Empire and Domestic Economy

INTERDISCIPLINARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO ARCHAEOLOGY

Series Editor: Michael A. Jochim, *University of California at Santa Barbara*
Founding Editor: Roy S. Dickens, Jr., *Late of University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

Current Volumes in This Series:

THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS LABORATORY
The Analysis of Archaeological Data
E. B. Banning

AURIGNACIAN LITHIC ECONOMY
Ecological Perspectives from southwestern France
Brooke S. Blades

DARWINIAN ARCHAEOLOGIES
Edited by Herbert Donald Graham Maschner

EARLIEST ITALY
An Overview of the Italian Paleolithic and Mesolithic
Margherita Mussi

EMPIRE AND DOMESTIC ECONOMY
Terence N. D'Altroy and Christine A. Hastorf

FAUNAL EXTINCTION IN AN ISLAND SOCIETY
Pygmy Hippopotamus Hunters of Cyprus
Alan H. Simmons and Associates

A HUNTER–GATHERER LANDSCAPE
Southwest Germany in the Late Paleolithic and Mesolithic
Michael A. Jochim

HUNTERS BETWEEN EAST AND WEST
The Paleolithic of Moravia
Jiri Svoboda, Vojen Ložek, and Emanuel Vlcek

MISSISSIPPIAN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
The Powers Phase in Southeastern Missouri
Michael J. O'Brien

MISSISSIPPIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY
Jon Muller

VILLAGERS OF THE MAROS
A Portrait of an Early Bronze Age Society
John M. O'Shea

A Chronological Listing of Volumes in this series appears at the back of this volume.

A Continuation Order Plan is available for this series. A continuation order will bring delivery of each new volume immediately upon publication. Volumes are billed only upon actual shipment. For further information please contact the publisher.

Empire and Domestic Economy

Terence N. D'Altroy

Columbia University
New York, New York

Christine A. Hastorf

University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

and Associates

KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS
New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow

eBook ISBN: 0-306-47192-2
Print ISBN: 0-306-46408-X

©2002 Kluwer Academic Publishers
New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow

All rights reserved

No part of this eBook may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording, or otherwise, without written consent from the Publisher

Created in the United States of America

Visit Kluwer Online at: http://www.kluweronline.com
and Kluwer's eBookstore at: http://www.ebooks.kluweronline.com

Authors

Cathy Lynne Costin • Department of Anthropology, California State University at Northridge, Northridge, California, 91330-8244.

Terence N. D'Altroy • Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, New York, New York, 10027.

Elizabeth DeMurrais • Department of Archaeology, Cambridge University, Cambridge, CB2 3DZ England.

Timothy K. Earle • Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 60208-1310.

Christine A. Hustorf • Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, California, 94720-3710.

Ramiro Matos Mendieta • Department of Anthropology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., 20560.

Bruce Owen • Department of Anthropology, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California, 94928.

Jeffrey R. Parsons • Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48109.

Elsie C. Sandefur • Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

Lynn Sikkink • Department of Anthropology, San Jose State University, San Jose, California, 95192-0113.

Foreword

We are both immensely pleased to have played supporting roles in the archaeological research that led to this volume. As a faculty member at the Universidad del Centro (Huancayo) in the 1960s and later at the Universidad Nacional de San Marcos (Lima), Matos Mendieta developed a special interest in the Upper Mantaro and adjacent Tarma drainages, and during the 1960s and 1970s, he carried out general reconnaissance and several excavations in the area between Lake Junín and Huancayo. Matos Mendieta began his field research in the *Sierra Central* as part of the "Proyecto Andino de Estudios Arqueológicos" sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution. As a fellow at the Smithsonian Institution in the mid-1960s, Matos Mendieta began to interact more closely with North American scholars; during this period, he began to encourage and facilitate the interests of several US.-based archaeologists in the Peruvian *Sierra Central,* including Craig Morris, John Murra, and Donald Thompson, who were beginning fieldwork at and around the Inka provincial center of Huanuco Pampa north of Lake Junín, and David Browman, who in 1969 carried out one of the very first systematic archaeological surveys in highland Peru over parts of the main Mantaro Valley between Huancayo and Jauja.

