

Landscapes of Inequality, Spectacle and Control: Inka Social Order in Provincial Contexts

Paisajes de Desigualdad, Espectáculo y Control: Orden Social Inka en Contextos Provinciales

FÉLIX A. ACUTOⁱ

ABSTRACT

This article explores Inka colonial order from a landscape perspective. It is argued that the Inkas strategically employed the spatial organization and architecture of the settlements they built throughout the Empire in order to regulate interactions, create particular representations, and assemble specific experiences. In this sense, this paper examines the spatial layout of Inka provincial centers in order to understand the world the Inkas sought to create within these places. I argue that there are three main principles that organized Inka spatiality in conquered lands: stratification, rituality, and control. It is claimed that those who resided in or visited Inka provincial centers experienced three overlapping landscapes: 1) a landscape of inequality, 2) a landscape of commemoration and spectacle, and 3) a landscape of control.

Key words: Inka Colonialism, Landscape, Inequality, Spectacle, Control.

RESUMEN

Este artículo explora el orden colonial Inka desde la perspectiva del paisaje. Se argumenta que los Inkas emplearon estratégicamente la organización espacial y la arquitectura de los asentamientos que construyeron a lo largo del Imperio con el objeto de regular las interacciones, crear representaciones particulares y ensamblar experiencias específicas. En este sentido, este trabajo examina el diseño espacial de los centros provinciales Inkas para entender el mundo que los Inkas buscaban crear dentro de estos lugares. Argumento que hubo tres principios que organizaron la espacialidad Inka en las tierras conquistadas: la estratificación, la ritualidad y el control. Se sostiene que aquellos que residían o visitaban un centro provincial Inka experimentaron tres paisajes superpuestos: 1) un paisaje de desigualdad, 2) un paisaje de conmemoración y espectáculo y 3) un paisaje de control.

Palabras clave: Colonialismo Inka, Paisaje, Desigualdad, Espectáculo, Control.

ⁱ Instituto Multidisciplinar de Historia y Ciencias Humanas – CONICET. Saavedra 15 Piso 5, C1083ACA. Buenos Aires, Argentina. Correo-e: facuto@gmail.com
Recibido: Mayo 2011 Revisado: Agosto 2011 Aceptado: Agosto 2011

INTRODUCTION

Spatial forms have played a central role in colonial encounters and colonialism. They are tactically used by both colonizers and the colonized. The former seeks to create a new social order in which buildings and spatial organization contribute to establish new representations and to control and direct the practices and experiences of rulers and ruled. The latter, on the other hand, employs spatiality to struggle against, coping with, avoid, or negotiate domination.

This article discusses the way colonial and power relations were built in the Inka Empire or Tawantinsuyu (its Quechua name). Specifically, I examine the spatial layout of Inka provincial centers in order to understand the world the Inkas sought to create within these places. By examining Inka provincial centers one is able to see that the Inkas employed spatial forms tactically with the aim of producing certain interactions and specific experiences. I argue that there are three main principles that organized Inka spatiality in conquered lands: stratification, rituality, and control. Thereby, it is possible to claim that those who resided in or visited Inka provincial centers experienced three overlapping landscapes: 1) a landscape of inequality, 2) a landscape of commemoration and spectacle, and 3) a landscape of control. Next, I discuss each of these landscapes and people's experiences within these *loci* of colonization.

But first, who were these people who resided in Inka settlements? People from Cuzco, the imperial capital, relocated *mitmaqkunas* engaged in different types of activities (agriculture, herding, construction, mining, craft production, etc.) or serving as imperial representatives¹, *yanaconas* (or Inkas' personal servants), and members of local communities participating in the *mit'a* system² were those who usually lived in Inka provincial centers. Members of native society often visited Tawantinsuyu's centers to participate in public and ritual activities hosted by the Inkas, especially feasting. Moreover, in many occasions, the Inkas resettled groups of native households near (or next to) provincial centers to serve imperial purposes (see for example Covey 2000:125, Hyslop 1976, Julien 1983:78, Menzel 1959:130, Stanish *et al.* 1997, Valdez, 1996:39).

LANDSCAPES OF INEQUALITY

The point I want to make in this part of the article is that through their main provincial settlements the Inkas sought to construct a new social order where the roles and identities of each group, as well as the interactions between them, were sharply established. The spatiality and materiality of these places contributed to the subalternization of the colonized, favored the construction of Inka power, and privileged the social reproduction of the imperial elite over that of the colonized. Moreover, the built environment of these provincial centers promoted the inkaization of those non-Inka people that, in many cases, the Inkas sent to conquered lands (distant provinces especially) to operate as representatives of Tawantinsuyu.

Tawantinsuyu's capital seems to have been the model of social order the Inkas applied to organize provincial centers. Inka society in Cuzco was divided according to principles of bi-, tri-, and quadripartition that set up relationships among people, groups, and royal and non-royal lineages. Not only this social order was discursively represented, but was also imprinted into the landscape layout which, as society, was segmented in two, three, and four parts (Gasparini and Margolies 1980, Pärssinen 1992, Rowe 1967). Social and spatial stratification instituted or regulated differences in power, practices performed (especially ceremonies and religious rituals), interactions between groups, kinship, rights over sacred shrines, and access to resources, such as land and water (Bauer 1999, Zuidema 1964, 1983, 1990).

Bipartition was one of the main principles underlying Inka society that also appeared in the landscape of Cuzco. Cuzco's population was physically divided into two halves, Hanan (upper Cuzco) and Hurin (lower Cuzco). The groups belonging to Hanan were considered more important than those of Hurin, who were seen as poor Inka or as the illegitimate children of the Inka emperor. Even in the symbolic battles enacted in Cuzco during religious ceremonies, Hanan always defeated Hurin (Pärssinen 1992). Ideally, but not so much in practice, Hanan or *hanansayas* had the first degree of nobility and they served as soldiers in every war, while *hurinsayas* were only assistants and performed auxiliary tasks such as transporting provision and weapons (Bauer 1992). These marked the subordinate position of Hurin. However, and although there were hierarchical and power differences between these moieties, ideologically they were represented as symmetrical and integrally connected in several spheres: gender, kinship, and topography. While Hanan was the masculine and upper side, Hurin was the feminine and lower side. Moreover, Spanish chroniclers characterize the relationship

between Hanan and Hurin as similar to that found between older and younger brothers (Pärssinen 1992, Zuidema 1964). Principles of tripartition and quadripartition also served to organize interactions, practices, power relations, rights, and spatial residence among the Inkas, and between the Inkas and non-Inka people who lived in Cuzco (Hyslop 1990, Zuidema 1964).

Now, how was the world the Inkas built outside Cuzco? Looking at Inka settlements will allow us to unravel this question.

The Inkas radically transformed the landscape of the Cuzco region (especially the Vilcanota-Urubamba Valley), erasing any trace of previous history. The best examples of Inka architecture are found in this area, as well as some of the more complex and intriguing sites. Many of these sites were royal estates, or Inka emperors' personal lands and settlements. In addition to their royal owners, personnel that served the emperor and his relatives in different tasks also resided in royal estates. In some cases, more than a thousand people from diverse ethnic backgrounds permanently lived in these places to satisfy the needs of their noble owners (Niles 1999:131). Niles (1993, 1999) argues that the design and materiality of these particular places was loaded with Inka ideology, producing and reproducing a highly stratified social order.

Ollantaytambo, a royal estate that belonged to emperor Pachacuti and his lineage, was located 90 km northwest from Cuzco. The Inkas took over the area where Ollantaytambo was established, erasing most traces of previous occupation and creating an overarching Inka landscape (Protzen 1993). A large plaza and a central street divided this settlement into two parts: north and south. The street-facing walls of the southern half of Ollantaytambo were built of cut fitted stones. In addition, the architecture of this half had an elaborated and symmetric built environment. On the other hand, the northern half of the town was built with irregular fieldstones and its spatial organization was not as tidy as that found in the southern section (Protzen 1993:52)³. The difference with respect to masonry and architectural quality between the northern and southern part of Ollantaytambo suggests that two hierarchically differentiated moieties lived in this royal estate. As Ollantaytambo, the layout of other royal estates (such as Pisac, Callacasa, Callachaca, and Calca) also generated inequalities and differences in status and power among their inhabitants. The spatial design of these royal estates distanced people from each other. Within these places, different groups occupied different areas with distinctly dissimilar architecture (Niles 1993).

While their royal dwellers, as well as elite visitors and minor nobles, lived in elaborated neighborhoods, attached workers and servants resided in less organized and simple buildings (Niles 1993).

There are a number of Inka centers in the Central Highlands of Peru that provide good information regarding the imperial microcosms the Inkas created in the provinces of Tawantinsuyu. Huánuco Pampa is, with no doubt, one of the best studied Inka sites of the Central Highlands (Figure 1). After a detailed architectural analysis, Morris (1987) has claimed that Huánuco Pampa's layout resembled the spatial organization of the imperial capital. As in Cuzco, lines that radiated from the core of this settlement divided it in different sectors. Roads, pathways between buildings, walls, and the axes of certain structures defined these lines that, as said by Morris, segmented this site according to principles of bi-, tri-, and quadripartition. The first and most noticeable division in Huánuco Pampa's plan is that produced by the main Inka road that passed through it diagonally in a southeast-northwest direction. This road split Huánuco Pampa into two parts (north/east and south/west) of similar size but different type of architecture. Morris suggests that this division represented Hanan and Hurin. However, in this provincial context, and differently from Cuzco, Huánuco Pampa's segmentation did not have so much to do with kinship or marriage relationships, but rather it was a way to classify, separate, and mark the hierarchy of people and groups, as well as to define relations and divisions among them (Morris 1987, 1998).




Figure 1. Map of Huánuco Pampa, Central Andes, Peru (redrawn from Morris 1987).

Figura 1: Plano de Huánuco Pampa, Andes Centrales, Perú (adaptado de Morris 1987).

The north/east half of Huánuco Pampa contained the most elaborate architecture and some of the more complex building compounds. Two large halls or *kallanka* were located in the eastern part⁴. In this same section, a fine-masonry *kancha* stood out from the rest of the structures (Figure 1)⁵. Morris believes that this particular building may have been the residence of the provincial governor or even the place where the Inka emperor stayed when he visited the region. Furthermore, two small subsidiary plazas were in this sector (which suggest that public activities were also developed in a smaller and more private sphere), as well as a fancy bath⁶. Evidence found in excavations in the eastern part of the site indicates that ritual

and feasting were one of the main activities conducted here (Morris 1982). There were also in this part of Huánuco Pampa fine-masonry residential compounds. The northern section of this half of the site had, among other buildings, a huge compound with 50 buildings where archaeologists found abundant traces of textile and corn beer (*chicha*) production. Morris thinks that this building could have lodged the famous *aqlla* or 'chosen women' (wives of the Sun or wives of the Inka), who brewed chicha for feasting and manufactured cloth for exchange, and whose labor was appropriated by the Inka State.

The western and southern parts of Huánuco Pampa seem to have lodged subordinate workers. Architectural studies and archaeological excavations demonstrate that the great majority of the buildings constructed in the other half of Huánuco Pampa were residential compounds. Many of these buildings were circular stone structures that Morris identifies as indigenous architecture, similar to those found in the neighboring Upper Marañón Valley (Morris 1987:29, Morris and Thompson 1985:62). The southern portion of the south part of the Huánuco Pampa exhibits the most irregular architecture in the site.

In a nutshell, Huánuco Pampa's spatial organization segregated the Inka from the non-Inka realm (conquerors and subjects), denoting the hierarchy of each group. Within this main provincial center, the Inkas appeared connected with political and administrative power, control of ritual activities and labor, monumentality, and high-quality architecture. On the other side of Huánuco Pampa, the colonized were linked to domestic activities and staple production; residing in Huánuco Pampa only to work for the Inkas (Morris 1982).

Pumpu was a major Inka center of the Central Highlands from which Tawantinsuyu administrated and controlled the economic and social activities developed in the Chinchaycocha Province (Matos 1994:135). According to studies in this site, a river divided Pumpu into two neighborhoods (Matos 1994:123-126). Large rectangular Inka style buildings, organized by principles of order and symmetry (see Lee 1997), distinguished the north section of Pumpu from its south part. This section had the site's main plaza, a ritual platform or *ushnu* (see below), several administrative and state-oriented buildings, an elite *kancha*, and a bath. The southern part of Pumpu, on the other hand, exhibited a combination of Inka architecture and circular, local-style, residential buildings, and a much less organized spatial layout. Pumpu's landscape set apart Inka

elite from non-Inka commoners. The architectural difference between these two neighborhoods was remarkable, and the crossing river seems to have confirmed the separation of both social realms. The tidy Inka space starkly contrasted with the disordered and asymmetric indigenous area. In this settlement, the colonizers kept themselves apart from the colonized, establishing distinction through the activities each performed. In this context of domination, bureaucratic administration and ritual belonged to the Inkas, while mundane daily life was associated with the non-Inka section of the city. The marked differences between each social stratum were also noticeable in the quantity and quality of resources they consumed. Matos (1997:135 and 407) points to the fact that those who resided in the northern part of the site consumed, in general, more resources than their southern neighbors. Moreover, northern residents' daily crockery was refined, whereas he only found non-decorated ceramics inside non-Inka houses. Residing or visiting this Inka center, especially if one was a simple *mit'a* worker, should have been an overpowering experience in which social stratification and differential access to knowledge, power, and resources were not subtly delineated. On the contrary, within Pumpu, the Inkas took care of clearly showing their subjects their lower ranking and lack of economic, political, and cultural power.

