chile, making him, most likely, the first Mapuche to publish in a Chilean academic journal. The first publication was titled Comentarios del pueblo araucano (la faz social) (1911), and three years later, in the same journal, Comentarios del pueblo araucano II: la jimnasia nacional (juegos, ejercicios y bailes) (1914). Both publications documented aspects of Mapuche culture based on Manquilef’s personal experiences and on texts that he had read and heard, and they included translations by Manquilef. As I will show, each text played a particular role in the development of Manquilef’s discourse of resistance.

Conscious Mimicry, Metatexts and Metaphor

When indigenous people create ethnographies or auto-ethnographies, to borrow Mary

---

4 These publications are: Psicología del pueblo araucano (1908), Folklore araucano (1911), Las últimas familias i costumbres araucanas (1913) and Historia de la civilización de Araucania (1922).

5 In a letter dated September 16, 1913 from Manquilef to Lenz he states that parts of Folklore araucano are of his penmanship. Out of three texts that are Manquilef’s, Guevara only attributes one to Manquilef and the other, erroneously, to Ramón Lienan (Pavez 12).

6 As Florencia Mallon shows in “La ‘Doble Columna’ y la ‘Doble Conciencia’ en la obra de Manuel Manquilef”, both Comentarios can be understood as “auto-ethnographies”. In my
Louise Pratt’s term, the paradigmatic transition from “being looked at” to “looking” implies a shift in the locus of enunciation, though never complete or static. Replacing the non-indigenous ethnographer, the traditionally ethnographized indigenous informant can subvert and reinforce the multiple positions that result from being both native and intellectual and of having knowledge of both traditional and official discourses and practices. In this way, auto-ethnography is similar to Homi Bhabha’s understanding of mimicry, in which a speaker may both accommodate colonizing powers or normative discourses and at the same time resist them. The consciousness of native mimicry and the choice to use colonizing codes or to create oppositional ones seems to be implied, but not explicit, in the terms proposed by Pratt and Bhabha. For this reason, when Walter Mignolo recalls Gloria Anzaldúa’s “mestizo consciousness,” or “consciousness of the mestizo” (108), he is reminding us of Anzaldúa’s unique emphasis on the speaker or writer’s awareness of their place between two cultures and their conscious effort to participate in a public space of writing. Much like the efforts of the Subaltern Studies Group to focus on the consciousness of peasants who, they argue, act as agents rather than irrational reactors to oppression, “conscious mimicry” is fundamental to exploring Manquilef’s two texts and his strategic effort to publish alongside non-indigenous, hegemonic texts. In addition to the doubleness Manquilef faces in terms of his identity, noted by Florencia Mallon as a “double consciousness,” his use of language reveals a conscious effort to both reflect hegemonic discourses and to challenge them. In what follows, I would like to show that Manquilef’s conscious mimicry is a strategy that can best be appreciated by analyzing his texts and the non-indigenous texts he includes.

Manquilef’s first Comentarios opens with a preface authored by Rodolfo Lenz, followed by three additional metatexts authored by Manquilef.7 Lenz’s “Prefacio” opens with the following comment: “Es la primera vez que un descendiente inmediato de la heroica raza cantada por Ercilla, un joven que en su infancia no ha hablado otra lengua que el mapuche, publica una obra científica” (393). Lenz establishes that Manquilef’s work is both permissible and noteworthy because he applies western notions of truth to his own culture. In what seems to be a response to Lenz’s “Prefacio,” Manquilef uses his “Introducción” to emphasize the scientific nature of his study and confirms the evolutionist discourses that frame non-indigenous thinking about the Mapuche. “Puede ser que este estudio, en el cual se comprueban la observación de las costumbres y de las preocupaciones del pueblo araucano, sea de alguna utilidad para el etnólogo y el filólogo i contribuya de esta manera a aclarar en parte el camino de la civilización…” (405). In Manquilef’s self-representation he positions himself as a loyal contributor to a paradigm that values scientific method and the integration (or gradual disappearance) of Mapuche culture. He represents his text as useful to non-indigenous intellectuals such as Guevara (ethnologist) and Lenz (philologist) because it will contribute to a civilizing mission to assimilate Mapuche people. Later he insists that describing Mapuche cultural practices is necessary because it shows “su poder de asimilación” (404). In these ways, Manquilef depends primarily on a performance of acquiescence to Lenz and Guevara’s evolutionist discourses in these metatexts, which seems to have been a necessary step in ensuring his participation in the prestigious Anales. While many times indigenous writers respond to non-indigenous metatexts in acts of decolonization,8 we can