In 1968 Matos Mendieta invited Kent Flannery to visit the known preceramic sites in the Mantaro Valley and the Junín *puna;* this led directly to their collaboration in the analysis of faunal remains from preceramic cave sites in the Junín *puna* (Flannery, 1975) and to Flannery's subsequent study of modern camelid pastoralists in the Ayacucho puna farther south (Flannery, Marcus, and Reynolds, 1989). This association between Matos Mendieta and Flannery produced a round of new investigations of Archaic rockshelter sites in the Junín *puna* during the 1970s and a series of articles, theses, and dissertations appeared over the next few years (e.g., Hurtado de Mendoza, 1971; Kaulicke, 1981; Lavallée and Julien, 1975; Morales, 1977; Rick, 1980; Wheeler, 1975; Pires-Ferreira, J., Pires-Ferreira, E., and Kaulicke, 1976). That same period in the Junín *puna* witnessed the beginning of paleoclimatic and geomorphological studies by Herbert Wright and John Bradbury (Wright and Bradbury, 1975) as well as studies of human biological adaptation to high altitude by Roberto Frisancho and his students (Frisancho, Borkan, and Klayman, 1975).

Beginning in the early 1960s, Parsons's interests focused on settlement pattern studies in the Valley of Mexico, where he was influenced by the regional and ecological orientation of William Sanders, a former student of Gordon Willey. Sanders and Parsons collaborated in settlement pattern surveys in Mexico throughout the 1960s and early 1970s. Terence D'Altroy participated in two of these field seasons, in 1972 and 1973, as an undergraduate student at the University of Michigan. Matos Mendieta and Parsons first met in 1967 during Matos Mendieta's visit to Mexico. At that time, Parsons was conducting surveys a few dozen kilometers east of Mexico City and Matos Mendieta was able to take part in that fieldwork. Here Matos Mendieta acquired a serious interest in systematic regional survey and Parsons became more fully aware of the possibilities of Andean field research.

In 1974 Matos Mendieta and Parsons together visited the area between Cerro de Pasco, Tarma, and Huancayo, examining many of the archaeological sites that Matos Mendieta had

previously located and studied. It was during this tour that a general plan was formulated for a systematic regional survey in Junín: Matos Mendieta felt that such a project was an essential component of long-term research in the Peruvian *Sierra Central,* and Parsons was eager to begin developing a regional Andean data set that could serve as a basis for making general comparisons between pre-Hispanic cultural development in Mesoamerica and the Central Andes. This survey project was carried out over an eleven-month period in two field seasons during 1975 and 1976.

Timothy Earle was a graduate student at the University of Michigan in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As an undergraduate student at Harvard in the mid-1960s, Earle had worked in the Lurin Valley on the Peruvian central Coast in a survey project directed by Thomas Patterson. Following his dissertation research in Hawaii, Earle's interests gravitated back to the Andes after the mid-1970s. Early in 1977, Earle and Parsons spent several days in Ann Arbor going over the field notes from Parsons's recently completed Junín survey. They agreed that a logical next research effort would be for Earle to build on the established regional foundation in part of the survey area and move forward from there to undertake more intensive investigations that would seriously address important questions about long-term cultural change in the region. Earle's project (Upper Mantaro Archaeological Research Project) got underway the following year and continued, with varied assistance and encouragement from Matos Mendieta, for several highly productive field seasons through 1986, when the study area became too insecure for further fieldwork.

More than a quarter century has now passed since Matos Mendieta and Parsons first talked about the possibility of their research collaboration in Junín and since Browman first demonstrated that systematic regional survey was feasible and productive in the main Mantaro Valley. UMARP's efforts in the intervening years have produced some ofthe most important new data and interpretations in contemporary Andean archaeology; clearly, more is still to come. The articles in this volume and in numerous other UMARP project reports have helped develop innovative approaches and set new standards in Andean archaeology in terms of research design, sampling strategy, data recovery, faunal and floral analyses, ethnoarchaeological study, ecological perspectives, materials analysis, and ethnohistoric–archaeological interfacing. Their contributions to the understanding of prehistoric Andean economy and polity are truly outstanding.