The northern frontier of Tawantinsuyu represents another good example of the way Inka social order was built. Drawing from historical information, Salomon sustains that the Inkas promoted 'the replication of the "sacred geography" of Cuzco' in the subsidiary centers they established in this part of Tawantinsuyu, such as Tomebamba and Quito (Salomon 1986:174, 1988). Quito was socially and physically divided into Hanan and Hurin moieties, where the Inkas played the part of Hanan, or the higher and more prestigious side, and subordinate communities the role of Hurin. In addition, Salomon asserts that Quito's landscape stratified colonizers and subjects into four social segments, each of them associated with different rights, resources, activities, and obligations towards the Empire.

According to this scholar, through the imposition of these social and spatial principles of organization the Inkas emphasized social differences between conquerors and conquered (Salomon 1988:67). Both historical and archaeological information suggest that a similar situation took place in Tomebamba, also in Ecuador (Idrovo Urigüen 2000). Besides having been partitioned in two halves (Hanan and Hurin), the Inkas divided this important provincial city in neighborhoods with different hierarchy. Parts of the city belonged to the Inka elite, other sections to local lords forced

to reside in Tomebamba, while there were areas within the city where the Inkas resettled indigenous workers (Idrovo Urigüen 2000:chapter IV). Tomebamba's layout simultaneously produced and represented a complex process of deep social stratification unknown in the region before Inka conquest.

There are some interesting Inka sites on the South Coast of Peru. Inkawasi, for example, was an impressive Inka center placed above an irrigated land in the Lunahuaná Valley, in the Chíncha region. It exhibited a clear separation between a group residing in symmetric compounds and controlling ritual facilities, and another group living in an asymmetrical built environment where researchers detected evidence of large-scale food processing. Local pottery was found in the latter area of the site, indicating that native people may have resided in this sector. Furthermore, there was a third residential area at Inkawasi with architecture that suggests that people of an intermediate status, perhaps special-function state workers, lived there (Hyslop 1985:31). In addition to Inkawasi's tripartite division, Hyslop suggests that a quadripartite division, marked by the roads that crossed this site, may have also served to stratify this settlement and its inhabitants.

Another example from the Southern Coast is the Inka administrative center of Uquira, in the Asia Valley, where Inka and local areas appeared estranged one from the other (Coello Rodríguez 1998). Compared to local architecture, Inka buildings were not only monumental, but also complex in terms of their interior spatial arrangement. Moreover, archaeological excavations and architectural analysis have showed that the Inkas carried out in their part of the settlement a wide range of specialized activities (ritual, administrative, military, and textile production), whereas the colonized only fulfilled domestic tasks.

Across the river, and facing Uquira, there is another intriguing Inka site. This settlement had two perfectly defined areas divided by a long adobe wall. There were noteworthy differences regarding architectural quality and building size between both sectors of the site. One of these areas included planned Inka architecture whereas the other had a less ordered distribution of native style buildings that, in certain cases, incorporated some Inka architectural features. In addition, before constructing the Inka neighborhood, the surface was flattened out and leveled, a task that apparently did not take place in the indigenous part of the site. This was not just a matter of greater 'energy expenditure', but a symbolic action that implied the purity of the Inka establishment, its separation from the

indigenous past and, therefore, its 'sacred intrusiveness'⁷. There were also distinctions with respect to the activities people of each part carried out and the goods they consumed. According to Coello Rodríguez (1998:50), the residents of the Inka neighborhood only consumed Inka or Inka style artifacts, while those who inhabited the indigenous part did not obtain Inka ceramic and employed indigenous ceramic vessels in their activities. The differential distribution of ceramics shows that an ideal, often represented in the built environment, found its realization in daily practices. A strikingly analogous archeological record is found in the Inka site of Chagua or Maucallajta in southern Bolivia (Raffino 1993:178), where a long wall divided the settlement into two parts, one with fine Inka architecture and a symmetric and tidy spatial layout, and the other with indigenous buildings arranged in a conglomerate fashion (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Map of Chagua or Maucallajta, southern Bolivia (redrawn from Raffino 1993).

Figura 2: Plano de Chagua o Maucallajta, sur de Bolivia (adaptado de Raffino 1993).

These two sites represent extreme examples of landscapes of inequality. The way the Inkas differentiated conqueror and conquered was never more dramatic than in these cases where two groups of people living side by side did not share architecture (style, size, and quality), did not consume the same goods, and did not conduct the same activities. To make these differences even more evident and vivid, the Inkas built a wall to separate both spaces and social spheres. These were fragmented communities where architecture and space not only represented Inka cosmology regarding imperial ideas of Inka/civilized-indigenous/uncivilized worlds, but also produced and reproduced a dialectic relation between rulers and subjects.

There are several cases throughout the Andes in which the Inkas stressed hierarchical differences between colonizers and the colonized by placing an Inka compound (with plazas, *kallanka*, *kancha*, storehouses, administrative buildings, and elite residences) inside or next to, but at the

same time disarticulated from, an indigenous settlement (see Arellano y Matos 2007, Gifford 2003, Hyslop 1990:250, Matos 1997:402)⁸. In these cases, the Inkas enhanced rulers and subjects' estrangement by creating a new experience of spatiality where the tidiness, massiveness, and symmetry of Inkaic built environment starkly contrasted with the agglomerated pattern of indigenous spatiality, generating a daily experience of social inequality and divergent identities. In addition, in some circumstances these Inka settlements were located next to local fortresses, emphasizing the separation between conquerors and those who were defeated. For the Inkas, this strategy meant striving of non-Inkas to incorporate themselves out of their own into a larger system, and gaining power in the process. Such gain came always with the loss of power of others.

In my own investigations in the Northern Calchaquí Valley, in the Southern Andes, I have found a similar situation as such described in this part of the article. Cortaderas is one of the two principal settlements the Inkas built in the region (Figure 3). This site has four parts: Cortaderas Bajo, with fine Inka architecture, including two large *kancha* with storage facilities, three residential compounds, and a central plaza associated to a massive *ushnu*⁹. Cortaderas Alto, a local fortress or *pucara* conquered and apparently abandoned once the Inkas controlled the area. Cortaderas Izquierda, which contains more than 50 Inka buildings, among them a large compound (about 130 x 35 m) with 19 rectangular enclosures arrayed in a double-row and a group of storage rooms. Surface evidence suggests that craft production took place at Cortaderas Izquierda. Cortaderas Derecha, a small village with local domestic architecture, settled during Inka times (Figure 4). Studies in this part of the site indicated that its inhabitants engaged in large-scale food production and processing (Acuto *et al.* 2004).




Figure 3: Map of Cortaderas Bajo, Cortaderas Alto and Cortaderas Izquierda, Calchaquí valley, Northwest Argentina.

Figura 3: Plano de Cortaderas Bajo, Cortaderas Alto y Cortaderas Izquierda en valle Calchaquí, Noroeste Argentino.

Whereas Northern-Calchaquíes used to live in settlements that were large clusters of homogeneous architecture arranged in a cellular pattern, with no divisions or signs of social stratification, both in terms of architecture and the goods people employed and consumed, showing, at the same time, a high degree of internal articulation and integration (Acuto *et al.* 2008); Cortaderas offered a fragmented landscape. Here, Inka domains were clearly alienated from indigenous spheres and the river served to demarcate the separation between natives and Inka representatives (Figure 5). Architecture noticeably differentiated the Inka and the non-Inka areas of the site. Well-constructed administrative buildings, fine architecture, large residential

compounds, and public spaces characterized the Inka area of Cortaderas. Small and semi-subterranean residential compounds and less elaborated architecture, on the other hand, characterized its local portion.

The activities that people carried out in Cortaderas also emphasized social inequality and increased the gulf between rulers and subordinates. On the one hand, the representatives of Tawantinsuyu lived in direct association with ritual structures and administrative and storage facilities, what suggests that they monopolized political and ritual practices, and had some sort of control over the distribution of the goods produced. On the other hand, those indigenous individuals who resided in Cortaderas Derecha, not only found themselves alienated from the goods they manufactured, but they were also relegated to lower prestige activities, such as staple production.



Figure 4: Map of Cortaderas Derecha, Calchaquí Valley, Northwest Argentina.

Figura 4: Plano de Cortaderas Derecha, valle Calchaquí, Noroeste Argentino.

In summary, the sense of communal integration lived in local towns disappeared in this imperial center, replaced by an increasing sense of social distance and distinction. The spatial organization and built environment were accomplices in the promotion and reproduction of divergent identities, which were rooted in deep social inequalities realized in several domains (from access to power to access to goods and ritual knowledge). This constituted a new experience for Northern-Calchaquíes, who found themselves subordinated under a major power, as well as for those who came as imperial representatives¹⁰, who saw themselves on the dominant side, favored by economic, political, and cultural capital. The Inkas created a new sense of membership and exclusion that shaped the identity of those who dwelled in Cortaderas.

All these examples demonstrate that, throughout their empire, the Inkas strategically used their settlements' spatial design and architecture as a mechanism of power to produce and institutionalize social inequalities. Tawantinsuyu set groups apart, connecting them with different resources, objects, buildings, social practices, and social and cultural identities. Whereas the Inkas carried out political, military, ritual, and state-oriented economic activities in their part of the settlement, they stripped of their subjects from many of these tasks, linking them instead to the domestic sphere and low-prestige activities. In these environments, the colonized may have experienced a profound sense of subalternization and alienation. The situation was completely different for the Inkas (or their representatives) for whom the spatiality and materiality of imperial centers helped enhancing their power, favoring their social reproduction. Experiencing Inka places implied the realization of deep inequalities, social distance, and differences in power between groups. Contrary to Cuzco social structure, where different social segments, especially Hanan and Hurin, were articulated and perceived as complementary and fraternal, through the social and spatial order of provincial settlements, the Inkas bluntly stated the fragmentation between conquerors and conquered.




Figure 5: Cortaderas site. Aerial view.

Figura 5: Sitio de Cortaderas. Vista aérea

LANDSCAPES OF COMMEMORATION AND SPECTACLE

If we carefully examine Inkaic provincial settlements, both principal and secondary centers, and even smaller sites, one can easily realize the centrality, formality, and monumentality of public facilities. Besides building their own centers, the Inkas also settled within some indigenous towns and villages and, sometimes, in important local (or even pan-Andean) ceremonial centers and oracles (such as Pachacamac, Isle of the Sun, the carved rock of Samaipata, La Centinela, among many others). In these cases again the principal features that characterize Tawantinsuyu's intervention in provincial lands were ritual facilities and/or large plazas (Bauer and Stanish 2001, Franco Jordán 1996, Meyers 2007, Morris and Santillana 2007, Wallace, 1998). This is, for example, the case of Turi, an important indigenous center in the Atacama region (Aldunate *et al.* 2003, Cornejo 1999). In this place, and after destroying local burials, Inka colonizers constructed a large plaza (Figure 6).

Public spaces covered a large portion of Inka settlements, and their construction (which included leveling, walling, and building associated facilities) involved a considerable amount of labor. Although there are many examples of pre-Inka plazas throughout the Andes, with the Inkas,

public spaces acquired unedited dimensions and degree of formalization. Plazas occupied the central area of Inka settlements and allowed access and permanence to a large body of people, which emphasize the great importance that rituals had in these contexts of domination. Contrary to what happened in many important pre-Inka sites (even in those that belong to some of the more complex societies of the Andes, such as Huari, Tiwanaku, Pukara, or Chimu), Inka plazas were designed to congregate a great number of people (see Moore 1996, von Hagen and Morris 1998)¹¹. This, in addition to rich evidence of feasting and ceremonial consumption that archaeologists have found in the majority of Inka provincial centers, such as food production, large-scale cooking and corn beer brewing, jars and plates for serving and consuming food, as well as culinary pottery (Bray 2003, Mackey 2003, Morris 1998, Morris and Covey 2003, Morris and Santillana 2007), allow us to think that more than places for habitation, bureaucracy, or simple *loci* of economic activities, Inka centers were stages for ritual performances (Coben 2006, Dillehay 2003, von Hagen and Morris 1998).




Figure 6: Turi, Atacama desert, Chile. Aerial view.

Figura 6: Vista aérea de Turi, desierto de Atacama, Chile.

An interesting example that demonstrates the great relevance that commemoration and spectacle had for the Inkas comes from the Paruro region, near Cuzco (Bauer 1992). The Inkas constructed in this area a

religious landscape composed of a series of sites (Maukallaqta and Puma Orco) especially built to remember Tawantinsuyu's myth of origin. In Maukallaqta, Inka architects built next to the main plaza an elaborate compound with an inner chamber and a secret passage. This building was used during ceremonies that recreated the moment during which the founding ancestors of the royal Inka lineage emerged from their mythical place of origin, the cave of Pacaritambo (Figure 7).




Figure 7: Map of Maukallaqta, Paruro region, Peru (redrawn from Bauer 1992).

Figura 7: Plano de Maukallaqta, región de Paruro, Perú (adaptado de Bauer 1992).

Morris (1982) has emphasized the great importance that rituals and ceremonial activities acquired in Huánuco Pampa (Figure 1). He has even claimed that most of the activities carried out in this site were oriented toward diplomacy, hospitality, and exchange during ceremonial contexts. A similar situation took place at Farfán, on the Northern Coast of Peru, an indigenous settlement the Inkas seized. Research revealed that under Inka government the number of ritual facilities and objects increased (Mackey 2003).

