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Los hombres del Barroco son seres en constitutiva soledad,  
clausurados sobre sí mismos,  
solo tácticamente relacionados con los demás:  
para cada uno de ellos su yo es una ciudadela o una prisión.

-José Antonio Maravall

(The men of the Baroque are beings in constitutive loneliness,  
cloistered in upon themselves,  
only tactically related to others: for each one of them,  
his “I” is a citadel or a prison.)

Toward the middle of the sixteenth century, Spanish America was  
established as a site of epistemological interdiction, in which the colonial  
order permeated the entire life of its inhabitants and its institutions. This  
order was reflected, for instance, in the gridiron pattern for the cities and the  
hierarchical organization of society among the conquistadors. Diverse  
discourses and temporalities were woven into an “ordered” American  
landscape. But there were individuals, such Lope de Aguirre, who changed  
the American order into an anonymous, devouring, violent, disordered  
territory without boundaries and without cultural coordinates.

Lope de Aguirre, a nobleman, enlisted in Pedro de Usúa’s expedition to  
Omagua and El Dorado, on September 26, 1560, with the intention of  
finding the mythical citadel of El Dorado that was believed to lie hidden in  
the Amazonian jungle. The expedition consisted of three hundred men and  
two women: Inés de Atienza, Usúa’s lover, and Elvira de Aguirre, Aguirre’s  
own mestiza daughter. Due to numerous financial and logistical problems,
the expedition ended in bloodshed. Early in January 1561, Usúa was assassinated by Aguirre’s followers, who, then, named Fernando de Guzmán as their captain. When the first declaration of American independence was signed on the twenty-third of March the same year, Guzmán was given the title of Prince of Peru. Shortly thereafter, in May, Guzmán was assassinated. At this point, the leadership of the expedition fell to Aguirre himself. He was proclaimed Caudillo of the Marañones after reaffirming his denaturalization from Spain, and after disassociating himself from all Spanish sovereignty.

From this moment onward, a series of events occurred that are marked by unlimited cruelty, including the assassination of Inés de Atienza, Aguirre’s execution of his own soldiers, and the establishment of a reign of terror that continued for the duration of the trip down the Marañón River (the Amazon River) until they took Margarita Island, in October 1561. On the Venezuelan coast, the tyrant found himself surrounded by Spanish troops and, obliged to put down his arms, he killed his daughter with his own hands, adding her murder to the sixty deaths already attributed to him.

During the siege of Margarita Island, Aguirre was wounded and killed. He was tried, post mortem, and found guilty of treason and tyranny. His corpse was subjected to an exemplary punishment, explicitly described in “Sentencia de Bernaldez contra la memoria de Aguirre” (The Sentence against the Memory of Aguirre): drawn and quartered, with the body parts being sent in the four cardinal directions. Any official mention of him was deleted from the records, and his properties in both the Americas and Spain were confiscated and destroyed, a judgment extending through the next two generations of his descendents. The sentence was carried out in Barquisimeto on October 27, 1561. The judgment signaled not only punishment against the physical body of the conquistador, but also constituted an attempt against “la memoria y fama” of the caudillo, since such a crime must be paid for in every way possible, in order to erase all traces and memory of the crime. Aguirre’s judgment reads as follows:

[U]n lope de Aguirre tirano alçado contra la majestad del rey don felipe nuestro señor a sido muerto y desbaratado en esta provincia [de venesçuela], el qual dicho tirano lope de Aguirre es fama que fue en muchos alzamientos y motines en la provincia del peru. [. . .] vino atalando y destruyendo la tierra, y apregonó guerra contra su majestad a fuego y sangre, trayendo banderas y standartes pendidas contra su majestad como tirano; prosiguiendo su intención hasta qu fue desbaratado vençido y muerto y por que de todo lo susodicho hasta agora no se avya fecho proceso contra la memoria y fama del dicho lope de Aguirre como se deuia fazer. (qtd. in Rodríguez 191, my emphasis)

([A] tyrant, Lope de Aguirre, who had rebelled against His Royal Majesty King Felipe, our lord, has been killed and routed in this
province [of Venezuela]. The above-mentioned tyrant Lope de Aguirre is famous for having participated in many uprisings and mutinies in the Province of Peru. [. . .] He came razing [atalando] and destroying the land, and he declared war against His Majesty in fire and blood, carrying flags and pendants against His Majesty, as a tyrant. He continued with this intention until he was routed, beaten and killed. Despite all of this, no legal procedure has been taken against the memory and fame of the aforesaid Lope de Aguirre. The sentence is long past due.)