Perhaps the project's paramount achievement has been twofold: (1) the development of a multistage research design that produced a varied database adequate to address multifaceted and complex problems at the household, settlement, community, regional, and interregional levels of analysis; and (2) the effective operationalization of anthropological theory in an archaeological context and the clear demonstration of the importance in archaeological research of the creative interplay between theory and substance. Their achievement is such that their work must be taken seriously even by those who may disagree with its orientation, focus, or interpretations; that its substance will endure and can serve as a testing ground for new and different ideas well into the future; that it serves as a model for future work in other areas and as a foundation for new work in the Upper Mantaro itself; and finally, that it appeals so strongly not only to Andeanists but also to scholars interested in the dynamics of prehistoric change all over the world. Our own claim to a small share of this achievement would be to emphasize that it was necessary for Earle and his collaborators to have a systematically defined regional context *at the outset* oftheir investigations; without

that, they simply could not have proceeded with anything approaching the success, productivity, and credibility that has characterized their work.

We might cite two specific UMARP contributions, as examples of many others, that have underwritten significant advances in archaeological interpretation. First is the refinement of the local Late Intermediate Period and Late Horizon ceramic sequence into three well-defined phases—Wanka I, II, and III. This has made it possible to disentangle reliably and consistently three very distinct developmental eras and to comprehend, at least in general outline, the complex processes that transformed smaller polities into larger ones. Second is their control of the spatial and temporal variability in architectural and architectonic detail such that good inferences can be made about the social status and activities of the people who occupied different structures in different times and different places. This accomplishment depends greatly, of course, on the remarkable superficial preservation of late prehistoric stone architecture. Nevertheless, it was only through careful selection of site areas for testing and detailed mapping that it was possible to work out the full range of architectonic variation and to relate this to other categories of archaeological variability.

One important function of a work such as this is to suggest the most promising directions for future investigation by calling attention to incomplete knowledge. One example would be the still relatively limited information about the pastoral component of the Mantaro economy, both past and present. Our own 1975–1976 survey in the main Mantaro Valley penetrated only into the edges of the high *puna* grasslands bordering the valley to the north and south. The UMARP investigations subsequently focused almost exclusively on the north side of the main valley floor and its immediate borders—areas of very predominantly agricultural economy. Our archaeological survey in the adjacent Tarama–Chinchaycocha region a few dozen kilometers to the northwest (Parsons, Hasting, and Matos Mendieta, 1997, 2000) suggests, as do many ethnohistoric and ethnographic studies, that changing relationships between *puna* herders and *kichwa* (valley) agriculturalists may have played key roles in long-term organizational change in highland Peru. Expanded surveys into the domain of ancient and modern herders in higher ground bordering the main Mantaro Valley should be equally productive of new insights into the nature of Wanka I, II, and III polity and economy.

It is also important to emphasize the rich and still largely untapped ethnographic resources of the Mantaro Valley that offer great potential for archaeological interpretation. UMARP investigators have made important contributions to the ethnoarchaeological study of modern pottery production, but many other contemporary cultural patterns with strong pre-Hispanic links persist in the region: for example, premonetary exchange systems, including networks of tambos that facilitate the movement of people who transport and redistribute goods and services between communities; agricultural terraces that maintain high productivity without the use of chemical fertilizers; the daily use of the traditional implements such as the *chaki-tajlla* (foot plow) and the backstrap loom; and premodern household cooking and fuel management systems.