---

7The specific order of Manquilef’s metatexts is: “Prefacio” by Lenz, a 4-page autobiography by Manquilef, a two-page description of the origins of the text by Manquilef, an “Introducción” by Manquilef and an “Esplanación de la escritura mapuche” by Lenz.

8For an analysis of the metatexts in a Mapuche testimony published after Manquilef’s publications, see Susan Foote’s Pascual Coña: historias de sobrevivientes. La voz en la letra y la
observe how, in the first Comentarios, Manquilef challenges Lenz’s “Prefacio” and simultaneously ensures the inclusion of his text among them. The bulk of his text, however, involves movement between two positions of enunciation: accommodation and subversion, which in turn invites at least two readings: promoting assimilation, on one hand, and working toward a degree of Mapuche cultural sovereignty, on the other.

This first Comentarios is organized according to customs that the Mapuche of Manquilef’s time practiced: “La construcción de una casa”; “La marcadura de los animales”; “Fabricación del cerco”; “La vuelta del viajero,” among others. Interestingly, though, despite the assumption that Manquilef’s primary purpose is to describe existing Mapuche traditions, an underlying purpose seems to be to present his vision of Mapuche participation within Chile’s nation in the post-Occupation period. The first section is entitled “La construcción de una casa,” where he describes the rukan, a ritual to reinforce existing alliances and friendships and attempt to create new ones. Manquilef prefaces the story with a description of his return home after living in Chillán. Upon arriving in his village, a Mapuche man asks him, in Mapudungun, if he had finished his studies. Manquilef replies, “Jamás se concluye el estudio; mientras más se estudia más se vale” (23). The man responds, disapprovingly, that he himself does not value “éstos [costumbres huincas], para mi, no valen ni un cinco.” Manquilef answers, “No digas eso amigo; mira que por esa jente sé hacer documentos, sé leer I muchas cosas que tú no sabés” (24). Needing no further convincing, the man concludes, “Dices la verdad ¿quieres enseñar lo que sabes a mi hijo? To which Manquilef responds, “Esa es mi profesión” (24). Following their conversation and agreement, the man invites Manquilef’s family to participate in a rukan. Manquilef’s references to new and existing Mapuche practices in the first Comentarios allow him to indirectly argue that a unique Mapuche community could continue to exist both despite and because of non-Mapuche practices.

On one level, the construction of the house is a metaphorical union between Manquilef, a bilingual, literate, and occidental-educated Mapuche, and those Mapuche who resist learning to read and write in the post-Occupation period. In the story, the process of building a home is symbolic of a new way of being Mapuche, presented in terms that could be recognized by both Mapuche and non-Mapuche readers. Through the description of the long-standing rukan tradition, Manquilef depicts a new type of agreement that could bring Mapuche together in the post-Occupation period by adopting non-Mapuche customs, specifically reading and writing. In representing the agreement as not altering the rukan tradition, Manquilef suggests that the adoption of new practices would not eliminate all traditions. On the contrary, he implies that accepting some Chilean practices could be the source of new alliances: “Todos los demas cumplimientos deben dejarse para aquellos que se ven por primera vez, con el objeto de ganar amigos I aumentar nuestra parentela” (34). Since Mapuche governance is organized around marriage alliances between individual families and not around a central governing body (Bengoa 124), Manquilef’s statement tends to a pressing question in the post-Occupation period regarding how to maintain alliances when the traditional geographic and political order had been destroyed by annexation and reservations.