Approximately in the center of almost every Inka main plaza there was an interesting structure, called *ushnu* (Figure 1). They were stone platforms used for ritual activities, libations, and sacrifices (Hyslop 1990, Zuidema 1989). Cuzco's *ushnu* was an image of the Sun. Provincial *ushnus*, on the other hand, were the place where the Inka emperor (representing the Sun) or a paramount Inka officer (representing the emperor) sat and directed ceremonies. *Ushnu* were key artifacts for astronomical observations related to the agricultural calendar. Through these structures, and supported by the knowledge to use them, the Inkas controlled calendric information and, during public activities, established subjects' annual labor obligations toward Tawantinsuyu (Villacorta 2003, Zuidema 1989). Some scholars have argued that these stone platforms were miniature representations of mountains, which in Andean cosmology were considered *wak'a* and/or *apus* or ancestors with control over natural forces (Meddens 1994, 1997). In this way, through these structures the Inkas not only worshiped and gave offerings to these *wak'a* and *apus*, but they also intended to overpower communication with them, maintaining in the process the balance between the upper world, which belonged to ancestors and deities, and the earthly world of Andean communities. Through libations on the *ushnus*, the Inkas managed to articulate and connect the upper part or Hanan Pacha, who provided rainwater, Key Pacha, or the earthly sphere, and Uku Pacha, or the underworld. Some agricultural ceremonies employed *ushnus* as a material and symbolic media through which those deities that controlled water were invoked, through rituals and offerings, to bring water from the upper world down to Earth. Libations meant the corporization of these entities in the middle world, the *ushnu*, to fecund Earth Mother or Pachamama (Farrington 1998:53, Pino Matos 2004).

Now, what types of activities and rituals were performed within Inka provincial plazas? What kinds of experiences did people live inside Inka public spaces? Although this is a topic that deserves a thorough analysis, for the sake of space I will present here some general points.

Feasting was the main activity carried out within Inka plazas. These state-hosted public events served to start off relations of 'reciprocal' exchange between the Inkas and their subjects. Reciprocity was a strong structuring principle for Andean societies, especially regarding labor exchange. As it happened in ethnic communities, in an environment of ritual celebration, the Inkas distributed food, corn beer, and presents to their subjects, especially to local elites, taking the opportunity to request, in exchange, labor for the state *mit'a*. Through feasting and ritual the Inkas intend to

impose upon their subjects a sense of debt toward the State. Of course, this was an unbalanced reciprocity. What was given was certainly different from what was received.

Nevertheless, the purpose of Inka feasting was not purely to initiate economic exchanges with the colonized. Public events were also organized in order to denote and build up social stratification and ethnic separation¹². Public activities constituted a key sphere for social demarcation and partition (Bauer 1999, Hyslop 1990, Niles 1992, Salomon 1988). This is the case of Huánuco Pampa (Figure 1) where, like in Cuzco, lines that radiated from the core of the site divided its large plaza, and those who filled it during public ceremonies, into two, three, and four parts (Morris 1987). As recent studies has cogently showed, the Inkas gathered in the plaza of Huánuco Pampa people with different ethnic backgrounds, assigning each group a specific space in the plaza and regulating the interactions among them and with the imperial elite (Morris and Covey 2003). In Pumpu, the plaza was artificially split by a water canal. Matos (1994:211) suggests that this particular construction allowed the Inkas to segregate participants in two hierarchically dissimilar segments. A central pathway created a dual division in Inkawasi's plaza (Hyslop 1985). The large dimensions of this plaza and its central position within the site clearly show the paramount significance that rituals had in this place and the large audience that the Inkas sought to gather for these events. A vast and complex building on the south side of the plaza, where several astronomical sight lines converge, confirms the ritual importance of this sector of the site.

Key aspects of Inkaic worldview and religion were also experienced within imperial public spaces. In addition to the imposition and diffusion of Sun worshiping, Tawantinsuyu's principal deity, Inka plazas hosted other public ceremonies that commemorated Inka myth of origin, history, and rise to power. Capac Raymi ceremony, for instance, sought to justify Cuzco's power and hierarchy and to articulate the different parts of the Inkaic social and cosmic universe (Farrington 1998). Ritual battles also occurred in Inka plazas. These events expressed relations of complementarity and antagonism between groups; relations that, in this contexts, the Inkas mediated (Morris and Covey 2003).

Monumentality and solidity (signifying something that was built to last) were key features of Inka public spaces. The formality, tidiness, and massiveness of Inka public spaces in sites such as Raqchi or Cacha (Sillar and Dean 2002) in Tawantinsuyu's core; Huánuco Pampa (Morris and

Covey 2003, Morris and Thompson 1985), Pumpu (Matos 1994:401), Vilcashuamán (González Carré *et al.* 1996, González Carré and Pozzi-Escot 2002) in the Central Andes; Tomebamba and Quito in the Northern Andes (Idrovo Urigüen 2000); or Inkallajta (Coben 2006), Oma Porco (Raffino 1993), Shincal (Farrington 1999, Raffino 2004), Turi (Aldunate *et al.* 2003, Cornejo 1999), and Nevados del Aconquija (Hyslop and Schobinger 1991) in the Southern Andes, to name just a few examples from different parts of Tawantinsuyu, may have awed indigenous visitors and residents, who, in many cases, were used to living in less structured villages and hamlets of small and perishable buildings, or in semi-subterranean architecture; in some cases, without formal paths or streets, plazas, temples, or large administrative buildings. Furthermore, and whereas people experienced in local towns the rhythm of daily routines more than a highly ritualized environment, in Inka settlements ritual life and spectacle acquired a paramount spatial and material relevance¹³.

In conclusion, Inka settlements were not only centers for bureaucratic administration and economic activities, but also contexts for rituals and pageant. The magnitude, centrality, and the great amount of labor invested in the construction of public and ceremonial spaces, and the immense amount of objects produced for these rituals, demonstrate the great importance that ritual activities acquired in Inka colonialism. The Inkas used these rites, which narrated Inka myths, spread the imperial worldview, and justified their power, to transform some of those who resided in the cities of Tawantinsuyu. Those non-Inka individuals who played the role of Inka officers in provincial contexts were more likely to be subjects of this transformation. These people not only had to learn the Inka ways, but they also had to reproduce Inka rituals during ceremonies. I claim that these practices, and the Inkaic material world in which they lived, favored their Inkaization.

LANDSCAPES OF CONTROL

In this last section of the article I argue that the spatiality of Inka settlements directed the experiences and perceptions of people, controlling and guiding corporeal senses. The spatial design of these sites allowed certain ways of circulation and sights (and possible hearing), while constraining some others. Architecture was tactically employed to direct views and movements and to frame the natural and cultural landscape. In this way, from within Inka settlements, landscape acquired an iconographic nature. I

claim, therefore, that through their built environment the Inkas carried out a political economy of the senses (King 1997), or the political and ideological manipulation of experience to create a new understanding about the order of things. Next, I offer some example to sustain this proposition.

Ollantaytambo's scenic layout seems to have been oriented to dazzle visitors. Many of its buildings went beyond the human scale and directed people's actions. Protzen's (1993:41-48) detailed description of the experience lived when approaching this settlement from different directions, and how gaze was guided toward certain buildings and features, demonstrates the theatrical design of Ollantaytambo and suggests that the Inkas framed the landscape to show their 'greatness' and 'superiority.' A walled pathway (the Wall of a Hundred Niches) channeled people circulation and progressively revealed this settlement to its visitors. Protzen says that upon entering Ollantaytambo,

'...the traveler encountered a succession of open spaces that are scaled from the vast horizons of the Andes to the intimate courtyard in town – spaces sprung together by narrow passages over precipitous cliffs, steep staircases, alleyways, and gates. Along this pathway the site is veiled and unveiled in a sequence of vistas that reveal the lay of the land and the setting of the town, and that attract attention to details of nature or architecture framed by narrow passages or gates' (Protzen 1993:41).

He later adds that once inside Ollantaytambo,

'...the traveler would have come out from a narrow passage enclosed "betwixt wall and mountain side" onto a wide open space. Only here did he get a full view of the imposing Fortaleza and a glimpse of Manyaraki across the Patakancha River, and only here did he discover the town on the north side of the esplanade... While skirting the town, he would have had a magnificent view of the Fortaleza and the adjoining banks and terraces to his right, and when passing the transverse streets, he would have caught an occasional glimpse of life in town to his left' (Protzen 1993:48).

Architecture in this royal estate wrapped people and made them feel small. In addition, the layout of this site shows that privacy was a main principle of Inkaic spatial order. The design of Ollantaytambo's *kancha* demonstrates that their builders arranged these spaces in a way that avoided intruders' visual and physical access (Figure 8A).




Figure 8: Inka kancha from: A. Ollantaytambo, Sacred Valley, Peru (redrawn from Protzen 1993); B. Aqllawasi, Huánuco Pampa (redrawn from Morris and Thompson 1985); C. Inkawasi, southern coast of Peru (aerial view); Cortaderas Bajo (Northwestern Argentina).

Figura 8: Kancha Inka de: A. Ollantaytambo, Valle Sagrado, Peru (adaptado de Protzen 1993); B. Aqllawasi, Huánuco Pampa (adaptado de Morris y Thompson 1985); C. Inkawasi, costa sur del Peru (vista aérea); Cortaderas Bajo (Noroeste Argentino)

Niles' (1999) fascinating study of Quispiguanca, a royal estate built during Huayna Capac's (the penultimate emperor) reign, shows the choreographic character of this place. Directing vistas and controlling circulation were major concerns for their designers¹⁴. Niles (1999:293) explains that in the case of Quispiguanca, views were almost obsessively directed toward Huayna Capac's possessions, avoiding looking at features that symbolized ancestors (such as the snow peak of Chicón) or previous emperor's lands. She argues that this may have helped "to reinforce the image of Huayna Capac's autonomy in the eyes of royal visitors or diplomats who were entertained in the place" (Niles 1999:293).

Kaulicke and his colleagues (2003) offer a provocative analysis of Pisac, one of the most intriguing Inca sites of the Sacred Valley. These authors discuss how Pisac's landscape shaped people's experiences and senses. By providing solid information and based on a detailed description of the site, maps, and photographs, they discuss how water sound effects, axes of visibility, contrasts between light and shadow, burial placement, color gradations, landscape framing, and water channeling were used to shape the experiences people lived in this sacred place.

Circulation and access to buildings were quite restricted in many Inka sites. As in Ollantaytambo's *kancha*, admission to both the elite compound located in the eastern part of Huánuco Pampa and to the complex building compound found in the northern sector, where archaeologists found solid evidence of textile production and *chicha* brewing, was tightly regulated (Morris and Thompson 1985:70). As seen in Figures 1 and 8B, there was only one door to access these two *kancha*. Furthermore, the presence of central open areas inside both compounds shows that public/ritual activities were developed in other parts of Huánuco Pampa besides its main plaza. The smaller size of these subsidiary plazas and the highly controlled admission to these *kancha* suggest that only a few people participated in these rituals and ceremonies.

In other words, the Inkas screened access to these buildings and to participation in the activities developed in them. Inkawasi's layout indicates that behavior within this site was also regulated. Hyslop (1985:17) explains that circulation was patterned and limited. Many building complexes, such as the one that contains the great majority of storage structures and the large ritual structure on the south side of the main plaza, had only one door, that allowed access to one person at the time, and narrow corridors (Figure 8C). Similarly, one unique door allowed access to the largest *kancha* of Cortaderas Bajo, in the North Calchaquí Valley (Figure 8D). There are many other similar cases throughout Tawantinsuyu, and in many of them there was a small room next to their unique door, probably for control of those who entered and left these buildings.

Public spaces also created instances of control over body movements and senses. Access to some Inka plazas was generally permitted through a few doors and narrow corridors between buildings. This produced an interesting sensorial effect. Even though people were able to hear (but not to see) what was happening inside a plaza while approaching to it, the view of what was going on in its interior space unveiled once one was standing at

the plaza's doorways. The built environment created, in these cases, a clear demarcation between those who the Inkas allowed to cross the doors and fully participate in the ceremonies that occurred inside plazas, and those who remained outside, able to hear the activities carried out within public spaces, but unable to see them because architecture blocked sight.

This was the case of Huayna Capa's royal estate, Quispiguanca. In order to enter this site's large plaza, people had to cross a unique and monumental door and gatehouse located on the east perimeter wall. To enter into this public space it was necessary to walk through a long ramp, go through the dark and tall gatehouse, to finally come out to the bright space of the large plaza. While walking along this ramp, anyone who came to participate in an Inka ceremonial event was able to hear but not to see the activities carried out inside the plaza, to only obtain a complete perspective of them once the impressive threshold was crossed (Niles and Batson 2007). According to Niles and Batson the architectural design of Quispiguanca's plaza and buildings associated to it guided experiences, chorographically alternating narrow passages with open spaces and contrasting dark and bright, and vertical and horizontal spaces.

Another graphic case of control upon entering public spaces comes from the Southern Andes. A single door permitted entrance to the large Inka plaza of Turi (Figure 6), in northern Chile, suggesting that the Inkas restricted and controlled access to this ritual space (Cornejo 1999). An analogous situation happened in Farfán, on the Northern Coast of Peru. As Mackey (2003) shows, access to Inka elite residences, storage facilities, and public spaces was also restricted in this case. My studies on Guitián's architectural design, a small-scale Inka ceremonial/public facility associated to La Paya, a main indigenous settlement, show that while local access to Guitián's plaza was indirect and through narrow pathways between building walls, Inka residences were directly articulated with this plaza and its ritual infrastructure (Figure 9). Moreover, Guitián's public space was surrounded by buildings that obstructed gazing inside the plaza. Those natives who inhabited right outside Guitián's perimeter wall¹⁵, and perhaps those who resided in the eastern side of Guitián, were close enough to heard Inka ceremonies, but were unable to see them because architecture blocked their views. The constraint upon circulation and views that Guitián's built environment imposed on residents and visitors highly contrasted with neighboring La Paya. In this indigenous settlement, an ample network of elevated pathways allowed people to walk above buildings floors and walls and to reach almost every corner of the site (Acuto *et al.* 2008). As in

Guitián, passageways between tall buildings channeled visitors' way into Huánuco Pampa's plaza (Figure 1), restricting and directing, at the same time, sight (Morris 1987, Morris and Covey 2003).