Wanka I—and even Wanka II—polities will remain inadequately comprehended until more is understood about the nature of the antecedent Middle Horizon in the main Mantaro Valley. This was precisely what UMARP was beginning to turn to at the point, in 1986, when it became too dangerous to continue fieldwork. Are Wanka I and Wanka II polities

best understood, as has been suggested or implied by most UMARP investigators, as corresponding to something like relatively simple (Wanka I) and relatively complex (Wanka 11) chiefdoms? Or will it be necessary to consider more fully how the inhabitants of the main Mantaro Valley may have been directly, or indirectly, linked to the Wari state, whose capital was only about 150 kilometers distant? A possible scenario might be that Wanka I represents the disarticulated remnants of a collapsed state organization—a situation for which a chiefdom model may not be closely applicable. There are certainly no obvious archaeological signs that the UMARP study area was a Wari administrative province during the Middle Horizon. Nevertheless, there is a major Wari-related site (Wari-Willka, an installation of still uncertain function, although it is usually considered a "temple" or "shrine") only a few dozen kilometers to the southeast near the modern town of Huancayo (Matos Mendieta, 1968; Shea, 1969). Like the Inka in many parts of their empire, Wari influence may have been subtly enough manifested in material terms such that it will require intensive and persistent archaeological investigation to detect and define it adequately.

In a different vein, other investigators working in the Mantaro Valley might one day want to modify an interpretive orientation that emphasizes a from-the-top-down perspective in its view of lnka impact. Such a perspective generally predominates in studies of Inka imperial organization throughout the Andes, yet several recent studies (e.g., Hayashida, 1995) suggest that it may be necessary to think more about the interests, priorities, and power of local elites, artisans, labor forces, and organizational structures that interacted with the imperial lnka more in the active than in the passive sense. The notable success of the Spanish in recruiting some disaffected Wanka factions to their cause in 1532–1533 (Espinoza Soriano, 1971) is suggestive of the continuing power and influence of local Wanka elites even two generations after initial Inka "conquest." Some future scholar might also want to reexamine D'Altroy's view in this work that "the Inka resettled much of the populace into lower-elevation, more open settlements," so as to recast it more as a process set in motion by local authorities in order to take advantage of new opportunities for their own wealth generation and prestige enhancement afforded by Inka-imposed peace and Inka interest in higher maize production.

UMARP investigations have provided great insight into Inka imperial strategies and tactics, but it is worth pointing out that these perspectives derive almost exclusively from the north side of the Mantaro Valley. Future archaeological studies should keep in mind that the nature ofthe lnka impact and interaction remains virtually unknown from the still largely unexplored southern side of the valley, where a handful of known sites (such as the Acostambo center and the *qollqas* at Pucará) indicate strong lnkaic influence—an influence that may not have been isomorphic with that exhibited on the valley's north side. Equally important in this regard is the need for renewed attention to understudied local archives throughout the *Sierra Central*—such as the investigation undertaken recently in Tarma by Carmen Arellano (1994)—that offer such great potential for the definition of local groups and their interactions with lnka and Spanish authorities.

One of the great strengths of the UMARP contribution is that new ideas or different views can often be evaluated using the UMARP database. Alternatively, should this database prove inadequate for such a purpose, the well-explicated UMARP research design can often clearly suggest the best ways to generate the necessary new field data.

As we noted earlier, a notable UMARP contribution has been the use of well-preserved stone architecture to make important inferences about function and status. A major effort

was made to make detailed architectural plans and to use these to design further testing operations involving both excavation and surface collection. These efforts should be emulated and expanded by others; in particular, we call attention to the vast, mostly untapped wealth of superficially well-preserved architectural remains that characterize late pre-Hispanic sites (and some earlier ones as well) throughout the central Andes. Recent advances in laser mapping instruments and geographical positioning systems (GPS) devices greatly reduce the time necessary for making accurate and detailed maps of ancient architecture. We urge Andean archaeologists to build on the UMARP lead and make use of this new technology in new mapping projects while the great resource of ancient surface architecture still remains relatively intact throughout such a large region.

In summary, the chapters in this collection, together with other UMARP contributions, help establish a whole new level of expectation about the quality of Andean archaeological research. They follow the lead ofearlier investigators and build firmly on these foundations; they greatly expand the corpus of available data and ideas; they clearly illuminate some of the best pathways for future Andean archaeological research; and they will help interest many non-Andeanists in the theory and substance of Andean archaeology.

JEFFREY R. PARSONS
Ann Arbor, Michigan

AND

RAMIRO MATOS MENDIETA
Washington D. C.