In addition to the numerous chronicles written by the participants in the expedition, especially that of Francisco Vázquez, a soldier out of favor with the tyrant, Aguirre left a record of the above-mentioned events in three letters in his own handwriting. The first was addressed to King Felipe II, the second to Father Montesinos, and the third was destined for Pablo Collado, who, at that time, was governor of Venezuela.

The severity of the Aguirre sentence underscores that legal authorities placed utmost significance on his crime. The Marañones adventure threatened to completely destabilize the colonial model imposed during the first sixty years of Spanish intervention in the New World. It demonstrated the possibility of undermining, from within, one of the most smoothly functioning colonial projects of the sixteenth century.

The following essay analyzes the punishment and death sentence as a return to the “natural” order of things. The punishment and death sentence were gestures and symbols of the need to reinstate a civil and civilized temporality, in order to recover modern coordinates whose restitution had been disrupted by the rebellion.

For sixteenth century Spanish chroniclers, the Marañones Expedition was transformed not only into a point of departure, but also into a constitutive moment of what would later cause the Spanish colonial edifice to crumble. The journey represents a space outside the boundaries of the discursive center, while at the same time, distancing itself from narrative (or narrated) nodes, administrative centers, and the lettered city, in order to insert itself into a jungle devoid of meaningful symbols, a desert without directions. The marañones are not dealing here with a journey that implied a linear temporal movement from a Point A to a Point B, but, rather, a trajectory that involved at least two cultural worlds capable of being crossed over.

Aguirre’s journey unveils a devouring, disordered landscape without borders or cultural coordinates. The objective of the march—the discovery and conquest of El Dorado—is forgotten. The anonymous character of the prototypical land (jungle, desert, an unending river that never reaches the ocean) is transmuted into a time without a when, a place without a where, a space in which everything known and guaranteed is suspended, and which
opens up infinitely to interpretation and overlay. There is no exit; the empty landscape devours everything. Little by little, contact with civilization is lost, and this gradual loss is specifically associated with the lack of consistency, the loss of density of signs that become fainter and thinner, the more the *marañones* distance themselves from civilization.

Lope de Aguirre tries desperately to hold on to a few recognizable signs in the middle of a swamp, and imitates a complete society, with its prince, governor, intrigues, hierarchies, and even a lover. But they gradually sink deeper into the swamp, and the logic of the signs rots, degrades, and changes. Lope de Aguirre imagines conspiracies at each turn; he gradually is crazed by the elements, the mosquitoes, and the swamp. He loses his mind because of the absence of any recognizable reason. Nothing is what it should be; the expedition changes its objectives, or better said, he loses sight of his objectives. Now there is nothing else to do except to “get through it.” The end of the rebellion has a goal that is so high—the conquest of all of Peru, “con el propósito de ir a tiranizar Perú” (Vázquez 89) (with the intention of going to Peru to tyrannize it), according to the chronicle—that perspective is lost and because of this, the goal becomes unattainable.

In the wake of the rebellion, colonial society is compelled to recreate itself as a civilized and civil temporality, to recover modern coordinates, already in a state of flux. Once again, the cardinal points must be marked with the quartered body of the sinner—the transgressor—somehow seen as an *axis mundi*, the form of the cosmos and the world in miniature. Everything is measured on the basis of the body buried in armor, the body as Baroque citadel, a cosmos in miniature. He is Baroque man, monstrous and alone, of whom Antonio Maravall spoke: a man cloistered within himself, surrounded by his shell, who only relates tacitly with others. The quartered body of Aguirre is both a citadel and a prison. That body forces the necessary creation of a made-to-order space, a measured space, once again, from the very parameters of space, itself.