In another section of the first Comentarios, entitled “La vuelta del viajero,” we have further evidence of the kinds of alliances Manquilef envisioned. In this section he describes a traditional greeting for travelers returning from journeys in search of needed goods. Extensive greetings upon meeting or parting are essential in Mapuche tradition; they allow those who have not traveled to learn about other people and places and to confirm and update their knowledge of friends and foes (Course 28). Manquilef similarly dedicates this three-paragraph section to describing the material and verbal exchanges involved in a nampülkantun. The verbal exchange

---

9The word “huinca” in Mapudungun refers to foreigners or all non-Mapuche.
Manquilef cites includes the following statement: “Todos tenemos que sufrir las consecuencias tan funestas del tiempo; todos nos alejamos de nuestra amada tierra con el objeto de buscar lo que ella no nos puede dar” (47). This particular saying reinforces the notion that the Mapuche were accustomed to leaving when the land could no longer provide for the people. Though the story focuses on a single traveler rather than on an entire community, the greeting expresses the assumption that the Mapuche leave a given dwelling area when they need something the land and its resources cannot give them, but always make their way back to their community. Since a connection to land is not central to Manquilef’s conception of Mapuche identity, he anticipates, both in this story and the entire section, that something other than land would create the cohesion necessary for a Mapuche community to continue to exist. Returning was not a return to the same; in Manquilef’s reasoning it was not possible to recover and reincorporate Mapuche traditions completely in the post-Occupation period. Rather, the stories in the first Commentaries have a didactic purpose: reading and writing are a means to return to the community and maintain cultural cohesion in dislocation, to create a unity in disunity. Through these stories Manquilef essentially claims diaspora, or dislocation, as a new way of being Mapuche, which in turn allows him to build this new community as exclusive and guarantees that it will maintain a degree of cohesion within the Chilean nation-state.

We may conclude, then, that in the first Comentarios, while Manquilef explicitly reinforces some of the evolutionist assumptions communicated by Lenz and Guevara, particularly in his “Introducción,” he also presents the survival of Mapuche traditions as being complementary to, and even dependent upon, reading and writing, which could be interpreted as either a strategy for protecting Mapuche cohesion against assimilation or as a proposal to accept non-Mapuche practices. In this way, Manquilef’s conscious mimicry can be read as both employing hegemonic terms and challenging them. This publication, as I will argue, is the foundation for his more provocative proposal in the second Comentarios.

**Conscious Mimicry and Strategic Intertextuality**

Scholarship on Manuel Manquilef rightfully highlights that he is an ambiguous figure for Mapuche communities and academics interested in projects of cultural vindication because later in his life, as “Diputado,” he made concrete proposals that favored modern concepts of property and the disintegration of communal notions of land (Mallon 74). Furthermore, as Foerster and Montecino point out, Manquilef made these proposals without consulting Mapuche leaders, which negates the hierarchies within Mapuche groups prior to the Occupation (25). I will show, however, that in his second publication Manquilef creates a model for written resistance against assimilation by moving in and out of the discursive frames that non-indigenous writers were using at the time to write about the Mapuche and that assumed the Mapuche to be non-contributors to official discourses.

After receiving positive feedback from Lenz about the first Comentarios, Manquilef publishes a second text, titled Comentarios del pueblo araucano II: la gimnasia nacional (juegos, ejercicios y bailes). This text is twice as long as the first Comentarios, spanning over 100 pages, and is a patchwork of narratives, texts originally written in Mapudungun with their Spanish translation as well as quotations in Spanish that are not translated to Mapudungun. The descriptions of games, exercises, and dances are divided into two sections: “Los juegos antiguos” and “Los juegos importados.” Like the first Comentarios, the second begins with several metatexts, opening with a preface, again authored by Lenz, and subsequent metatexts authored by Manquilef: a dedicatory, an introduction, and a prologue. Lenz justifies this second text’s inclusion in the Anales journal by referring to the same principle: mainly, that Manquilef is a
positive example of a modern, assimilated Mapuche. In this “Prefacio” Lenz frames the traditions Manquilef describes as anachronistic:

El valor de todos los estudios está fundado en la circunstancia de que el señor Manquilef da sus descripciones desde el punto de vista nacional del indio moderno. Cuando se trata de juegos i ejercicios que hoi han perdido su importancia primitiva, como por ejemplo en [section] 14 del cap. II, el tiro de la flecha, las noticias naturalmente son científicamente incompletas [... Manquilef] sabe cuántos de sus compatriotas indios ya son capaces de leer su lengua, i desea aumentar el interes de los indios civilizados por su propia cultura e historia. A esta idea se deben los párrafos que contienen trozos originales de autores chilenos que el señor Manquilef traduce al mapuche. (2)

Lenz suggests that the games and exercises described in this text have “lost their primitive importance,” and emphasizes that the text’s value is in the fact that Manquilef is a “modern Indian” who will facilitate the assimilatory process by including quotations that will well serve “civilized Indians.” In Lenz’s view, the purpose of the quotations by “Chilean authors” the Manquilef inserts is to teach literate Mapuche about their own past, most likely forgotten as a result of assimilation. In Manquilef’s text, however, quotations are an essential site of negotiation for authority to represent the Mapuche: As in his first publication, part of Manquilef’s written resistance in the second Comentarios involves including quotations that appease Lenz and simultaneously deconstruct an evolutionist approach to studying the Mapuche.

Manquilef’s resistance to Lenz’s discourse can be observed immediately following Lenz’s “Prefacio” in a dedicatory Manquilef writes to his father, Fermín Terkaman, who once insisted on the need for traditional Mapuche games in the present:

Afkilpe aukantun dunu, aukantun, dunu meu, piam, yeneenolu ta che; que no se concluya el conocimiento del juego, pues por él, se dice, la jente fué invencible. (93)

According to Manquilef’s father, the traditional Mapuche game of “chueca” is essential because Mapuche self-defense had always depended on it. His father’s insistence that the knowledge of the game must continue contrasts with Lenz’s suggestion that many of the games Manquilef describes have lost their importance in the present and are thus reflections of the Mapuche ability to assimilate. This dedicatory is a first attempt to counter Lenz’s gesture to relegate Mapuche games to the past. A second attempt is found in the subsequent text by Manquilef, in which he suggests that only Mapuche subjects are qualified to speak about or represent this knowledge. In his “Introducción” he says:

Pues bien se sabe que “solo el que ama a un pueblo es capaz de penetrar en las reconditeces de su alma (2)” i para descubrir lo que ocultamente pasa de jeneracion a jeneracion se necesita haber heredado esa sangre, esas costumbres i esos sentimientos innatos de raza. (22)

The quotation within Manquilef’s text is from Julio Vicuña Cifuentes, an early 20th century writer who participated in the Folkloric Society with Rodolfo Lenz. By embedding within this sentence a quotation from a non-indigenous intellectual with direct ties to Lenz, Manquilef accommodates non-indigenous representations of the Mapuche. At the same time, however, the actual content of his statement is quite exclusionary: only the Mapuche (those that have “heredado esa sangre”) are capable of knowing what happens “de jeneracion a jeneracion” within their community. In this brief text, then, Manquilef expresses an interest in creating a space for Mapuche to speak without the intervention of non-Mapuche, who, as he later states, have consciously misrepresented the Mapuche: “Baste decir, que muchos, bajo el móvil de diversas circunstancias, atrofian, funden o alteren un pensamiento mapuche tan solo con el suave desliz de un sencillo e intencionado plumazo” (23). Directly criticizing the writing of non-Mapuche who, with great ease and awareness, misrepresent the Mapuche, it seems that one of
Manquilef’s objectives with this second publication is to show his authority to represent Mapuche people. In the final section of *Comentarios II*, Manquilef uses conscious mimicry to oppose Lenz and Guevara’s assimilationist discourses and to make a proposal for future Mapuche writers.