Preface

> The villages were made up of neighborhoods, [with houses] like forts made of stone, that seemed like little towers, wide at the base and narrow in the upper part. . . . And walking along the royal highway, . . . one can see certain very ancient buildings, all undone and torn down, on the mountaintops that surround the valley. . . , In all these parts there were great lodgings of the Inkas, although the principal ones were at the beginning of the valley in the part they call Xauxa, because there was a large enclosure, where there were strong and very excellent stone lodgings, and a house of women of the Sun, and a very rich temple, and many storage structures full of all the things that could be had.—Pedro Cieza de León[1]

> This city [Cuzco] is the greatest and finest ever seen in this country or anywhere in the Indies. We can assure Your Majesty that it is so beautiful and has such fine buildings that it would be remarkable even in Spain.—Pedro Pizarro[2]

In these phrases, the first European witnesses captured images of life in native America's grandest empire—bucolic peasant villages, a provincial center that presided over state affairs, and the Inka capital with its splendid palaces, temples, and artistry. For centuries, adventurers and scholars alike have been captivated by the upper tiers of the empire, especially the life and times of royalty. Drawing from a Cuzco-centered viewpoint, they wrote that *Tuwantinsuyu*—"The Four Parts Together"—was a powerful monarchy in which the mummies of long-dead kings and queens participated in lnka politics, ceremony, and social life through cults staffed by their descendants. Eyewitnesses described the empire as a neatly structured society that was ruled according to uniform, if sometimes diabolically inspired, customs. In the self-promoted view of Cuzco's royal kin, the Inkas had created social order from chaos and nothing was too slight to escape their interest. The myriad ethnic groups found in the empire adopted Inka customs into their daily lives and fulfilled state needs through a rotating labor tax applied to individual households, while local lords learned Quechua as the language of public affairs.

There is much truth to this vision but the order and eccentricities that permeated Inka rule have long overshadowed the lives of the diverse peoples who inhabited Tawantinsuyu. The domain outside the Inka heartland was a cultural mosaic made up of hundreds of local societies, each with its own history and nature. Many had economies and cultures similar to those of the Inkas, but Tawantinsuyu took in everything from forest villages to the Chimu Empire. Without downplaying the changes imposed by Cuzco, numerous scholars point out that the Inkas often based their policies on existing local relations or past Andean statecraft

[1] Cieza de León (1984:242–243, 245).

[2] Cabildo of Jauja, cited in Hemming (1970:120).

(e.g., Murra, 1980; Schreiber, 1987). And while it may be true that the lnkas remade the ethnic landscape by resettling millions of subjects and imposed new burdens on the taxpaying populace, they often tried to mask the changes by pretending that the new policies were simple extensions of time-honored relations, many of which continued uninterrupted. Even with their duties for the state, householders spent most of their time in commonplace activities revolving around family and community. Overall, the rhythm of daily life in many areas owed as least as much, if not more, to existing conventions and local relations as to dictates from above.

This communal focus defined the character of Andean life in the last centuries before the Spanish invasion of 1532 and for decades thereafter. When the Inka expansion began in the early fifteenth century A.D., a few communities or a regional polity formed the most extensive political or economic unit in much of the highlands. Most societies did not have a market system, state taxation, a temple economy, or any other institution that would allow the Inkas to divert easily the products of their labor to Cuzco's ends. The lnkas did not have a large urban population to support in Cuzco nor could they move bulk goods across great distances as part of a subsistence system. That situation contrasted with other early empires, such as the Aztecs or Romans, where urban economies drew support from specialized or market-oriented regional economies whose production was channeled to sustain a large civil population, the aristocracy, or both.

Under the circumstances, study of local communities before and under lnka rule has a great deal to contribute to our comparative understanding of preindustrial society. The authors in this volume take on that challenge, using archaeology complemented by written sources and ethnography to examine daily life in Peru's Upper Mantaro Valley. This valley—the same described in the opening quotation by the soldier Cieza de León—was a rich farming and pastoral region. It was home to the populous Xauxa and Wanka societies that built some of Peru's largest towns during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries A.D., a few of them almost surely the ruins that Cieza de León saw. Under the Inka kings in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the valley's inhabitants became favored subjects, enjoying some privileges of status while they served their Cuzqueñan lords.