Although the quartered body will mark the limits of empire, a gesture dramatized to an extreme, Aguirre’s head disappears from the stage. Contrary to what one might expect, his head, the classic trophy in cases of sedition, is not publicly exhibited on a pike. The head is not shown, and is not mentioned, perhaps because the minute it appears, it would symbolize the madness of the *marañón*. It is an infected head, rotted by the swamp and mosquitoes, dangerous, perhaps capable of spreading its sickness, of contaminating. Clearly, it is the seat of the lunacy that, in Lope, is the insanity of sin and transgression: “Llamábanle en el Perú Aguirre el loco” (Vázquez 168) (In Peru they called him Aguirre the mad man). This comment is not historical but rather contemporary, and Aguirre carries it with him, by emphasizing his status as tyrant and pilgrim. Mad Lope is outside himself, beyond reason, and, consequently, beyond rigid colonial structures. Because of this, he functions as a kind of wild card, free and freed.
of a rational corset. The counterfeit of his body coincides with the failure of his reason: he is crippled, or, as he himself says, “manco de mi pierna derecha” (Navia 176) (lame in my right leg) and unbalanced. He cannot maintain the equilibrium of his body, nor that of his spirit, and both incapacities occurred in the service of the King. He writes to the king, feverish and crazed by the arduous landscape: “manco de mi pierna derecha, de dos arcabuzazos que me dieron en el valle de Chuquinga, con el mariscal Alonso de Alvarado, siguiendo tu voz” (Navia 176.) ([I am] lame in my right leg, due to two bullets I received in the valley of Chuquinga, with Mariscal Alonso de Alvarado, following your [Phillip II] voice”).

The quality that madness confers upon Aguirre isolated him from his historical context. He transgressed and crossed the circumstances that surround him in the complete isolation created by his own madness. He is an isolated man, a citadel, enclosed in his worm-eaten armor, rusted, ruined and dull, limited by the borders of his own body. The land, Spanish America, will eat away at Lope de Aguirre’s armor, removing any possible luster. He is not a nobleman sheathed in a brilliant shell, but rather a damaged man locked in his rusty, ruined armor. He travels through time, —without reason, without connection, in a time of absolute cruelty. He circulates through a time without history that (dis)articulates and denounces the truth about colonial structures from the perspective of irrationality.

Aguirre signals a place without boundaries, or with a boundary line that cannot be drawn in a place that does not have any. He marks off a hybrid space of interdiction, madness, rebellion and treason, and by doing so, he invalidates his own figure and his own discourse, when he signs the letter to Felipe II as a traitor. Then, he becomes a pilgrim, without land, without a place of origin or a destiny, a wanderer outside civil society. But essentially, he takes all of this to the ultimate consequences: he denaturalized himself from Spain, he becomes a new man, disinherited, a product of opposing forces, of madness, of his environment, of his society, of the profound degradation of the imperial model.

He justifies his innocence through a claim of madness, writing that he is innocent and mad in the same penstroke. He also makes the colonial structure disappear completely: “y todo hombre inocente es loco, y vuestro gobierno es aire” (Navia 177) (and every innocent man is crazy, and your government is air). In his own madness, understood as innocence, he was capable of saying anything without guilt or obstacle, without reason, in dissidence and dissent. This double condition of being simultaneously mad and innocent put him at the margins of convention and the norms of civilized society, an ambiguous and contradictory condition that somehow guides his steps, provokes a dangerous tottering. He was installed like a thorn in the colonial heart. He destabilized the provisional order of things, and uncovered the contradictions of the regime. Madness freed him from norms and laws, and it made his discourse a devastating criticism of colonial
relations, since the voice of a madman is the only one who can, in this context, articulate the critique and state the truth from the perspective of pure absence of reason, from the most absolute solitude.