The Inkas carefully rearranged ritual and pilgrimage centers' architecture in order to adjust experience and representations within these places. La Centinela was a major Chíncha oracle on the Southern Coast of Peru. The Inkas appropriated this pilgrimage center erecting, after disassembling previous structures, an imposing building complex. This compound included a square plaza and an elevated palace. Wallace's (1998) study of the Inka part of La Centinela, especially its palace, demonstrates the sophisticated design of this compound, which included principles of order, privacy, monumentality, and spectacle, and which distanced the Inkas from the colonized. The Inka precinct at La Centinela had a highly ordered plan in which architects pushed construction techniques to the limit to obtain an extremely organized spatial form. Wallace's interesting analysis shows how tidy circulation and access to the Inka precinct were. A few strategically located doors and narrow alleys served to limit and screen entrance and to direct views to specific features. Within the palace complex, for instance, several core rooms were kept in private and away from intruders' direct access and gazes, including a large terrace with a bath. Moreover, ramps and terraces lifted up parts of the Inka complex, which acquired a monumental scale. La Centinela's Inka compound has a raised gallery, with a tall niche-wall, that faces a large rectangular courtyard below. Wallace (1998:18) considers that this platform and the well-constructed niche-wall were meant to be viewed by an audience gathered in the courtyard. As in the case of the Maukallaqta (Figure 7), one of the niches is actually a disguised door that concealed the more private part of the palace, and from which an Inka priest or ruler may unexpectedly have appeared to conduct rituals. Wallace even suggests that the false niche may have served to hide a person from the audience in the courtyard, whose voice, apparently coming from nowhere, may have appeared as La Centinela's oracle voice, now under Inka control.




Figure 9: Map of Guitián, Calchaquí valley, Northwest Argentina.

Figura 9: Plano de Guitián, valle Calchaquí, Noroeste Argentino

During Inka times, the southern corner of the Titicaca Basin constituted a Pan-Andean and Inka-hosted pilgrimage and ritual area. The Inkas constructed here a landscape of power and worship. Several Inka sites with large plazas served to congregate pilgrims, who observed and participated in ritual activities and astronomical events. For example, the Inkas constructed a large plaza near the Sacred Rock, on the Island of the Sun, from where the Inkas believed the Sun was born and raised up to the sky¹⁶. Bauer and Stanish (2001) offer a compelling description of pilgrims' experiences and perceptions when visiting this sacred landscape. Based on archaeological and ethno-historical studies, they discuss the way Inka architecture and roads oriented the circulation of worshippers across this landscape. Access to the Copacabana Peninsula, where this experience

began, was controlled, as well as crossing the Titicaca Lake toward the Island of the Sun. During this journey, there were several entrances people had to go through. Depending on their status, they may or may not have been allowed access to certain areas, deepening the experience of social stratification (Bauer and Stanish 2001:212)¹⁷. In addition, while circulating in this landscape, the built environment was assembled in a way in which vistas were slowly revealing this sacred place to the visitor. The Inkas monitored entrance to the Sacred Rock area. Those who were allowed to approach this particular feature had to cross a door and to continue walking down toward a large plaza, next to this revered boulder (Figure 10). On the other hand, people of lower status had to stop at this door and walk to a nearby stone platform from where they were able to watch the ceremonies and astronomical events that occurred in the plaza and in relation to the Sacred Rock from the distance.




Figure 10: Sacred Rock area, Island of the Sun, Titicaca Lake, Bolivia.

Figure 10: Área de la Roca Sagrada, Isla del Sol, Lago Titicaca, Bolivia.

In my investigations in the Northern Calchaquí Valley I found that the Inkas used architecture to control peoples' sensory experiences within Inka installations (Acuto and Gifford 2007). Natives visiting Cortaderas in order to participate in public activities in Cortaderas Bajo's plaza arrived in this settlement from the south. While walking on the Inka road right before entering this plaza, they walked between two large *kancha* whose tall walls blocked any chance of gazing inside to see how Inka's life was like. Once inside the plaza people saw, to the west, the abandoned local stronghold (Figure 11) and, to the east, the imposing Inka *ushnu* (Figure 12). In this scenario, the contrasting presence of the new massive *ushnu* platform and the old and destroyed indigenous fortress acted as a continuous narrative about conquest and colonization, a clear representation of the former social organization suppressed and transformed by the new order of things.



Figure 11: View of Cortaderas Alto from Cortaderas Bajo's plaza.
Figura 11: Vista de Cortaderas Alto desde la plaza de Cortaderas Bajo



Figure 12: Cortaderas Bajo's ushnu from plaza.
Figure 12: Ushnu de Cortaderas Bajo desde plaza

It seems that the Inkas also designed the experience of leaving Cortaderas Bajo in a meaningful way. Once ceremonies concluded and local visitors returned to their settlements in the southern parts of the Valley, the road led to a place from where people could obtain an instant snapshot of a fully constructed and fully active Inka landscape. The spectacle the Inkas presented from this particular point included people removed from their settlements and forced to work for the Empire in Cortaderas Derecha, novel and large Inka buildings in Cortaderas Izquierda, agriculture fields exploited for Tawantinsuyu's benefit, three branches of the imperial road going in different directions, and, at the back of the picture, a group of sacred snowy mountains that the Inkas appropriated, building a full imperial landscape with Inka roads, ritual sites, and high-altitude sanctuaries (Acuto *et al.* 2010, Figure 13). This particular vista, together with the experience acquired inside the plaza, may have deeply impacted on local visitors who were dramatically exposed to the new political situation and full extent of Inka intervention in the region. On the other hand, for those Inka allies who came to the region as rulers and representatives of the Empire, the new landscape confirmed the power and status they obtained through their alliance with Tawantinsuyu. The Inkas framed the landscape that, as

a set design, was a clear materialization and representation of the degree of colonization over the Northern Calchaquí Valley, facilitating people's awareness of the new context of domination and relations of power.




Figure 13: Perspective when exiting Cortaderas Bajo toward south, from the Inka road.

Figura 13: Perspectiva al salir desde Cortaderas Bajo hacia el Sur desde el camino del Inka.

In brief, once inside Inka settlements people were not allowed to do what they pleased; in fact, architecture and spatial design provided a framework for guided and controlled admission and behavior within these places. In provincial contexts, the spatial organization of Inka settlements oriented and controlled the experiences of the colonized. The symmetry of the Inka built environment did not really suited to human bodily movement, but rather spread an ideology of order, or a necessity of order. Within Inka installations, walls did not permit any practice different from the framework they set; or at least this is what Inka architects intended.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have submerged in the spatial organization of Inka settlements in order to understand the social order the Inkas attempted to build throughout Tawantinsuyu. I have focused on the types of relations and practices these centers set up, the identities they constructed, and the experiences and perceptions they created. Inka sites were not considered static representations of a larger political or economic system, but rather I have thought spatiality as an active dimension in the production of peoples' interactions and experiences, and in the construction of colonial and power relations. In tune with this idea, this article has showed that the Inkas used their settlements tactically to create a new order embedded in Tawantinsuyu's socialness and ideology.

Provincial Inka settlements' spatial layout and materiality generated hierarchically divided communities where the Inkas, or those who represented them, found themselves inhabiting and using monumental imperial architecture, consuming Inka goods, and performing and directing bureaucratic and ritual activities. Differently from Cuzco society, where social segments, especially Hanan/Hurin, were seen as complementary and fraternal, the relationship between the Inkas and the colonized was set as a more cohesitive relation, clearly demarcating those who held power from those who lacked it. Spatiality and material culture were accomplices in the production and reproduction of, at least, two estranged identities: Inka conquerors - colonized other; giving more room to the social reproduction of the former and leaving, in the process, non-Inkas in a clear subordinate position in terms of areas occupied, architecture used, objects consumed, and activities developed. All in all, the spatial organization of provincial Inka centers, as well as the royal estates of the Cuzco region, created a landscape of inequality

Rituals, which both diffused Inka ideology and articulated social interactions, acquired great importance in the social life of Inka provincial centers. Some scholars have even claimed that these settlements were more centers for diplomacy, ritual, and pageant than for the practical administration of the provinces (Morris 1998, von Hagen and Morris 1998). Public spaces and ritual facilities were main components of Inka installations throughout Tawantinsuyu, constituting them as landscapes of commemoration and spectacle.

Finally, experience was highly regulated within Inka places. I have argued that the Inkas carried out a political economy of the senses, or the political and ideological manipulation of experience to create an image of the world fit to their own interest. In these locales, the colonized experienced deep control and surveillance. Spatiality did not allow them to freely circulate and restricted and directed their views. Access to state or ritual facilities was highly regulated. Moreover, imperial workers were able to carry out a few activities and were not always allowed to pursue other practices.

Acknowledgment: Recent research in the Northern Calchaquí Valley has been financed through Heinz Grant for Latin American Archaeology and Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, International Collaborative Research Grant.

Notes

- ¹ It was a general Inka policy to force the mobilization of ethnic communities (or part of them) from their homelands to other locations within Tawantinsuyu. These re-settled *mitmaqkuna* populations served imperial interests, either as soldiers, artisans, or officials representing the Inka Empire in some of its multiple provinces. *Mitmaqkunas'* exile in foreign lands produced, simultaneously, the rupture of their ties to their original community and their direct attachment to the Inka Empire.
- ² In the Inka Empire tribute was commonly paid in labor. Once a region was conquered, the Inkas ritually ordered indigenous societies to provide labor for the imperial projects. This type of tribute, called *mit'a*, involved the recruitment of contingents of local households, who were moved to specific locations to temporarily work for Tawantinsuyu.
- ³ Protzen demonstrates that the difference between the north and south area of the site are not the product of two episodes of construction. The site, on the contrary, seems to have been built in one operation.
- ⁴ *Kallanka* were big rectangular buildings without interior divisions, usually established next to the settlement's main plaza, and used in administrative activities, as temples, or to lodge high state officials and active troops.
- ⁵ *Kancha* was the basic unit of Inka architecture. They were walled rectangular blocks enclosing groups of one-room buildings. There was great variation in the size and number of structures that comprised a *kancha*. Some were residential units, temples and palaces, while others were used to house craft and specialized production.
- ⁶ Several Inka sites throughout the Andes have baths. The Inkas took special care in their construction, applying the full range of Inka architectural techniques. Cieza (1985 [1553]) explains that these baths were used in ritualized social contexts and by high-status individuals, including the Inka emperor. Atahualpa, the last Inka emperor, was enjoying one of these baths when he heard about the arrival and proximity of the Spanish conquerors.
- ⁷ Cuzco's landscape was also wiped out from traces of previous past.
- ⁸ For example La Puerta in the Copiapó River Valley in Chile (Niemeyer 1986), Turi in the Atacama Desert in Chile (Aldunate *et al.* 2003; Cornejo 1999), La Huerta in the Quebrada de Humahuaca in Argentina (Palma 1998), Ingapirca in Ecuador (Hyslop 1990:261), and probably many sites on the Peruvian Coast, such as Cerro Azul (Marcus 1987) and La Centinela (Morris and Santillana 2007; Wallace 1998). Gifford (2003) provides a partial list of Paired Sites in Northwestern Argentina (local-Inka): Esquina Azul and SL005 in the northern end of the Calchaquí Valley, Cortaderas Alto and Cortaderas Bajo in the Potrero River Valley, Pucará de Yacoraite and Yacoraite Bajo in the Quebrada de Humahuaca region, Hornaditas and Roderococtaca in the northern Quebrada de Humahuaca, Fuerte Mendozino and Punta de Balasto in the Yocavil or Santa María Valley.
- ⁹ We have previously interpreted this structure as a fortress (Acuto and Gifford 2007); however, recent investigations allow us to believe that it was an *ushnu* instead.
- ¹⁰ According to historical information, it is possible that *mitmaqkunas* from southern Cuzco, south of the Titicaca Basin, and the Chicha region in southern Bolivia came to the Calchaquí Valley to serve as representatives of Tawantinsuyu (Lorandi and Boixadós 1987-88).
- ¹¹ For example, Huanuco Pampa's plaza is 520 by 360 meters side. La Viña, on the Northern Coast of Peru, has a 4-ha plaza (Hayashida 2003).
- ¹² Ethnohistorical investigations have established that the Inkas fostered ethnic demarcation by compelling those who participated in *mit'a* works, or in Inka ceremonies, to wear their ethnic dresses (Cobo 1988 [1553]: book 12, chapter 24:1996).
- ¹³ This does not imply the secular character of Andean daily life. Rituality involves many daily activities in Andean social life (see for example Wachtel 2001, among others). However, I do state that within Inka sites rituals had a more obvious, formal, and monumental presence.
- ¹⁴ Both Niles (1999) and Protzen (1993) highlight the importance of waterworks in these royal estates. These waterworks created a special sound effect that may have been part of the experience of visiting or residing in these places.
- ¹⁵ Right on the western side of Guitián there is a group of local buildings that have not being mapped yet.
- ¹⁶ Spanish chroniclers say that the Inkas covered one side of the Sacred Rock with a high-quality Inka cloth or *cumbi*, while they deposited, on the other side, gold and silver offerings.
- ¹⁷ Bauer and Stanish's (2001:212, 230) historical study demonstrates that not everyone was allowed to enter into the area of the Sacred Rock. In general, just Inka nobility get into this area.