The authors here draw from more than a decade's research by UMARP to provide a window into those times before Francisco Pizarro's invasion interrupted the autonomous flow of Andean history. Studying the shift from community independence to subordination was a complex task because we had to investigate simultaneously the household, the community, and the imperial province. The work was initially made possible by the generous sharing of field survey data by the authors of the Foreword, Jeffrey Parsons and Ramiro Matos Mendieta, and their colleague Charles Hastings. UMARP began its studies in 1977 and worked in the field until the Shining Path insurgency made further study untenable in 1988. The research included a nested series of projects designed to examine (1) the relations among warfare, demography, and community organization in the formation of political hierarchies; (2) changes in agriculture and craft production from independent to imperial contexts; and (3) the nature of Inka rule. The fieldwork entailed intensive surface surveys and chronological refinement, study of modern land use practices, extensive excavations, and reference to early written sources. Overall, UMARP recorded information on more than 300 archaeological sites, the largest of which contained about 4,500 buildings and may have housed over 10,000 people. As the data analysis continued beyond the fieldwork, the authors began to pose a new set of questions, such as how the lives of men

and women complemented one another or were differently affected by imperial incorporation. We were fortunate in that the data collected allowed this book's authors to continue to address some of their unfolding research interests.

This volume—the synthetic capstone to our project on local communities—is organized into three parts. In the first, the authors discuss how UMARP's study of the household was conceived theoretically and carried out in practice. It continues with portraits of the social and natural context of life in the Upper Mantaro, drawing on environmental, ethnographic, and historical sources. The second part describes the Xauxa's household activities through study of architecture and community planning, agriculture, use of faunal resources, ceramic production and use, metals and shell adornments, and regional exchange. The final section draws the information together to draw pictures of life before and under Inka rule. By the end, we hope that it will be apparent that the Xauxa were an autonomous people before the Inkas took over their valley and maintained that identity through imperial Inka rule and into the hispanic centuries that followed. This volume is part of an effort to understand their lives.

TERENCE N. D'ALTROY
New York, New York

AND

CHRISTINE A. HASTORF
Berkeley, California

Acknowledgments

This volume is the product of over a decade's efforts by a large group of researchers working under the UMARP umbrella. The principal authors of this work, which represents only part of the research by project members, would like to acknowledge the enormous debt of gratitude that UMARP owes to the individuals and communities that supported or participated in our research, as well as to the governmental and private agencies that underwrote its completion and publication. Our first acknowledgment must go to the people of Peru who facilitated the study reported here. We owe a special debt to Ramiro Matos Mendieta, who introduced us to the archaeology of the valley and has been an unfailing friend of scholars working in the central Andes. Without his pioneering work as Director of the Junín Project and his shared knowledge of the region's prehistory, we could not have undertaken this research. Jorge Silva S. also deserves particular mention for his years of close work with UMARP and help over many an archaeological and administrative hurdle. The people of the valley made us feel welcome, especially Sr. Miguel Martinez and his family, who were our gracious landlords and dear friends in Jauja. Our heartfelt appreciation also goes to Andrés Moya, his wife Faustina Yachachin Moya, and their family. Andrés arranged for and managed the field crew and Faustina looked after us in our home, while their son José became an accomplished excavator. Many other people from Ataura worked with us, amazing us with their strength and patience in both the field and laboratory: Cirlio Arellano, Martin Casas, Alex Castro, Juan de la Cruz, Victor Esteban, Grimaldo Flores, Carlos Guerra, Zósimo Llanto, Teodoro Marticoreno, Miguel Mateo, Hector Moya, Jorge Neyra, and César Soto. Special thanks also go to the citizens of Jauja, Ataura, Sausa, Pancan, Marco, Concho, Tragadero, and Yanamarca for allowing extended fieldwork on their lands. Throughout its research, UMARP worked under the auspices of the Instituto Nacional de Cultura, which both supervised and collaborated with the project. We would particularly like to recognize the support lent by Dra. Isabel Flores.