In the final section of *Comentarios II* Manquilef describes the “juegos” that the Mapuche inherited or imitated from the Spanish. In his “Prefacio” Lenz had described these games as proof of the “assimilatory potential” of the Mapuche. As we will see, however, the two stories that Manquilef tells could be read as challenging an assimilationist discourse. The first story is a lengthy passage titled “Épico,” from the book *La raza chilena* by Nicolás Palacios. The passage is a story about Esteban Romero, a prominent Mapuche leader of the 1881 “General Uprising.” The story is written in the third person and begins with a description of the Chilean military, relaxing after a day of hard work and suddenly caught off guard when a Mapuche man on horseback emerges from a distant forest. As the man approaches the Chilean soldiers, “A nadie le quedó duda de que se trataba de un escuadrón de caballería indígena oculto en las sombras del bosque I que se preparaba para el ataque” (198). In response to the apparently ensuing offense, the Chilean commanding officer orders his troops to prepare to attack, but he retracts the order when he realizes the Mapuche man is unarmed. Unsure of his intentions, another officer suggests that perhaps the Mapuche man had come to sell his horse. Although no words had been exchanged, the commander assumes the officer is correct and exclaims, “¡Lindísimo! Me quedo con él” (201). As the commander continues to admire the horse’s prance, he fails to notice that the Mapuche rider approaches the head of the battalion. To the surprise of all the onlookers, the Mapuche rider, as stated by Palacios, “se metió entre los cornetas, atropellando a varios, i con puño de hierro, tomándolo de las ropas de la espalda, arrebató el indio a un muchachon. Un grito de espanto i luego ¡ágarrenlo! ¡agárrrenlo! Los más próximos se abalanzaron como gatos; pero el indio no dio tiempo” (201). The story ends with the rider slipping away with the young cornet player underarm.

In this particular story, the unarmed and seemingly disadvantaged Mapuche warrior manages to take away the organizing life source of the Chilean military: the cornet player. Although we don’t know exactly what Romero will do with the cornet player, he now has the potential to use him against the Chilean military. The seemingly disadvantaged Mapuche who strategically mimics the colonizer is the guiding theme for the final section of this publication and has its roots in the story of Lautaro, the historical and literary figure in Alonso de Ercilla’s *La Araucana* who is captured by the Spanish, learns their military techniques, and passes them on to his people for their successful defense against the Spanish. This is significant, on one level, because it is a practice the Mapuche had been doing for centuries: adopting the military strategies of foreign groups as their own. On another level, we see that the inclusion of this fragment from Palacios’s book is an act of conscious mimicry. Manquilef appeases Lenz, who praises the inclusion of non-indigenous quotations that will “teach” civilized Mapuche about their forgotten past; however, if we look specifically at the book from which this quotation is extracted, we find that Palacios, unlike Lenz and Guevara, believes that the Mapuche already reflect an occidental definition of civilized. Regarding Esteban Romero’s “epic,” he states:

Revela ese hecho, no solo la falta completa de límites a la audacia araucana, sino tambien, por los detalles de su ejecucion, el conocimiento mas perfecto del carácter del enemigo, i el concepto clarísimo de la sucesion lógica de todos los incidentes de aquel hecho extraordinario. (43)

It is possible that Manquilef inserts Palacios’s quotation because he represents the Mapuche as “rational” and thus already civilized, an interpretation that directly opposes that of Guevara and Lenz. In this way Manquilef employs both accommodating and subversive positions, simultaneously appeasing Lenz while indirectly arguing that Guevara and Lenz’s evolutionist projects are faulty. In this section, then, the theme of “juegos adquiridos” is actually
a mimetic strategy that Manquilef has transformed into a discourse, for he has incorporated a non-indigenous quotation that coincides with Lenz and Guevara’s discourse but that, upon closer look, ultimately dismantles the logic of their evolutionist approach. Like the potential for Romero to use the cornet player in self-defense, the quotation is a tool that creates a self-representation that evades a monolithic interpretation and demands a reading against itself. This section and the text itself are not simply a reflection of Mapuche games on the verge of disappearance, but an offering of strategies that can be used, in the present, to create cohesion and maintain some Mapuche practices: primarily, the adopting of reading and writing.