Thus, Aguirre’s punishment, his drawing and quartering, the symbolism of his missing head, and the sending of his remains to the four corners of the kingdom, can be read as a way of re-marking the lost cardinal points with the sinner’s body. His civil death will, in this manner, procure a return to the civility suspended by the devouring dangers of an unblemished territory, whereby the state constructs itself into a normalizing body through the discourse of an exemplary death. The state punishment will serve as a measure of things, affirmation of authority, and recuperation of an alien space measured individually. In this manner, the boundaries of the state are reestablished with the body of the dissident.

The solution that Aguirre presents is contrasted with a profound intensification of the internal contradictions of a colonial reality that is very uneasy, in a somewhat cunning and artificial representation of the deepest ambiguity of the imperial model: Aguirre coaxes out a society that he knows and does not know. In this new context, the land is the one in charge of giving a distinctive touch to this mimesis, a monstrous touch that changes everything. In order to participate in a different logic, Aguirre can only build his cardboard empire when colonial structures have been momentarily displaced, or forgotten, or when they move beyond the imperial umbrella. Aguirre’s journey (del)imitates the empire, establishes metropolis and periphery, and, in some way, tries to reproduce their conditions on a reduced scale in a totally different context, recreating a whole royal court with its prince, lovers, gossips, and intrigues. In the hallucinating journey of the marañones, the humid putrefaction of the jungle slowly takes possession of the men, rotting them, while Amazonian worms wriggle out of the mud that covers their boots, eating away at their weapons and their souls.

When he denounces the crisis of a colonial ideological model that no longer includes him, Aguirre creates an escape hatch from the colonial regime. The inability of the system to contain its own product, such as Aguirre and his marañones, signals the weaknesses of the system, while at the same time, it radically exposes the need for a new kind of modernity. Aguirre, in his own madness, had the ability to dislocate and de-center the imperial project by transforming the New World into a space of epistemological interdiction. This peculiar position allows the (temporal) appearance of alternative identities, to an extent that the system can return in one way or another to the pre-established and precarious order, by punishing the sins and crimes. Put simply, Aguirre’s gesture changes him from caudillo to traitor, and fiercely condemns him in order to demonstrate that transgressions always end under the weight of the law.

The transgression (treason, in this case) can be thought of as an “interdicted” space, a space suspended between two possible worlds that
pertain to one nature. The *marañones* participate in structures that they want to betray by, paradoxically, conserving them. They devour colonial structures (authority, military hierarchies, etc.), all the while showing how they operate. The moment indicated for this suspension produces a temporal and geographic lapse, in which, to find oneself beyond, as Bakhtin stated, an understandable time, space, and culture. All the territory surrounding Lope de Aguirre is hyper-territory, the specific location is extra-local, is immeasurable, foreign, and impenetrable. Indeed, it is precisely this condition of extra-locality, of hyper-territoriality, that marks the wavering of the colonial system: How can it colonize that which is beyond its space? How can it control madness? How can it fill the epistemological void? In sum, how can it legislate an individual outside society or an individual in a rotted society? These questions make us perceive the Spanish imperial project as momentarily dislocated, de-centered, and wobbling.

By denying the traitor the minimal possibility of returning to the colonial universe and to social order, the only way to restore this order will be by a conclusive, exemplary punishment of the sinner that leaves no room for maneuvering, and that completely ends the rebellion. If there is no escape, if there is no return from absolute madness, the condition of “rebelde hasta la muerte por tu ingratitud” (Navia 181) (rebel to the death because of your ingratitude) or maximum betrayal, the way to restore order will be as absolute as madness itself. The “definitive sentence” against Aguirre, or better said, against his corpse and memory, states:

[La tribunal] hallo que debe declarar y declarava y declaró, el dicho tirano lope de aguirre aver cometido crimen lese magestatis contra la magestad real del rey don felipe nuestro señor, y aberle sido traydor muchas vezes, en cuya consecuencia, condenó a su fama y memoria a que desde oy en adelante y desde la ora que propuso determino de cometer traycion y tirania, a que sea tenyda por de hombre traydor y tirano contra su rey y señor natural, y como tal, declaro aber sido justamente degollado y hecho cuartos. Asi mismo declaro todos y qualequiera bienes que dexase, abellos perdido e ser e pertenecer a la camara e fisco de su magestad y por tal los aplico o mando que doquiera que el dicho lope de aguirre dexase casas de su morada, le sean derribadas por los cimientos, de arte que no quede figura ni memoria dellas ni de parte dellas, y asi derribadas sean aradas y sembradas de sal con pregon publico de esta sentencia. Asi mismo declaro todos los hijos barones que del dicho aguirre ayan quedado, ora sean legitimos o bastados o espureos, por infames para siempre jamas, como hijos de padre traydor e tirano, a los quales tambien declaro por yndignos e yncapazes de poder tener honrra de cavalleria ni denidad, ni oficio publico ni otro de los proybidos en derecho. (qtd. in Rodriguez 192 and following, my emphasis)
([The court] finds that it should be declared and so declared, that the aforementioned tyrant, Lope de Aguirre, having committed the crime of lese majesty against His Royal Majesty the king, don Felipe, our lord, and of having been many times a traitor, in consequence of which, he condemned his fame and remembrance from today and in the future, from the hour when he proposed and decided to commit treason and tyranny, that he be held as a traitor and tyrant against his king and natural lord, and as such, it is declared that he had been justly beheaded and quartered. In addition, it is declared that every and all goods that were left have been lost to him and now are of and pertain to His Majesty’s Chamber and Fiscal, and as such they are applied or sent so that wherever said Aguirre left houses of his residence, they should be pulled down to their foundations, in such a way that no image or memory of them nor any part of them remains, and that pulled down in this manner they be plowed and sown with salt with a public announcement of this sentence. In addition, I declare that all of Aguirre’s remaining the male children, either legitimate or bastard or illegitimate, are infamous forever, as children of a traitorous and tyrannical father, who I also declare are unworthy and incapable of having the honor of a nobleman nor dignity, nor hold public office not any other prohibited by law.)

Nothing that would remind anyone of Aguirre’s treason should remain, and his sons could never receive any honors. Only after having completely destroyed the tyrant could a state of relative order and social peace be reestablished. According to Francisco Vázquez:

Acabado de desbaratar el tirano cruel y malo, el gobernador y capitán general y demás capitanes se fueron al Tocuyo, donde residían, y los vecinos de Barraquisinieto [sic] tornaron a reedificar su pueblo, y los de Mérida también se fueron; de manera que quedó la tierra sosegada con la muerte de tan mal hombre. (169, my emphasis)

(Having just routed the cruel and evil tyrant, the governor and captain general and the other capitanes went to Tocuyo, where they lived, and the men of Barraquisinieto [sic] focused on rebuilding their town, and those from Mérida also went off; this way, the land was calmed by the death of so evil a man.)

It was necessary to appease the earth, to rebuild that which the tyrant destroyed, and only in this way could things return to a certain state of normalcy that had been momentarily suspended by the forces let loose by Aguirre. It was necessary, in sum, to erase all memory of the sedition, annul
the signs of madness, and rebuild the roads that had been destroyed by the
traitor’s insane pilgrimage. The rebellion was effectively neutralized,
condemned, and, as Beatrice Pastor says, “exorcised,” as a representation of
the pure evil associated with the figure of the tyrant.

Even Aguirre knew beforehand that he was on his way to his death, on a
road with no return, which he continually reaffirmed in his writings: he
presented himself “en artículo de muerte” in his letter to Felipe II in order to
negate any possibility of royal pardon, “pues v.m. a rrompiendo la guerra
apriete bien los puños que aquí le daremos harto que hazer, porque somos
gente que deseamos poco vivir” (Navia 178, my emphasis) (since Your
Majesty has started the war, make good hard fists, because here we will give
you plenty to do, because we are people with little desire to live). Aguirre
has a desire to die, as well as an absolute disregard for the highest imperial
authority, since he considers a royal pardon irrelevant. Addressing himself to
the king, the nobleman writes: “Aunque yo y mis compañeros, por la gran
razón que tenemos, nos hayamos determinado de morir, de esto y otras cosas
pasadas, singular rey, tú has sido causa, por no te doler el trabajo de estos
vasallos y no mirar lo mucho que les debes” (Navia 178, my emphasis)
(Although my companions and I, for the great sense that we have, have
decided to die, of this and other things that have happened, singular King,
you have been the cause, since you do not feel the pain of these vassals and
you do not see how much you owe them).