COMMENTS / COMENTARIOS

SONIA ALCONINI

(UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO, ESTADOS UNIDOS. CORREO-E: SONIA.
ALCONINI@UTSA.EDU)

In this manuscript, Felix Acuto explores the function of provincial Inka centers as the scenarios to enhance social inequality, spectacle, and control. First, as landscapes of social inequality, he compares the architectural layout, configuration and labor investment of distinct Inka provincial centers, and compares those with Cuzco and other royal estates. He concludes that based on principles of duality and quadripartition, the Inkas spatially divided the provincial center in two or more sectors in order to create spaces of inequality and social difference between conquerors and conquered, rulers and subjects and Inkas and non-Inka. Archaeologically in his view, this is manifested in the zonation of the centers into two main areas or neighborhoods. The first (or Hanan) was inhabited by the Inkas or their representatives, and whose architecture was elaborate, had state facilities and had affluent access to status materials. The second half (or Hurin) –often separated by a river, geographic feature or wall–, was inhabited by low-status people and whose low quality residences were often constructed in the local architectural styles. Such were the cases of Huanuco Pampa, Tomebamba or Quito to cite a few examples.

Second, as landscapes of commemoration and spectacle, and based on existing literature, he argues that provincial Inka centers –whether primary or secondary– were also the loci of diplomacy, hospitality celebrations and exchange in ritualized contexts. As microcosmic representations of Cuzco, such activities, mostly conducted in the main plazas, were spaces of commemoration and spectacle, aimed to legitimize the Inka's right to rule. In this context, the monumentality of such centers also contributed to the awe of any visitor.

Third, as spaces of control, such Inka facilities –whether imperial centers or royal states–, were choreographic in nature and designed to control the flow of movement and circulation of people. This was facilitated by the strategic distribution of doors and passage ways, and intended to divide public and private spaces. These facilities also served to enhance the visitors' sensorial experience, by strategically framing the landscape through niches, while also emphasizing the view of important features.

I consider Acuto's analysis to be a significant contribution to the study of Inka provincial centers and their function. Such analysis highlights the importance of such centers as spaces of control, domination and commemoration of power. However, I consider that such provincial centers were not only spaces reifying emerging inequalities between conquerors and conquered and rulers and subjects. More importantly, and as materializations of a broader imperial agenda, they served to facilitate political incorporation, social integration and acculturation of the subjects into the Inka ways of life. Such a situation is manifested in the function of the plaza provincial centers and attached kallankas, aimed to sponsor redistribution feasts, celebrations, and diplomatic incorporation. Archaeologically for example, such was not the case of Aztec provincial centers, where state-sanctioned redistributive feasts in the plazas were nearly absent.

In addition, and taking into account such a central function of provincial centers, one wonders why local elite (such as those in Tomebamba) were "forced" to live in the provincial centers. I argue that instead of dichotomizing the complex relations between Inka and local populations into only conquerors and conquered, and rulers and subjects, it may be more fruitful to explore such relations in a gradient of possibilities. Many authors have already discussed the rise of powerful intermediate elite, whether they were fully Inkanized or not.

Therefore, the co-residence of the imperial administrators (whether from Cuzco, Inkas-by-privilege or Inkanized lords) with the local populations (whether the regional elite, specialized craft producers, simple commoners or low-status yanacunas) in the provincial centers, would have promoted complex relations of power and asymmetries beyond the conqueror-conquered dichotomy. Archaeologically, such a situation should be expressed in the nature and layout of the provincial centers, the nature of their inhabitants, and the kinds of interaction that such centers maintained with surrounding areas. Hopefully further regional studies on the Inka in distinct parts of the empire will highlight such complexity by using multiscale, multidimensional and multidisciplinary studies.

I argue that such is particularly the case if we take into account the agency of the individuals –whether from the empire, the regional lords or the competing ethnicities–, the creation of a new social order and the implementation of the imperial agenda. Such an agenda is only viable as long as the locals appropriate, modify and interpret it for their own ends. After all, Cuzco was not only the capital of the empire. More importantly, it was a center of encounter and where asymmetric forces were balanced out.

GABRIEL CANTARUTTI

(UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, ESTADOS UNIDOS. CORREO-E:
GCANTA2@UIC.EDU)

En su artículo, Félix Acuto discute la existencia de principios ordenadores que son deliberadamente expresados en el planeamiento espacial y arquitectónico estatal incaico, dirigidos a adoctrinar y disciplinar (en términos de Foucault) culturalmente dentro de un nuevo orden social, a quienes participan con mayor o menor regularidad dentro de las dinámicas propias de los centros administrativos provinciales (CAPs). La organización arquitectónica de los CAPs, así como la vinculación espacial de estos con otros sitios y rasgos culturalmente significativos del entorno, son entendidas como un registro a partir del cual es posible inferir la intención manifiesta del estado inca por modelar las prácticas de interacción social, favoreciendo la instauración de nuevos referentes simbólicos y a la postre, de un nuevo orden cultural.

Tres son los paisajes que, de acuerdo a Acuto, viven y experimentan quienes residen o visitan los CAPs: a) un paisaje de desigualdad social; b) un paisaje de conmemoración y festividad ritual; y c) y un paisaje de control (que podríamos apellidar de “conductual”). Así, a través de la reiteración habitual de actividades y prácticas cuyo desarrollo es modelado y favorecido por deliberados planeamientos espaciales, el estado inculca lógicas de inequidad social y subordinación conductual, acompañadas de generosas festividades rituales, que entre otros fines, sirven a la propagación de la cosmovisión e institucionalidad religiosa estatal.

Acuto, acertadamente se apoya en el trabajo de un buen número de investigaciones (incluidas las suyas) que ilustran la creación de los tres tipos de paisajes reunidos en los CAPs. Por cierto, varios de los sitios utilizados para explicar dichos paisajes no son CAPs (p.e. Ollantaytambo, Pisac, Maukallacta, Quispiguanca, entre otros), pero esto no desvirtúa su uso como ejemplos de aquellos principios ordenadores que sí están presentes en los primeros. En términos estrictamente formales, la organización del artículo podría haber ganado en claridad si se especificara cuales son los sitios considerados como CAPs, particularmente en las secciones en que se discuten los “paisajes de conmemoración” y los “paisajes de control”. Otra alternativa, podría haber sido el dedicar una sección especial para discutir cómo se presentan los tres tipos de paisajes en cada uno de los CAPs considerados ¿Es acaso Turi, en la región del Loa, un CAP?

Si entiendo bien al autor, no en todos los sitios mencionados se conjuguen los tres tipos de paisajes discutidos, pero sí ocurriría esta situación en todos los CAPs. De hecho, esta particularidad es la que transformaría a los CAPs en potentes instrumentos de subordinación. De cualquier modo, me parece importante resaltar como los tres tipos de paisaje discutidos por el autor imprimen, a manera de lógica estructurante, una regularidad que subyace a la variabilidad formal arquitectónica presente no sólo en los CAPs, sino que en otros sitios, como el centro ceremonial de la Isla del Sol, en el Lago Titicaca. En este sentido, el trabajo de Acuto enriquece las posturas de autores como Raffino, Hyslop y Farrington (quienes interpretan a los CAPs como “Nuevos Cuscos”), enfatizando no sólo patrones arquitectónico-espaciales de los CAPs, sino que también aquellas regularidades que, ahora en el plano de las experiencias, comparten sus ocupantes distribuidos a lo largo del imperio.

Dentro de una visión global del imperio, también me parece importante invertir la reflexión y pensar en torno a las implicancias que se derivan de la variabilidad presente en la regularidad paisajística descrita por el autor. Fundamentalmente, me refiero a los distintos grados de formatización arquitectónica y a las diferencias de envergadura entre los distintos CAPs a lo largo del imperio ¿Cómo incidirían estas diferencias en las experiencias que el estado pretendía que los ocupantes vivieran? Tómese por ejemplo las diferencias de envergadura entre las plazas de Huanuco Pampa o Pumpu y la de Cortaderas ¿Se trata sólo de replicar las experiencias a mayor o menor escala o es que las audiencias y potenciales participantes de las experiencias podrían también variar en términos de composición y estatus, por ejemplo?

Una última interrogante que me asalta de la lectura de este trabajo, surge de una afirmación contenida en su introducción: “[the colonizad], employs spatiality to struggle against, coping with, avoid, or negotiate domination”. Evidentemente, Acuto se concentra en discutir el orden o visión que los incas deseaban imprimir en el espacio, pero ¿Se manifiesta espacialmente la respuesta (por luchar, sobrellevar, evitar, o negociar) la dominación por parte del colonizado en los CAPs? Personalmente, me parece algo difícil de rastrear exclusivamente en el registro arquitectónico/espacial de estos sitios, pero no me queda claro si el autor está pensando en esta posibilidad, o si dicha respuesta se verificaría en otros sitios de planeamiento local (p.e. en sitios defensivos y habitacionales).

Siguiendo a Acuto, los tres tipos de paisajes que se conjugan en los CAPs definen a estos sitios, al mismo tiempo, como escenarios e instrumentos de la dominación incaica. En consecuencia, la presencia de estos nos sitúa frente a un potente instrumento de subordinación y control que no siempre hallamos a lo largo del imperio. Sin duda, los principios de desigualdad, control y conmemoración son comunes a la dominación incaica. Sin embargo y como el propio autor lo demuestra en su trabajo, aparte de los CAPs, el estado inca también se valió de otros tipos de sitios y materialidades (sobre todo muebles) para reformular los paisajes en función de aquellos tres principios comunes a la dominación. Esto último, obviamente se relaciona con las diversas estrategias de control implementadas a lo largo de imperio.

R. ALAN COVEY

(DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, HANOVER, ESTADOS UNIDOS. CORREO-E: R.ALAN.COVEY@
DARTMOUTH.EDU)

The tinku –an encounter of antagonistic complementarity– is a key Andean concept found widely in the ethnohistoric and ethnographic literature that has been productively applied to Inca imperial strategies. In a tinku, two opposing things unite to form something new—early Colonial Quechua dictionaries use the term for ritual battles between village moieties, the interweaving of the warp and weft of a garment, and the confluence of two streams to form a river. As Acuto describes in his paper, the Incas constructed spacious plazas and great halls for the jostling convergence of imperial encounters that occurred on specific occasions. Looking at Acuto’s discussion of Inca landscapes, it is clear that there is a broader context to the tinku that contemporary scholars should consider. Inca landscapes reflect not only a multiplicity of encounters that were variably interpreted by participating individuals and groups, but also the necessary flow of component parts to the imperial tinku and the inevitable transformation of these parts through the encounter.

Early Colonial Quechua uses multiple verbs to describe currents of water and wind, but human progress is best encapsulated by *puriy*, “to go, travel.” The backbone of Tawantinsuyu was a network of roads that achieved a flow of social power to Cuzco, which was the empire’s ultimate locus of encounter and transformation. The Inca *qhapaqñan* moved strategic information and soldiers, staple surpluses produced with labor tribute, the local *kurakas* and Inca officials who administered provincial hierarchies, and exotic raw materials that would be transformed into wealth goods

by specialists at the capital. Sacrificial victims traveled the Inca road to be sanctified at Cuzco by the ruler, and portable sacred objects circulated between the capital and provinces. Inca highways promoted specific routes for pan-Andean pilgrimages, linking them to Cuzco so that ritual circuits traced a cosmological return from the center of the civilized universe to the place and time of ancestral origins or universal creation.

Although the Inca road system established critical new flows of provincial social power, it could not monopolize these. There were places that the road had to travel—for example, through desert oases and coastal valleys with well-established local populations—and there were immovable sacred places that could not be reduced to a single imperial transportation network. This meant that the empire either had to eradicate existing networks of social power or accommodate them to varying degrees. The Incas chose the latter, appropriating local landscapes in ways that preserved mutual fictions of imperial dominance and local independence that could be celebrated simultaneously during imperial encounters. Near the capital, the system of royal estates occupied by royal lineages—such as Ollantaytambo, which Acuto discusses—represents another kind of network that the ruler could summon and edit only to a certain extent.

Imperial flows created encounters that were partly scripted, yet open to interpretation, and they transformed those taking part. Among the words that Colonial Quechua offers for transformation, the verb *tukuy* is particularly resonant. *Tukuy* refers to all people or things joined together, and a key Inca provincial official was the *tukuyrikhuq*, “the one who sees all [those assembled]”. Serving as a stand-in (*rantiq*) for the Inca ruler, this inspector might occupy provincial palaces and *ushnu* platforms to bear witness to the transformation of diverse peripheral tribes into provincial subjects. *Tukuy* also means “to change into something else,” and examples of legendary transformation dot Andean landscapes, as *wak’as* that converted from living people to rock outcrops during ancestral journeys. Inca subjects may have viewed periods of festive congregation as opportunities to celebrate mythic transfiguration. Descriptions of early Colonial processions mention that people came to central plaza spaces in the order that they had been conquered by the Incas, and that many dressed with emblems of their origin places (lakes, mountains, caves), or as animal totems. As Inca officials on the *ushnu* platform marked the unified and ordered subjectivity of the gathered crowd, participants flowed into the encounter space personifying all that made them distinct from the Incas, transformed by the power and antiquity of that difference.

As Acuto notes, the Incas appropriated local places for some of these equivocal encounters, such as at Turi, where they cleared a sacred and ancestral space for imperial gatherings. In others, such as the administrative center at Huánuco Pampa, they built new spaces on the imperial network, although even at this site, the state lacked complete domination over space. Beyond the massive central plaza and pathways accessing it, and past the state compounds on the plaza, residential architecture is diverse and haphazard. The Inca state was vastly more powerful than any other Andean society, but it could not extend the power of Cuzco to dominate every shrine or household; as Acuto observes, the heterogeneity of Inca landscapes reflects the value of ambiguity in imperial encounters.

IAN FARRINGTON

(THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, AUSTRALIA. CORREO-E: TAWANTINSUYU@OPTUSNET.COM.AU)

The paper by Félix Acuto presents an important archaeological statement to advance our knowledge and understanding of Tawantinsuyu. He correctly sees inka domination of its vast empire as one of conquest and colonisation and focusses his attention on the planning of its colonial centres. Utilising a post-processual approach, he suggests that residents and visitors to these centers experienced three overlapping landscapes: of inequality, commemoration and spectacle, and of control. His knowledge of these centres derives from his own field work at Cortaderas in the northern Calchaquí valley and a judicious reading of the literature from other parts of the empire, including Cusco.