The final section is a continuation of the previous, since it also takes place in the years leading up to annexation and has as its central theme the conscious mimicry of the Mapuche in war; however, it is discernibly more oppositional, as Manquilef includes quotations that come from Mapuche oral sources. At the beginning of the section Manquilef states that all of the narratives he includes here come from one community of story-tellers and that this is the first time they appear in writing: “El asalto de Angol no pertenece a ningún cronista como tampoco a ningun araucanista, sino que es el reflejo de la tradición mapuche. No pertenece, aun, ni a la lira del poeta ni al pincel del artista” (137). The notion of belonging is essential to the discourse Manquilef constructs in this section. Like his statements in the “Introducción,” only Mapuche communities have access to this particular story, excluding the possibility that non-Mapuche could appropriate it first. The story that follows is of a Mapuche leader named Quilapán who led successful attacks against the Chilean military by uniting multiple Mapuche groups that shared a culture and language but were not united politically or geographically (Bengoa 299).

Specifically, the story relates an attack Quilapán leads on the military fort at the small town of Angol. There are a series of brief sentences, including one that is formatted into bilingual columns:\footnote{In Mapudungun it reads, “Kiñe liwen meu, piam, petu ŋi dumĩñ kũlelu, petu ŋi ankũlen ta ketrán, penennelañui, piam, ta menu. Ilkkauktũlen ta müleñui, piam, che ŋi piuké meu ŋi doi kũmẽ duam, ŋi zakiñ dunu mai lanumael ta winka wechan meu ll mai.” (“One morning, they said, when it was still dark, the harvest was dried, the sky could not be seen. In the heart of the people, their biggest thought, they said, was to kill the wingka in war”) (211).}

In both the Mapudungun and Spanish versions, Manquilef emphasizes that the Mapuche warriors’ main objective is to eliminate the Chilean military in a violent offensive. One noteworthy difference is that in the Mapudungun version Manquilef uses the word “piam” in a traditional manner.\footnote{In Mapudungun the particles $pi$ and $am$ mean “to say” and “spirit,” respectively.}$Piam$ reflects the oral life of stories and literally means “so they said.” By repeating the word twice he implies that the words have traveled between many Mapuche speakers and listeners. After this brief introduction, the story proceeds by describing how Quilapán leads the organization of multiple Mapuche groups. The narration then continues by explaining that the Mapuche are excellent imitators of animal sounds and that this is how the Mapuche groups entered the Chilean military fort: by hiding behind a flock of sheep and simulating their cries:

Los moradores de Angol, tranquila i dulcemente cuchicheaban i saboreaban ya la carne de los ricos asados que les proporcionian los hermosos capones. La jente, toda, creía que eran piños de ovejas que los soldados del general Pinto habían quitado de los indios belicosos que no deseaban bajo ningún pretesto someterse a las leyes de la República. (139)

In the story, while the Mapuche hide near the fort, the soldiers carelessly enjoy the music Quilapán plays on his bugle, a mimetic tool similar to the cornet in Palacios’s story, appropriated by the Mapuche and, in this case, used to facilitate an ambush.
Although the General Uprising only led to short-lived Mapuche victories at different Chilean military forts, historically speaking it was a significant moment for Mapuche groups because it was the first time so many communities had come together using a common strategy to oust the military from Mapuche lands. From both non-indigenous and indigenous points of view, the General Uprising was the most recent and largest indigenous attack against Chileans. As such, the historical events recounted by Manquilef and the figure of Quilapán specifically, could have been problematic for Manquilef’s non-indigenous readers, because they symbolized Mapuche military strength and unity in opposition to the military. And while the purpose of this text, according to Lenz, was to demonstrate the potential of the Mapuche to assimilate, Manquilef’s seems to represent a uniquely Mapuche version of the recent past. With Comentarios II Manquilef puts into circulation a version of a past that was still being constructed in Chilean national imaginaries, illustrated by the fact that the General Uprising had not yet been registered in official historiography.12