His ideals are expressed in his anguished vision of the history, in what is
experienced in the degraded colonies, and in his consciousness of his own
alienation. Symbolic order has been altered, and because of this, the way to
return to order was by completely undoing it, mimicking it, making it appear
in all of its splendid cruelty, slapping the colonial face, and challenging it to
a duel. And the duel is to the death.

Nevertheless, the appeased earth of which the chronicler writes is a land
that is left with scars and marks, and because of this, must be justified. Such
justification can be read on the side of the labels Lope gave himself during
the course of his raid—madman, traitor, and pilgrim—which complete the
image of an isolated, solitary person outside of himself, beyond the law, the
state, and off the track altogether.

The adventure of Aguirre checkmates the delicate imperial equilibrium
when it suggests determined degrees of legitimacy. This means asking if
colonial modernity, already contaminated and discontinuous, needs these
points of escape in order to somehow legitimize itself, subsuming the very
errors produced by the system. In other words, it means capitalizing on the
errors “positively,” if, in fact, this is possible. So, how can there be a return
to the “natural” order of things after such a rebellion? What are the tools that
the empire uses to swallow up its own anomalies? How does European,
organizing modernity absorb situations of extreme heterogeneity, which,
somehow, also make the entire edifice of Western reason tremble? Is it
possible to return to the previously established order, or are these radical experiences impossible to assimilate and impossible models? Can at least some benefit be obtained from the rebellion? Why are there no juridical or political consequences? Why does nothing change following Aguirre’s sedition?

But the question is how to return from sedition to the “regular order” of things. The answer would be found by taking Aguirre’s exemplary punishment as an escape hatch; in other words, (re)narrating the ordering forces of the story in his very body and his own name.

[V]ino atalando y destruyendo la tierra, y apregonó guerra contra su magestad a fuego y sangre, trayendo banderas y estandartes pendidas contra su magestad como tirano, prosiguiendo su yntincion hasta que fue desbaratado vencido y muerto. (qtd. in Rodriguez 191)

([H]e came razing [atalando] and destroying the land, and he declared war against His Majesty in fire and blood, carrying flags and pendants against His Majesty, as a tyrant. He continued with this intention until he was routed, beaten and killed, and since, in spite of everything just mentioned, until now no legal procedure has been brought against the memory and fame of said Lope de Aguirre.)

The judgment proposes to eliminate his memory and reputation, in such a manner, that it is possible to return to a state of “peace” that existed before the rebellion. Vázquez’s comment, cited above, continues:

de manera que quedó la tierra sosegada con la muerte de tan mal hombre, y los tiranos que con él venían se fue cada uno a buscar su ventura, y algunos se quedaron en la dicha gobernación, y otros se fueron al Nuevo Reino de Granada [. . .] y hubo paz. (Vázquez, 169, my emphasis)

(this way, the land was calmed by the death of so evil a man, and the tyrants who came with him went off, each one to search for his good fortune, and some stayed in the region, and others went off to the New Kingdom of Granada [. . .] and there was peace.)

This solitary hero (marginal, unusual, unedited, canceled in himself) represents a degree of constitutive solitude that terminated his actions, enclosing them in impregnable armor, or in an absolutely Baroque gesture, with its great capacity to subvert the reigning order. Nevertheless, ever-absorbing modernity orders, or eliminates, these seditious elements that always leave tracks.
The actions of misfits or misplaced people, such as Aguirre, signal the constitutive breach of Spanish America. Aguirre, as fictitious and discursive as the New World itself, is formed from the interdiction of different discursive practices that, in one way or another, will be crossed, interwoven, and moved from place to place. The Aguirre case represents the possibility of a heterogeneous discourse that teaches another logic capable of coexisting with the imperial regime and that points dangerously at the juridical and ontological scaffolding of the conquest. The organizing modernity of the colony has escape hatches that it must suppress in order to survive.
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