Foremost among our colleagues from the United States is Jeffrey Parsons, who has been the most giving scholar and friend imaginable. Ramiro, Jeff, and Chuck Hastings provided UMARP with full access to their field notes, collections, and transport. Since they had completed a survey of UMARP's study area, their generosity allowed us to address research questions that otherwise would have been beyond our reach. One of UMARP's parents is missing from the list of authors—Cathy Scott. An original codirector, Cathy has been a delightful friend and colleague. Her closely thought out ideas permeate this text, whether in the chronology used in our work, the pre-Inka settlement pattern study, or the design of the present work. Among UMARP's other fine colleagues upon whose work we draw here are Glenn Russell, Terry LeVine, and Melissa Hagstrum whose studies provided crucial insight into lithic industries, Inka administration, and modern craft production.

The principal authors would also like to express particular thanks to Tim Earle, whose chapter on exchange represents only a fraction of his contributions both to the present volume and to the lives of its authors. As the founder of UMARP and its director

our doctoral studies. Many of the chapters in this work are outgrowths of our doctoral research and Tim can claim a considerable measure of the credit for the entire work.

Many students and colleagues worked for months in the field and the laboratory with little financial support. The research that led to the publication of this volume has been accomplished only through their energies and special skills, and many of the ideas presented here arose from their insightful observations. From Peru, Cristina Baltazar, Enrique Bragayrac, Antonio Cornejo, Carlos Elera, Manuel Escobedo, Rubén Garcia, Beatriz Miyashiro, Virginia Peláez, Carmen Thays, Humberto Vega, and Moisés Vergara were first-class participants. Colleagues and students from the United States, England, and Australia included David Bulbeck, Andrew Christensen, Bruce Crespin, Jim Fenton, Anabel Ford, Patricia Gilman, ElizabethHart, David Hearst, Lisa LeCount, Banks Leonard, Sarah Massey, Marilyn Norconk, Bruce Owen, and Elzbieta Zechenter.

Many of the illustrations were drafted by Victor A. Buchli, Robert Keller, Joanne Pillsbury, Kevin Pratt, and Christine Flaherty. Other friends and colleagues also contributed unpublished information and commentary that further helped aspects of this project; they include Deborah Caro, Charles Hastings, Ian Hodder, John Hyslop, Sissel Johannessen, Tom Leatherman, Craig Moms, Kate Moore, Deborah Pearsall, John Rick, Geoffrey Seltzer, Brooke Thomas, Jane Wheeler, and Herb Wright. Finally, we owe a debt of undying gratitude to Christine Flaherty and Kirsten Olson, whose work on the preparation of the graphics and electronic formatting of this volume made its final production possible.

The principal sources of funding for the research reported here are the National Science Foundation (BNS-820373); the Department of Anthropology, Academic Senate, and the Friends of Archaeology at the University of California, Los Angeles; the Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Council for the Social Sciences; and the Graduate School and the McMillan Travel Fund at the University of Minnesota. Cathy Costin was supported by an International Doctoral Research Fellowship from the Social Science Research Council.

Contents

PART I • INVESTIGATING THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Chapter 1 • The Domestic Economy. Households. and Imperial Transformation 3

Christine A . Hastorf and Terence N . D'Altroy

The Domestic Economy in Anthropology 6
Studying the Household 9
Key Issues in Household Archaeology 12
Andean Household Archaeology 14
Archaeological Approaches to the Domestic Economy of Complex Societies 15
Empires and Their Economies 17
The Inka Empire and the Domestic Economy 22
Outline of the Book 24

Chapter 2 • The Cultural Setting 27

Terence N . D'Altroy

Archaeological Studies in the Upper Mantaro Valley 29
The Cultural Setting 35
The Inka State Economy 45
The Research Questions: Changes in the Domestic Economy under Inka Rule 48
Conclusion 53

Chapter 3 • The Natural Environment 55

Christine A . Hastorf

The Environment 56
Climate 58
Biotic Zones 60
Summary 63

Chapter 4 • The Archaeological Context 65

Terence N. D 'Altroy

The UMARP Site Typology 65
The Archaeological Sample 66
Selection of Locations for Excavation 72
The Sample and the Regional Archaeological Record 77
Archaeological Sampling and Indigenous Social Groups 86