Acuto establishes his landscapes of inequality using the chronicle accounts of Cusco and the urban plans of many centres, indicating the potential for the recognition of the *hanan:burin* divide but also sustaining the separation into urban districts, inka and local, at many places and particularly the spatially divided centre of Cortaderas. The core of the inka centre, the plaza and *usnu* complex, he articulates, maintained the schedule of imperial festivities and rituals that formed the core of the landscapes of commemoration and spectacle. In these celebrations of inka power, both the inka and non-inka governors and officials emphasised their separation from and superiority over the local population. Through his landscapes of control, Acuto demonstrates that the urban plan and its architecture of ceremony, feasting and ritual of 'controlled the experiences of the colonized.' I see this integration of social order, urban planning and

architecture, as well as observation of and participation in ceremony and ritual experience as fundamental to the understanding of colonial inka and indeed of understanding Cusco itself. However, I do think that it is not quite so simple.

In general, Acuto has used the provincial settlements well to sustain his thesis but there are a few issues with some data that I should mention. For Cusco, he has relied on the historical accounts but his arguments can be strengthened with the knowledge that *usnu* platforms have been discovered recently in both plazas, Hawkaypata and Limaqpampa (Farrington in press). While the social division into *hanan* and *hurin* is not manifest in my analyses of the archaeological excavations in either Cusco or Ollantaytambo, in the latter and in Calca, there is a distinctive architectural change dividing each into two, which may or may not subtly represent it (Farrington in press). The organisation and presentation of ceremony can be seen in the plan of Cusco as the approaches to Hawkaypata are wide streets and spaces, '*vomitoria*,' that would have directed processions from the four quarters into that ceremonial space (Farrington in press). For a different case study, my own survey and excavations at Quispeguanca indicate not only an entrance on the western side of the plaza but also no evidence for a bridged gateway on the eastern, as illustrated by Niles (Farrington 1995). Nevertheless, these issues do not detract from the value of this paper.

Landscape is a cultural expression. It exists in its natural or humanly modified state that changes and develops through time. Its physical appearance provides the setting for human experience, the shape for interpretation and the anchors for understanding. The experience and understanding of landscape is always personal but in those societies in which individual will is suborned by the group's collective cultural world view, its cosmovision, it is the latter which pervades. In any colonial situation, where two or more groups share a territory and landscape, both cultural worldviews prevail, according to who is the narrator. Indeed, long term change in the colonised world view would depend on the longevity of the colonial occupation.

In the expansion of Tawantinsuyu the inkas relied on their perception of their own identity and paramountcy, such as their linkages with the origins of the world and with the Sun, to persuade other polities to become part of the empire or be forcefully integrated into it. Tactics for colonisation involved not only military force but also the translocation of peoples as *mitmaquna* and the use of inka ceremony, architecture and landscape to

inscribe the conquered landscapes in their own image. Therefore, not only did the inkas take the architectural components, such as large plaza and *usnu* with them, as discussed by Acuto, but their meaning, significance and rituals. In other words, it was the *camay* (essence) of Cusco that was transferred to these provincial centres as each new settlement became and was Cusco. Cieza de León (1984: 218 [1551]) and Betanzos (1987: 261-262 [1551]) called these centres '*nuevo cusco*', whereas Guaman Poma (1980: 185 [187] [1609]) termed them '*otro cusco*.'

The inkas also renamed the landscape surrounding these centres with toponyms that culturally underlined their own identity and importance and thereby domesticated the 'new' landscape into a form, that they were comfortable with. Such names were derived from their legendary history; in particular, they commemorated significant events and places within the myths of inka origins, the visions and battles of the Chanka war and even places where Sapa Inka had slept. Therefore place names, such as Wanakawri, Anawarki, Yawiri, Qorikancha, Tambokancha and even Titiqaqa, were given to certain landscape features around these centres. Indeed, Cieza de León (1986: 174 [1554]) noted that Pachakuti Inka Yupanki ordered that at the new cusco built in the Huarco valley that '*... las calles y collados y plaças tuvieron el nombre que las verdaderas*.' The persistence of these names into the modern era at certain places demonstrates the extent to which inka influence remained strong and powerful. For example, in the vicinity of Quito, Ingapirka and Tumibamba (modern Cuenca) in Ecuador, as well as Cajamarca, Huánuco Pampa and Vilkaswaman in central Peru, as well as Wanokite and Tambokancha near Cusco there are prominent nearby mountains called Wanakawri, the supreme *waka* of inka ancestry and identity. However, the loss of such place names around the centres of Qollasuyu, such as El Shinkal and Cortaderas, can be explained by the brevity of inka occupation, the abandonment of those centres by their resident populations and the subsequent wars of conquest of northwestern Argentina. Nevertheless, the topographical setting and architecture of both of these centres would suggest that mountains, hills, rocks, caves, springs and pools, whether man-made or not, would have been similarly privileged and nominated.

In Tawantinsuyu, the non-inka responded in similar andean ways. For example, for *mitmaqkuna* the *camay* of their principal *waka* was taken with them to their new territory, however distant from their homeland, to be placed in or at a similar feature, pool, spring or rock, assuming the name of and performing as their principal *waka*. In other words, the essence of cultural identity was transportable and capable of being established in new

locations, irrespective of the dominance of inka icons in the landscape. In contrast, the colonised witnessed the transference to Cusco of their important *waka*, *paqarina* or their images to be worshipped there, embraced in the inka pantheon and incorporated within that alien landscape. Presumably they maintained their existing homeland landscape system of *paqarina* and *waka*, incorporating inka changes, perhaps even the new toponyms, for as long as it was politically and culturally expedient.

MARTTI PÄRSSINEN

(INSTITUTO IBEROAMERICANO DE FINLANDIA, MADRID. CORREO-E: MARTTI.
PARSSINEN@HELSINKI.FI)

Félix A. Acuto deals with an important issue: Cultural landscapes and Inka settlements as means of commemoration and control in an unequal political, social and ideological order. It is easy to agree that various Inka-time settlements built on different environmental surroundings and landscapes did not only unconsciously reflect, but were also intentionally aimed to be a part of Inka politics and social practices. As the French historian Fernand Braudel (1980:52) once noted: “Spatial models are the charts upon which social reality is projected.”

In his article, Acuto demonstrates that many Inka settlements had been divided into *Hanan* and *Hurin* segments, and that this dichotomy creates a division between local and Inka-related populations. The divisor lines may have crossed the main plaza with *usnu*-platform, or they were constituted by a mural wall, river or canal, for example. Also, access to sacred or otherwise prestigious spaces was generally restricted with a small entrance, *pongo*, which separated different *kancha*-type walled spaces from general urban environments. I agree that many provincial Inka centers and defensive settlements really had these characteristics. I also agree that many provincial Inka centers such as Huánaco or Paria (Pärssinen *et al.* 2010) had huge storage and rooming capacities, yet only few buildings were permanently inhabited. More than permanent settlements, those were centers for Inka’s “symbolic generosity and redistribution of accumulated material capital” in the sense explained by John V. Murra (2002). Not even provincial Inka governors, *tocricocs*, lived in these centers permanently (Pärssinen 1992: 269-287). Equally our Finnish-Bolivian team has excavated Inka buildings in other centers such as Sun Island of Lake Titicaca and in the Fortress of Oroncota with no marks of habitational refuge (Pärssinen 2005:209; Pärssinen and Siiriäinen 2003:180-182).

As said, the debate on the Andean spatial models is very important, and thus, this kind of research should be continued. However, it should also be kept in mind that the Inka state was not extremely unified. In fact, many kind of local administrative principles were held, and Tawantinsuyu was constituted on a mosaic of different political and social practices based on older local traditions. The most universal in the Andean context seems to have been the dual organization, of which Acuto's article gives some good examples. Nevertheless, as Acuto himself notes, also triad, quaternary and even more complicated, such as seven-part administrative structures, were common. Thus, if we agree that Andean social and political structures used to have spatial manifestations, we may expect that detailed multidisciplinary studies –that combine archaeology, history and oral tradition– would detect these even more complicated patterns. For example, I did not find any correspondence when I intended to compare the social organization of the Inkan Cusco to the traditional spatial division –based on the chronicle of Garcilaso (1609)– in which the Inka capital was split into two halves (*Hanan-Hurin*) across the main plaza Hanan Haucaypata. However, when I reread our historical sources on Cusco, I understood that if we use other sources instead of Garcilaso, such as Betanzos (1557), Sarmiento (1572) or the *ceque*-list based on Inkan *kipu* and copied by Cobo (1653), we may find a clear correspondence between the Inkan social and spatial organizations, and we may suspect that our traditional view of the division of Cusco has been erroneous. In fact, the original divisor lines may have started from Coricancha (Temple of Sun) crossing Cusco into four sections: Chinsaysuyu, Antisuyu, Collasuyu and Cuntisuyu. The same lines seem to have divided Cusco also into *Hanansaya* and *Hurinsaya* (Pärssinen 1992:228-235). Furthermore, if we accept this revised division as the “original” one, the sites of the known palaces of Inka rulers are also in logical positions. Hence, we may conclude that correspondence between sociopolitical and spatial organizations did, indeed, exist in the 15th century Inka capital.

When I published these observations some twenty years ago, I expected some debate to arise. I also expected that similar reinterpretations of other Inka settlements such as Machu Picchu, Ollantaytambo, Huánuco would appear. Acuto's article gives me new hope. In fact, Tawantinsuyu was full of different types of settlements: “New Cuscos” or capitals of “Hatun Apocazgos,” provincial capitals, *markas* or *cabeceras*, ordinary settlements, settlements of *mitimas*, production or mining centers, religious centers, military settlements, etc. Let's study and compare different Inka settlements in order to better understand the Andean past.

SIMÓN URBINA ARAYA

(BECARIO CONICYT. INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES, UNIVERSIDAD AUSTRAL DE CHILE, VALDIVIA. CORREO-E: SIMON.URBINA@UACH.CL)

El estudio de la planta arquitectónica de centros provinciales incaicos es, al igual que hace tres décadas (Raffino 1981), materia de fundamental importancia para la arqueología sudamericana y la historia urbana prehispánica. Debido a que en un número cada vez mayor se documentan y valoran asentamientos administrativos por décadas considerados meros enclaves, colonias o *tambos* dentro de *Qapaqñan*, análisis sistemáticos de asentamiento y sus patrones son requeridos en esta línea. Al describir y explicar cómo fueron establecidas las instalaciones incaicas en localidades, valles o regiones, se hace evidente a partir de la contribución de Felix Acuto, cuán difícil es seguir utilizando un criterio exclusivamente localista o estudio de sitios aislados.

Opacados muchas veces por el fulgor monumentalista y los modelos de conquistas del norte de Perú como de la región circum Titicaca (Stanish 2001), los trabajos efectuados en áreas distantes del Cusco—especialmente en el norte de Chile, sur de Bolivia y noroeste de Argentina—, se han automarginado de comparaciones macro regionales y sobre todo de dialogar con áreas/regiones vecinas o distantes y especialistas/enfoques divergentes. Las tensiones académicas, la subordinación científica e intelectual de los especialistas a los nacionalismos y límites republicanos post hispanos (siglos XIX-XXI), han influido negativamente encapsulando los equipos/investigadores que han trabajado y trabajan en asentamientos incaicos en estas tres naciones.

En estas dos materias, creemos que la perspectiva arqueológica de Acuto deja entrar aire fresco al ámbito de los estudios andinos referidos a la arquitectura Inca, por largas décadas carente de nuevos temas. Aporta también a un formato que se estima requiere de nuevas miradas y ejercicios metodológicos. La contribución del presente trabajo es observar la trama edilicia de diversas instalaciones asociadas a la expansión cusqueña iniciada en el siglo XV, distribuidas en un marco biogeográfico amplio y propio de la extensión que alcanza el Imperio Inca a mediados del siglo XVI. A diferencia de la mayor parte de los estudios de asentamientos desarrollados por especialistas en el Centro Sur de los Andes, el autor efectúa un repaso de la organización espacial de instalaciones regionales Inca, como aquellas de la zona Vilcanota-Urubamba y de la capital cusqueña, articulando esta información con aquellas que han sido objeto de sus propias investigaciones de campo (Cortaderas y Guitián) en el norte de los valles calchaquies.

A diferencia de los estudios de Hyslop (1990, 1993) y Raffino (1981, 1996), Félix Acuto plantea un estudio fenomenológico y cualitativo de los espacios edificados por la expansión del *Tawantinsuyo*. Se establecen ciertos elementos estratégicos de la “especialidad Inca”, diseñados tácticamente o de antemano por los arquitectos o albañiles del Imperio para inducir una experimentación controlada o coaccionada a los visitantes. Se trataría de una compleja batería de dispositivos arquitectónicos y paisajísticos destinados a crear una escenografía constructiva, un espacio teatral o una coreografía del lugar para sus habitantes y usuarios. Estos dispositivos permitirían a los propios Incas, o sus representantes, manipular restringir la circulación, la visibilidad y el movimiento humano y de grupos sometidos a ciertas actividades, recursos o capitales (*sensu* Nielsen 1995) en áreas residenciales, públicas y productivas. Con todo, una estrategia constructiva como la descrita generaría matizadas percepciones de la supremacía Inca por parte de “los dominados”, aunque una en especial: el poder del Inca para crear e imponer un nuevo orden.