By briefly recalling Manquilef’s first publication alongside the second, we may recognize that the process of self-representation in Manquilef’s writing depends on a particular use of a conscious mimetic strategy: In the first publication he primarily utilizes the locus of enunciation that implies accommodating Lenz and Guevara’s discourses about assimilation, guaranteeing the acceptance of his text for publication in the Anales journal, while the second publication primarily constructs a discourse of dissonance and opposition to Lenz and Guevara. This resistance is particularly visible in the two aforementioned texts, in which Manquilef inserts histories that represent the Mapuche as united during the Occupation. Considering that their central theme is the power secured from adopting or appropriating tools (i.e. military instruments) from Chileans, and that reading and writing could also be included in this category, then it seems likely that Manquilef is reflecting on how the Mapuche will negotiate their inclusion and integration process in Chile’s nation through the tools of reading and writing. Through Palacios’s quotation Manquilef suggests that the Mapuche are already highly civilized because they strategically imitate non-Mapuche practices to oppose colonization. In this way, he not only disputes the discourses that frame his text, but also constructs and demonstrates the authority to self-represent against assimilation. Furthermore, his suggestion to his indigenous readers seems quite explicit in the second publication: The Mapuche must learn to read and write as well as use traditional knowledge to maintain cultural cohesion. Manquilef establishes, then, for the first time in these two publications, the possibility that Mapuche resistance against assimilation could be accomplished through writing. We know that Manquilef intended to publish a book about the late nineteenth century, through oral tradition, but for reasons unknown to scholars he never carried out this project (Huenún 18). He did go on to found one of the first Mapuche organizations and to be a House Representative, and from both positions he advocated that Mapuche citizens learn to read and write. While these later choices could reflect an assimilationist perspective, we have seen that through strategic intertextuality, Manquilef provides a more complex view of the Mapuche relationship with Chile’s nation, implying that through self-representation and resistance to representations circulated by non-Mapuche, the Mapuche could create cohesion.

These publications seem significant for current Mapuche writers because Manquilef insists on the necessity of Mapuche self-representation. As seen in the stories in the first publication, he suggests that circulating oral tradition in writing will benefit the community and create a sense of belonging. By offering a Mapuche version of the past in the second publication, he attempts to construct a community through language, one that could only be appropriated by

12The earliest representation of Quilapán is a fictional text written by Baldomero Lillo: Quilapán. We can find an early unofficial representation of the General Uprising in Pascual Coña’s testimony: Lonco Pascual Coña ñi tukulpazungun, testimonio de un cacique mapuche.
those who claim Mapuche identity. The resistance that he establishes and that is carried on in the work of contemporary poets involves the strategy of including non-Mapuche discourses and setting them against Mapuche versions of the past and present. For example, contemporary poet Graciela Huinao’s brief poem “1492” reads: “Nunca fuimos el pueblo señalado, pero nos matan en señal de la cruz” (13). By recalling a particular rite of the Catholic Church (specifically, making “la señal de la cruz”), Huinao suggests that the deaths endured by Mapuche subjects with the arrival of Europeans were part of a project of contradictory and symbolic violence. The juxtaposition of official and unofficial discourses invites readers to reconsider normative discourses and, like Manquilef, reflect not only on historical events, but on the language used to represent them. So, while Mapuche poets today do not rely on conscious mimicry in the same ways that Manquilef did due to the fact that their publications circulate more widely than in Manquilef’s time, the art of some Mapuche poetry still calls attention to the continuation of abuses that take place physically and discursively, and offers perspectives of the present and past that challenge non-Mapuche versions.
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