Chapter 5 • Ethnoarchaeology and Contemporary Domestic Economy in the Mantaro Valley 97

Lynn Sikkink

Ethnoarchaeological Research and Contemporary Households 97
Andean Domestic Economy and Gender 101
Contemporary Studies of the Andean Household and Domestic Economy 101
Domestic Economy in the Mantaro Valley 105
Summary 110

PART II • LIFE IN THE COMMUNITY

Chapter 6 • The Architecture and Organization of Xauxa Settlements 115

Elizabeth DeMarrais

Levels of Organization 116
Planning 118
Face-to-Face Interactions 119
Wanka II 121
Wanka III 141
Conclusions 152

Chapter 7 • Agricultural Production and Consumption 155

Christine A. Hastorf

The Xauxa 157
The Study Region 158
The Xauxa Settlement Pattern and Politics 158

Possible Effects of the Inka on the Domestic Economy 160
The Paleoethnobotanical Data 161
Evidence of Agricultural Production 163
Evidence of Consumption 173
Conclusions 177

Chapter 8 • Animal Husbandry and Meat Consumption 179

Elsie C. Sandefur

The Nature of a Mixed Agropastoral Economy 179
Fauna of the Xauxa Region 181
Faunal Data 183
Data Interpretation 190
Conclusions 195

Chapter 9 • Production and Exchange of Ceramics 203

Cathy Lynne Costin

Introduction 203
Description of Types Recovered 205
Data Analysis 211
Production: Local or Nonlocal? 217
Production: Generalized or Specialized? 222
Local Production and Exchange 224
Discussion of Local Production and Exchange Networks. 231
Production and Exchange of Non-Locally Produced Ceramic Types 231
Long-Distance Exchange 238
Summary and Conclusions 239

Chapter 10 • State Goods in the Domestic Economy: The Inka Ceramic Assemblage 243

Terence N. D'Altroy

Ceramics in the State Economy 244
The Upper Mantaro Inka Assemblage 247
Distributions of Inka Pottery at Local Towns 249
Comparisons with the Surface Assemblage from Hatun Xauxa 259
Conclusion 263

Chapter 11 • The Economy of Metal and Shell Wealth Goods 265

Bruce Owen

Wealth among the Xauxa 266
Models of Xauxa and Inka Wealth Economies 267
Questions about Xauxa and Inka Wealth Economies: Primary Utility 267
Questions about Xauxa and Inka Wealth Economies: Secondary Utility 268
The Excavated Materials 268
Analytical Methods: The Commoner–Elite Distinction 273
Analytical Methods: Ubiquity and Density Measures 277
Were Metal and Shell Objects Wealth Goods? 278
Display and Status Legitimation 280
Explicit Bearer's Rights to State Resources 282
Convertibility 282
Control of Wealth Goods Production 284
The Flow of Wealth Goods 289
Manipulations of Wealth Economy Parameters 290
Conclusions 291

PART III • SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 12 • Exchange and Social Stratification in the Andes:
The Xauxa Case 297

Timothy K. Earle

Introduction 297
The Changing Extent and Character of Wanka II and III Exchange 299
The Local Procurement Zone (< 10 KM) 300
The Regional Procurement Zone (10–50 KM) 306
The Long-Distance Procurement Zone (> 50 KM) 310
Conclusions: the Extent and Character of Prehistoric Exchange 312

Chapter 13 • The Xauxa Andean Life 315

Christine A. Hastorf

Heterarchy and Hierarchy among the Xauxa 315
Leaders and Their Activities 317
The Domestic Economy 320
Finance for the Wanka II People 322
Conclusions 323

Chapter 14 • From Autonomous to Imperial Rule 325

Terence N. D'Altroy

The Regional Context 327
The Architectural Context 329
Agropastoral Production in Wanka III 330
Technological Changes 332
Relations Outside the Household 333
Economic Continuities 334
Comparisons with Other Regions of the Inka Empire 335
Concluding Comments 338

References 341

Index 367