La idea central artículo parece, en nuestra opinión, en extremo esencialista, como abstracta. El argumento fenomenológico del autor expone ciertas debilidades relacionadas con (1) su mirada sincrónica de los asentamientos que analiza, su aplicación bibliográfica y planimétrica “... a vuelo de pájaro”, como con (2) la percepción a-histórica de los procesos mediante los cuales el dominio Inca pareciera establecerse “de golpe” sobre sociedades que no pueden sino pasivamente recibir la invasión y la instalación colonial (Inca). El discurso del autor, en tanto historia política, simplifica las situaciones regionales a las que alude y tiende a subestimar las formas de organización social no cusqueñas y los resultados o hibridaciones de estilos o materialidades luego de la invasión Inca (p.e. arquitectura o alfarería “Inca Local” [*sensu* Uribe 2004]). En una escala micro, la historia ocupacional de los asentamientos tratados es obviada, puesto que el análisis evalúa únicamente la planta arquitectónica final, a pesar que ella es resultado de espacios edificados y modificados, en casos más de una vez, a lo largo de siglos.

La arqueología de los entornos construidos y de los paisajes imperiales ha sido tratada explícitamente por otros autores en los Andes (Malpass 1993), América (Earle 1991) y otros continentes (Snead *et al.* 2009). El autor, cuyos estudios sobre la temática se sitúan en una relevante área cultural del noroeste de Argentina y los Andes Centro Sur, exhibe un despliegue conceptual tan amplio, en un modo que podríamos denominar *fashionista* (ávido seguidor de vanguardias o modas emergentes) –vinculado a la historia y antropología

del cuerpo, los análisis de percepción o accesibilidad en arquitectura, como acerca de la economía política Inca—, que es difícil seguir la genealogía de términos o perspectivas utilizadas a lo largo del artículo.

A pesar de lo anterior insistimos, en el actual escenario, una arqueología fenomenológica, de la experiencia o de la percepción se estima una ventana abierta que permite la entrada de oxígeno a los estudios sobre arquitectura y planificación Inca.

REPLY / RÉPLICA

When the editors of *Revista Chilena de Antropología* told me that my article would be part of this dynamic of comments and reply, and when I finally saw who the people who made comments to my paper were, I was quite shocked. Not only there are in this group two persons (Ian Farrington and Martti Pärssinen) whose works have been a source of knowledge and inspiration for me and who I consider *maestros* in the study of Tawantinsuyu, but also other prestigious scholars have made commentaries on my paper, some of whom are leading today the studies about the Inka Empire. I am flattered by their good comments and I have learnt from their keen observations and critiques, which I have found very useful for my current and future work.

This group of commentators has raised important issues and has brought new and solid knowledge to the discussion we attempt to develop in these pages. Gabriel Cantarutti suggests that, in order to study how Tawantinsuyu dealt with local social contexts, we should pay attention to Inka settlements' variability and not only to their formal similarities. By looking at early Colonial Quechua, Covey discusses the nature of Inka colonial encounters and the relationships they established with indigenous societies. The concept of *tinku* is certainly something to take into consideration if we want to understand these interactions. Ian Farrington has contributed to this paper with new information about Cuzco's *ushnus* and with his keen understanding of Inka colonization, both at the center of the Empire as well as in distant areas. As he claims, to obtain a complete picture of Inka centers we need to look at the toponyms and the smaller sites and facilities found in the surroundings of these places since both were integral parts of the sense of place and the experience people acquired in these localities. Through his comments, Martti Pärssinen shares his sophisticated knowledge about Cuzco landscape and about early historical sources and chroniclers. Paying attention to the historicity of Inka colonization and the transformations that Inka settlements suffered over time, as Simón Urbina Araya claims, will

inform us about changing strategies of domination. Finally, Sonia Alconini points to the fact that Inka centers not only favored the indoctrination and subordination of colonial subjects, but they also constituted social and material environments that favored the political and social integration and cultural Inkaization of the colonized, especially of those who helped with and participated in Tawantinsuyu's governance and administration. I recognize that the central points these scholars have made here are of key importance to better understand colonial encounters in the Andes during Inka times. I have addressed some of these points in other publications and I will use the rest to improve and inform my future studies and interpretations.

One major issue raised by practically all the commentators is that the Inkas designed their strategies of power under the influence of local traditions. Overall, they claim that, during colonial encounters, communities and people do not submissively accept and comply with colonizers' rule, but rather they play an active role in shaping colonial relationships.

I agree with them that in every process of cultural contact and colonization there are at least two parts (and probably more as Alconini states) and a mutual influence between them. I do not think that local societies and persons are just passive receivers, enactors, and performers of the dominant culture and ideology. The colonized had the agency to adapt but also to modify, resist, and re-signify Tawantinsuyu's influences. There are a number of papers that have developed a very interesting bottom-up perspective on Inka domination by exploring local responses to Inka presence (Alconini 2010; Jennings 2003; Leibowicz 2007; Mackey 2003; Troncoso 2004; Villacorta 2003, to name just a few examples). I myself have discussed somewhere else how the Calchaquíes faced and engaged with Inka rule, arguing that whereas some native people took advantage of the new context of domination, transforming their material practices, expanding their agency, and improving their status; some others stuck to their own cultural ways (Acuto 2010).

But colonial dynamics are not just about colonizers trying to impose their rule and the colonized responding to it. I think that the Inkas created themselves through this process of colonization. Tawantinsuyu is, therefore, a product of those whom the Inkas ruled. Paraphrasing Hall (2000:13), one might say that the Inkas made history and made themselves through becoming colonizers.

Inka policies of conquest and domination were certainly influenced by the cultural and social organization of indigenous societies, as well as by the way these societies reacted to Inka presence. The variability seen in

Inka strategies of colonization, including the variability observed in Inka sites and material culture throughout Tawantinsuyu, is the product of this influence. In a few words, we could argue that the Inkas not only adapted to local circumstances but also absorbed indigenous influences, reshaping their strategies of domination according to them. As Covey explains, the tinku, or the encounter of antagonistic complementarity, produced the transformation of all the parts that participated in this encounter. The inclusion of native symbols on Inka ceramic vessels and the presence of buildings that mingle Inka and native architectural techniques and forms within Inka sites express some sort of negotiation and show that, under the impact of subordinate societies, Inka material culture went through a process of hybridization. Colonial contexts give usually birth to new cultural products, or what has been called a culture of empire (see for example Dirks 1992, Hall 2000, Said 1993, Thomas 1994). Cultures of empire are not the addition of colonizers plus colonized cultures but a new reality that colonial encounters produce.

Even though I do acknowledge the impact that indigenous societies and the process of expansion and colonization itself had on Inka culture, and even though I recognize an important degree of variability and adaptability in Inka strategies of domination, I still claim that there was a general plan of conquest and colonization. The existence of this plan is the reason why we are able to identify clear patterns in the way Tawantinsuyu dealt with indigenous societies and built their landscapes of domination. For years scholars have recognized some of these patterns, such as the use of corvée labor, attached craft specialists, state farms, and storage facilities to finance the State, the forced relocation of ethnic communities as *mitmaqkuna*, the systematic appropriation of native shrines, among some others. In this paper, I have explored the spatial and material patterns seen in Inka places and, in connection with these patterns, the social relations, experiences, and meanings that the Inkas intended to impose, either in the center of Tawantinsuyu or in its periphery. Gabriel Cantarutti has been more eloquent than me in this regard when explaining that my paper shows that despite the variability we see in the spatial design and architectural forms of Inka sites throughout the Andes, there were regularities among Inka places. These regularities show that the Inkas had a prearranged plan oriented to create and to establish certain representations and narratives, specific interactions between rulers and ruled, and particular experiences. On the one hand, indigenous people who visited or resided in Inka places confronted here a built environment that put them in a subordinate position and that coercively guided their movements and sights (nonetheless, I agree with Covey and Alconini when they explain that in these places, and when

participating in Inka activities, the colonized lived this tension of being subordinate but at the same time being part of Tawantinsuyu). On the other hand, those who acted as Inka representatives found within these localities a material and social environment that enhanced their status and power and benefited their social reproduction.

I would like to make here two brief remarks. First, I consider that these three overlapping landscapes were not only present in provincial capitals and main administrative centers, but also in other types of Inka sites, such as royal estates, religious and pilgrimage centers, and even in *tampus*. The strategic manipulation of space, architecture, and material culture to create social inequalities and the clear-cut demarcation between Inkas and local subordinates, to put ritual and spectacle center stage, to construct narratives that supported and sought to justify Inka colonization, and to control people's experiences and senses, took place, with different degrees, in every Inka settlement. I have presented in this paper a number of examples, but there are many others that support these claims. Second, although spatiality and the body have been involved in strategies of power in modernity, Inka control over these two realms did not encompass the rational organization of space to improve labor efficiency or to facilitate bureaucratic administration, or implied surveillance and the disciplining of the body backed up by scientific discourses, as is the case in modernity (i.e. Foucault 1976, Ewen 1991, Markus 1993). In other words, we cannot really match Inka colonial policies over the body and the senses with those that have taken place in Western modernity. This, at least, was not my intention in this paper.

This article focuses on one side of the picture and examines how the Inkas objectified their domination by tactically employing spatial forms (landscape, place, and architecture) and material culture to create a new social order throughout the Andes. I have not analyzed here whether or not the Inkas actually achieved their goals (I believe that they were successful in some case, less effective in others, and failed in some other contexts); I have rather been concerned with exploring the empire they attempted to create.

Overall, and in tune with Farrington's comments, I think that the Inkas had a substantial social, cultural, and ideological influence on the colonized, even in areas where Inka occupation was quite short. The persistence of Inka toponyms in indigenous landscapes and the use of Inka identity and history as utopia to resist Spanish domination in many areas of the Andes demonstrate that Inka colonization did not go unnoticed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuto, F.A.** 2010. "Living Under the Imperial Thumb in the Northern Calchaquí Valley (Argentina)". In *Distant Provinces in the Inka Empire: Toward a Deeper Understanding of Inka Imperialism*, edited by M. Malpass and S. Alconini, pp: 108-150. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City.
- Acuto, F.A. and C. Gifford.** 2007. "Lugar, arquitectura y narrativas de poder: Experiencia y percepción en los centros Inkas de los Andes del Sur". *Arqueología Suramericana* 3(2): 135-161
- Acuto, F.A., C. Amuedo, M. Kergaravat, A. Ferrari, L. Gamarra and A.L. Goldín.** 2008. "Experiencias subjetivas en las aldeas prehispánicas del valle Calchaquí Norte: arqueología de la vida cotidiana, prácticas y relaciones sociales durante el Período Prehispánico Tardío". In *Arqueología del extremo sur del continente americano. Resultados de nuevos proyectos*, edited by L.A. Borrero and N.V. Franco, pp: 11-54. CONICET-IMHICIHU, Buenos Aires.
- Acuto, F.A., C. Aranda, C. Jacob, L. Luna and M. Sprovieri.** 2004. "El impacto de la colonización Inka en la vida social de las comunidades del Valle Calchaquí Norte". *Revista Andina* 39: 179-201.
- Acuto, F.A., A. Troncoso, A. Ferrari, D. Pavlovic, C. Jacob, E. Gilardenghi, R. Sánchez, C. Amuedo and M. Smith.** 2010. "Espacialidad incaica en los Andes del Sur: La colonización simbólica del paisaje y la ritualidad Inca en Chile Central y el valle Calchaquí Norte". *Actas del XVII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Argentina*, Tomo III: 1297-1302. Mendoza, Argentina.
- Alconini, S.** 2010. "Yampara Households and Communal Evolution in the Southeastern Inka Peripheries". In *Distant Provinces in The Inka Empire: Toward a Deeper Understanding of Inka Imperialism*, edited by M. Malpass and S. Alconini, pp: 75-107. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City.
- Aldunate, C., V. Castro and V. Varela.** 2003. "Antes del Inka y después del Inka: paisajes culturales y sacralidad en la puna de Atacama, Chile". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 9-26.
- Arellano, C. and R. Matos.** 2007. "Variations between Inka installations in the Puna of Chinchayqocha and the drainage of Tarma". In *Variations in the Expression of Inka Power*, edited by R.L. Burger, C. Morris and R. Matos, pp: 11-41. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington D.C.
- Bauer, B.** 1992. *The Development of the Inca State*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

- 1999. *The Sacred Landscape of the Inca*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Bauer, B. and C. Stanish.** 2001. *Ritual and Pilgrimage in the Ancient Andes. The Islands of the Sun and the Moon*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Braudel, F.** 1980. *On History*. Translated by Sarah Matthews. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London. [MP]
- Bray, T.** 2003. "Inka pottery as culinary equipment: Food, feasting, and gender in imperial state design". *Latin American Antiquity* 14 (1): 3-28.
- Cieza de León, P.** 1984 [1551]. *La Crónica del Perú. Primera parte*. Fondo Editorial, Pontificia Universidad del Perú. Lima. [IF]
- 1985 [1553]. *El Señorío de los Incas (Segunda Parte de la Crónica del Perú)*. Edición de Manuel Ballesteros, Madrid.
- Coben, L.** 2006. "Other Cuzcos: Replicated theaters of Inka power". In *Archaeology of Performance. Theaters of Power, Community, and Politics*, edited by T. Inomata and L.S. Coben, pp: 223-259. AltaMira, Lanham, MD.
- Cobo, B.** 1956 [1653]. *Historia del Nuevo Mundo*. In *Obras del P. Bernabé Cobo de la Compañía de Jesús*. Estudio preliminar de P.F. Mateos, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, tomos 91 y 92. Edición Atlas. Madrid. [IF]
- 1988 [1553]. *History of the Inca Empire: An Account of the Indians' Customs and their Origins Together with a Treatise on Inca Legends, History and Social Institutions*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Coello, A.** 1998. "La ocupación Inca en el valle de Asia, Perú". *Tawantinsuyu: An International Journal of Inka Studies* 5: 44-52.
- Covey, R.A.** 2000. "Inka Administration of the Far South Coast of Peru". *Latin American Antiquity* 11 (2): 119-138.
- Cornejo, L.** 1999. "Los incas y la construcción del espacio en Turi". *Estudios Atacameños* 18: 165-176.
- Dillehay, T.** 2003. "El colonialismo Inka, el consumo de chicha y los festines desde una perspectiva de banquetes políticos". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 355-363.
- Dirks, N.** (Ed). 1992. *Colonialism and culture*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Earle, T.** 1991 "Paths and roads in evolutionary perspective". In *Ancient Road Networks and Settlement Hierarchies in the New World*, edited by C.D. Trombold, pp. 10-16. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [SU].

- Ewen, S.** 1991. *Todas las Imágenes del Consumismo*. Editorial Grijalbo, México.
- Farrington, I.** 1998. "The concept of Cusco". *Tawantinsuyu: An International Journal of Inka Studies* 5: 53-59.
- 1995. "The mummy, estate and palace of Inka Huayna Capac at Quispeguanca". *Tawantinsuyu* 1: 55-65. [IF]
- 1999. "El Shincal: Un Cusco del Kollasuyu". *Actas del XII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología Argentina*, tomo I: 53-62. La Plata, Argentina.
- In press. *Cusco. Urbanism and archaeology at the navel of the inka world*. University Press of Florida. Gainesville. [IF].
- Foucault, M.** 1976. *Vigilar y Castigar*. Siglo Veintiuno Editores, Buenos Aires.
- Franco, R.** 1996. *El Templo del Sol de Pachacamac*. DPI, Lima.
- Gasparini, G. and L. Margolies.** 1980. *Inca Architecture*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Gifford, C.** 2003. *Local Matters: Encountering the Imperial Inkas in the South Andes* Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- González Carré, E., J. Cosmópolis and J. Lévano.** 1996. *La Ciudad Inca de Vilcashuamán*. Universidad Nacional de San Cristobal de Huamán, Peru.
- González Carré, E. and D. Pozzi-Escot.** 2002. "Arqueología y etnohistoria en Vilcashuamán". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 6: 79-106.
- Hall, C.** 2000. "Introduction: Thinking the Postcolonial, Thinking the Empire". In *Cultures of Empire: A Reader*, edited by C. Hall, pp: 1-33. Routledge, Nueva York.
- Hayashida, F.** 2003. "Leyendo el registro arqueológico del domino inka: reflexiones desde la costa norte del Perú". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 305-319.
- Hyslop, J.** 1976. *An Archaeological Investigation of the Lupaca Kingdom and Its Origins*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- 1985. *Inkawasi, the New Cuzco: Cañete, Lunahuana, Peru*. BAR, Oxford.
- 1990. *Inka Settlement Planning*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- 1993. "Factors influencing the transmission and distribution of Inka cultural materials throughout Tawantinsuyo". In *Latin Americans Horizons: a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks*, edited by D. Rice, pp. 337-356. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. [SU]

- Hyslop, J. and J. Schobinger.** 1991. "Las ruinas incaicas de los Nevados del Aconquija (prov. de Tucumán, Argentina)". *Comechingonia* 9: 15-30.
- Idrovo, J.** 2000. *Tomebamba. Arqueología e Historia de una Ciudad Imperial*. Ediciones del Banco Central del Ecuador, Cuenca.
- Jennings, J.** 2003. "Inca Imperialism, Ritual Change, and Cosmological Continuity in the Cotahuasi Valley of Peru". *Journal of Anthropological Research* 59(4): 433-462.
- Julien, C.** 1983. *Hatunqolla: A View of Inca Rule from the Lake Titicaca Region*. University of California Publications, California.
- Kaulicke, P., R. Kondo, T. Kusuda and J. Zapata.** 2003. "Agua, ancestros y arqueología del paisaje". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 27-56.
- King, A.** 1997. "The politics of vision". In *Understanding Ordinary Landscapes*, edited by P. Groth and T. Bressi, pp: 134-144. Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
- Lee, V.** 1997. "Design by numbers: Architectural order among the Incas". *Tawantinsuyu: An International Journal of Inka Studies* 3: 103-118.
- Leibowicz, I.** 2007. "Espacios de poder en La Huerta, quebrada de Humahuaca". *Estudios Atacameños. Arqueología y Antropología Surandinas* 34: 51-69.
- Lorandi, A.M. and R. Boixadós.** 1987-88. "Etnohistoria de los Valles Calchaquíes en los siglos XVI y XVII". *Runa* 17-18: 263-419.
- Mackey, C.** 2003. "La transformación socioeconómica de Farfán bajo el gobierno Inka". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 321-353.
- Malpass, M.** (Ed). 1993. *Provincial Inca: Archaeological and ethnohistorical assessment of the impact of the Inca State*. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City [SU]
- Marcus, J.** 1987. *Late Intermediate Occupation at Cerro Azul, Peru: A Preliminary Report*. University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology Technical Report 20, Ann Arbor.
- Markus, T.** 1993. *Buildings and Power: Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*. Routledge, New York & London.
- Matos, R.** 1994. *Pumpu: Centro Administrativo Inka de la Puna de Junín*. Editorial Horizonte, Lima.
- 1997. "Incas y etnías regionales en Junín. Una visión arqueológica". In *Arqueología, antropología e historia en los Andes. Homenaje a María*

- Rostoworowski*, edited by R. Gabai and J. Flores Espinoza, pp: 397-413. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima.
- Meddens, F.** 1994. "Mountains, miniatures, ancestors, and fertility. The meaning of Late Horizon offerings in a Middle Horizon structure in Peru". *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 31: 127-150.
- 1997. "Function and meaning of the usnu in Late Horizon Peru". *Tawantinsuyu: An International Journal of Inka Studies* 3: 5-14.
- Menzel, D.** 1959. "The Inca occupation of the South Coast of Peru". *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 15 (2): 125-142.
- Meyers, A.** 2007. "Toward a reconceptualization of the Late Horizon and the Inka Period: Perspectives from Cochasquí, Ecuador, and Samaipata, Bolivia". In *Variations in the Expression of Inka Power*, edited by R.L. Burger, C. Morris and R. Matos, pp: 223-254. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington D.C.
- Moore, J.** 1996. "The archaeology of plazas and the proxemics of ritual: Three Andean traditions". *American Anthropologist* 98 (4): 789-802.
- Morris, C.** 1982. "The infraestructure of Inka control in the Central Highlands". In *The Inca and Aztec States, 1400-1800*, edited by G. Collier, R. Rosaldo and J. Wirth, pp: 153-70. Academic Press, New York.
- 1987. "Arquitectura y estructura del espacio en Huánuco Pampa". *Cuadernos Instituto Nacional de Antropología* 12: 27-45.
- 1998. "Inca strategies of incorporation and governance". In *Archaic States*, edited by G.M. Feinman and J. Marcus, pp: 293-309. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Morris, C. y R.A. Covey.** 2003. "La plaza central de Huánuco Pampa: Espacio y transformación". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 133-149.
- Morris, C. y J.I. Santillán.** 2007. "The Inka transformation of the Chíncha capital". In *Variations in the Expression of Inka Power*, edited by R.L. Burger, C. Morris and R. Matos, pp: 135-163. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington D.C.
- Morris, C. y D. Thompson.** 1985. *Huánuco Pampa: An Inca City and its Hinterland*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- Murra, J.** 2002 *El mundo andino: Población, medio ambiente y economía*. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú and Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima. [MP].

- Niemeyer, H.** 1986. "La ocupación inkaica de la cuenca alta del Río Copiapó". *Comechingonia* 4: 165-294.
- Nielsen, A.** 1995. "Architectural performance and the reproduction of social power". In *Expanding Archaeology*, edited by J. Skibo, W. Walker and A. Nielsen, pp. 47-66. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City [SU].
- Niles, S.** 1992. "Inca architecture and sacred landscape". In *The Ancient Americas: Art from Sacred Landscapes*, edited by R. Townsend, pp: 346-57. The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.
- 1993. "The Provinces in the Heartland: Stylistic variation and architectural innovation near Inca Cuzco". In *Provincial Inca: Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Assessment of the Impact of the Inca State*, edited by M. Malpass, pp: 145-176. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City.
- 1999. *The Shape of Inca History. Narrative and Architecture in an Andean Empire*. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City.
- Niles, S. and R. Batson.** 2007. "Sculpting the Yucaj Valley: Power and Style in Late Inka Architecture". In *Variations in the Expression of Inka Power*, edited by R.L. Burger, C. Morris and R. Matos, pp: 185-221. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington D.C.
- Palma, J.R.** 1998. *Curacas y Señores: Una visión de la Sociedad Política Prehispánica en la Quebrada de Humahuaca*. Instituto Interdisciplinario Tilcara, Tilcara.
- Pärssinen, M.** 1992. *Tawantinsuyu. The Inca State and its Political Organization*. Studia Historica 43. Societas Historica Finlandiae, Helsinki.
- 2005. *Caquiaviri y la provincia Pacasa: Desde el Alto-Formativo hasta la Conquista Española (1-1533)*. Maestría en Historias Andinas y Amazónicas, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, Colegio Nacional de Historiadores de Bolivia, and CIMA, La Paz. [MP]
- Pärssinen, M. and A. Siiriäinen** 2003. *Andes Orientales y Amazonía Occidental: Ensayos entre la historia y la arqueología de Bolivia, Brasil y Perú*. Maestría en Historias Andinas y Amazónicas, Colegio Nacional de Historiadores de Bolivia, and CIMA, La Paz. [MP]
- Pärssinen, M., R. Kesseli, and J. Faldín.** 2010. "Paria, the Southern Inka Capital Rediscovered". *Chungara, Revista de Antropología Chilena* 42(1):235-246. [MP]
- Pino Matos, J.** 2004. "El *ushnu* Inka y la organización del espacio en los principales *tampus* de los *wamani* de la sierra central del Chinchaysuyu". *Chugara* 36 (2): 303-311.

- Protzen, J.** 1993. *Inca Architecture and Construction at Ollantaytambo*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Raffino, R.** 1981. *Los Inkas del Kollasuyu*. Ramos Americana Editora, La Plata [SU].
- 1993. "El dominio Inka en el Altiplano de Bolivia". In *Inka: Arqueología, historia y urbanismo del Altiplano Andino*, edited by R. Raffino, pp: 169-212. Corregidor, Buenos Aires.
- 1996. "La integración surandina en tiempos del Tawantinsuyu". In *La integración surandina cinco siglos después*, edited by X. Albó, M. I. Arratia, J. Hidalgo, L. Núñez, A. Llagostera, M. I. Remy and B. Revesz, pp: 63-80. Estudios y Debates Regionales Andinos 91, Cusco [SU].
- 2004. *El Shincal de Quimivil*. Editorial Sarquís, Catamarca.
- Rowe, J.** 1967. "What kind of settlement was Inca Cuzco?" *Ñawpa Pacha* 5: 59-75.
- Said, E.** 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. Knopf, Nueva York.
- Salomon, F.** 1986. *Native Lords of Quito in the Age of the Incas*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1988. "Frontera aborígen y dualismo Inca en el Ecuador Prehispánico: Pistas Onomásticas". In *La frontera del Estado Inca*, edited by T. Dillehay and P. Netherly, pp: 59-86. BAR, Oxford.
- Sillar, B. and E. Dean.** 2002. "Identidad étnica bajo el domino inca: Una evaluación arqueológica y etnohistórica de las repercusiones del Estado Inca en el grupo étnico Canas". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 6: 205-264.
- Snead, J., C. Erickson and A. Darling** (Eds). 2009. *Landscapes of Movement Trails, Paths, and Roads in Anthropological Perspective*. University of Pennsylvania Museum [SU].
- Stanish, Ch.** 2001. "Regional research on the Inca". *Journal of Archaeological Research* 9: 213-241 [SU].
- Stanish, Ch., E. Vega, L. Steadman, J. Chávez, K. Frye, L. Onofre, M. Seddon and P. Chuquimia.** 1997. *Archaeological Survey in the Juli-Pomata Area, Lake Titicaca Basin, Peru*. Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
- Thomas, N.** 1994. *Colonialism's Culture. Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

- Troncoso, A.** 2004. "El arte de la dominación: Arte rupestre y paisaje durante el período incaico en la cuenca superior del río Aconcagua". *Chungará, Revista de Antropología Chilena* 36(2): 553-561.
- Uribe, M.** 2004. "El Inka y el poder como problemas de la arqueología del Norte Grande de Chile". *Chungara*, 36(2): 313-324 [SU].
- Valdez, L.** 1996. "Los depósitos Inka de Tambo Viejo, Acari". *Tawantinsuyu: An International Journal of Inka Studies* 2: 37-42.
- Villacorta, L.F.** 2003. "Palacios y ushnus: Curacas del Rimac y gobierno inca en la costa central". *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 7: 151-187.
- Von Hagen, A. and C. Morris.** 1998. *The Cities of the Ancient Andes*. Thames & Hudson, London.
- Wachtel, N.** 2001. *El Regreso de los Antepasados. Los Indios Urus de Bolivia, del Siglo XX al XVI*. Fondo de Cultura Económica, México D.F.
- Wallace, D.** 1998. "The Inca compound at La Centinela, Chinchá". *Andean Past* 5: 9-33.
- Zuidema, R.T.** 1964. *The Ceque System of Cuzco: The Social Organization of the Capital of the Inca*. International Archives of Ethnography, E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- 1983. "Hierarchy and space in Incaic social organization". *Ethnohistory* 30 (2): 49-75.
- 1989. "El ushnu". In *Reyes y Guerreros*, edited by M. Burga, pp: 402-454. Fomciencias, Lima.
- 1990. *Inca Civilization in Cuzco*. The University of Texas Press, Austin.