

Reprinted from:

CULTURE IN HISTORY

ESSAYS IN HONOR OF PAUL RADIN

Copyright ©

Columbia University Press, 1960

To Prof. K. Polanyi -
the respect + gratitude
of J. V. Murra

RITE AND CROP IN THE INCA STATE

By John V. Murra

VASSAR COLLEGE

1961
May

AS ONE READS the sixteenth-century European sources on Inca ceremonialism one becomes aware of a curious and unexpected discrepancy: the ritual crop calendar reported does not reflect either the agricultural realities of that period or the modern patterns of expressing concern over the fate of the crops. The chroniclers of the European invasion and early settlement fill many pages describing peasant- and state-sponsored ceremonies and sacrifices accompanying the planting, irrigating, weeding, and harvesting of maize; they report little if any ritual connected with the many Andean root crops.

Such a discrepancy in reporting focuses attention on the botanical and ecological differences between the two sets of crops: one a locally domesticated, high-altitude series of frost-resistant tubers, of which the potato is only the most celebrated; the other a warm weather grain, of Pan-American distribution, maize. I hope to show that the chroniclers' discrepancy is also a hint to important cultural and social differences.

At the upper levels of the Andean *Altiplano* the alpine root crops—the potato, the *oca*, the *ulluco*—are the only ones at home. Juzepczuk found one wild species of potato blooming at 16,400 feet (5,000 meters) in an 18-degree frost,¹ and many of the cultivated varieties bear tubers regularly at 14,000 feet. Without them human occupancy in this area would be impossible; "half the Indians do not have any other bread."² In pre-Columbian times they were the mountain peasant's staple food crops, so common in the diet that time was measured in units equivalent to a potato's boiling time.³ In the cold, high steppe known as the *puna*, around Lake Titicaca, the chroniclers were surprised to find no grains; they report the area's dependence upon alpine crops.⁴ This does not condemn this area to culture-historical marginality: long before the Tiahuanaco and Inca expansions, the Collao made the most basic contribution to the possibilities of civilizational development in the Andes through the domestication of the llama and the alpaca as well as the tubers.

In our time, LaBarre collected over 220 named varieties of potatoes in the Collao alone; most of the names, after four hundred years of European occupation, show no trace of European influence.⁹ While some diploid varieties, which botanists consider the more primitive, stick to the *quiswa*, the protected slopes of Andean valleys, most of the domesticated varieties are true *puna* specimens—hardy, frost-resistant and closely dependent on man. In fact, the most frost-resistant, the bitter *tuki*, are sterile triploids which will not grow below 8,200 feet (2,500 meters) and cannot propagate themselves without human intervention.⁸ The large number of these hybrid, high-altitude varieties would indicate that throughout most of the history of human occupancy in the Andes, the pressure has been on taming the high *puna*; the steep, lower slopes, which would seem more inviting on first glance, can seriously be utilized only when large-scale public works provide terraces and irrigation.

Elsewhere in the world, root crops cannot usually be kept for any length of time.⁹ Some of the Andean varieties keep seven, ten, and twelve months under *puna* conditions, which have a mummifying effect not only on vegetables but also on llama meat and other tissues. In addition, several processes were developed here which took advantage of the climate to increase storing capacity. Most potatoes could be made into *chuñu*, a substance derived from tubers alternately frozen and dried soon after harvest. The slow-ripening, bitter, high-altitude varieties are grown exclusively for *chuñu*, which can be kept for much longer periods than the potatoes themselves. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to determine exactly how long *chuñu* could be kept, though Cobo talks of "many years."⁹ The process itself is closely dependent on *puna* conditions: cold nights, warm days, and a dry climate. There is no *chuñu* in Ecuador, which lacks a true *puna*, nor was Sapper able to make it experimentally in Germany.¹⁰

While potatoes have this neat zonal distribution, maize is found on both highland and coast. This has masked the essentially warm climate character of maize; it requires a good deal of humidity and warmth and has a relatively long growing season. The Andean highlands are dry and given to frequent frosts, and it is only on the *quiswa* slopes, and then not everywhere, that maize can be found as a field crop.

We still do not know when maize reached the highlands; there is no reason to doubt that it was long before the Inca conquest, though it

probably was after the domestication of alpine tubers. Even on the coast it was relatively late; archaeology shows that it appears there only after a thousand years of root-crop, bean, and cotton agriculture.¹¹ According to Carbon 14 dates, corn was introduced ca. 900-700 B.C. in the Chicama valley.¹² It is hard to think of it ripening here without irrigation, although archaeologists tell us that artificial watering does not begin till considerably after the introduction of maize. It is possible that corn was first grown in *pukios*, the sunken cultivation plots which use some of the subsurface seepage.¹³ This early association, or lack of it, between maize and irrigation on the coast, needs additional investigation.

As one moves from coast to highlands, the situation becomes clear-cut: in the Andes maize and irrigation were closely correlated. Despite the adaptation of certain varieties in the Callejón de Huaylas and the Urubamba valley, maize in the Andes is a handicapped plant: it cannot grow in the hot valley bottoms, where the desert has a way of reaching up to 5,000 and even 8,000 feet in the Apurimac valley, nor can it grow above 9,000 feet in northern Peru and 11,500 feet in the south, since above these altitudes frost can be expected any month of the year¹⁴ with disastrous effects on the corn crop. In both Inca and modern times, irrigation was considered highly desirable wherever maize was grown,¹⁵ even where there was no acute shortage of rainfall.¹⁶ Garcilaso de la Vega tells us that "not a single grain of maize was planted without irrigation," and that given steady watering and the use of fertilizers corn fields "were like a garden."¹⁷ Irrigated fields need no crop rotation, nor must they be left to lie fallow.¹⁸

There is some indication that the famous Andean terraces so laboriously constructed on the *quişwa* slopes were meant to produce maize. The terrace of Colcamapata, the garden of the Sun, was planted to corn and Garcilaso had seen it worked in his youth. He is also specific when discussing terraces in general: "this is how industrious the Inca were in expanding the lands for maize planting."¹⁹ Pedro Pizarro, an eyewitness to the invasion, claims that "all were planted to maize."²⁰

While irrigation is one of the factors making it possible to raise the upper limit of corn cultivation, it was rarely applied to potatoes and other alpine crops. In part, this is due to the topographic characteristics of the *puna*, a high plateau, with the rivers flowing in deep gorges far below it. As Garcilaso puts it, where irrigation did not reach "they

¹¹ potatoes and chuno. Maize was offered at village shrines.¹² The An-

planted grains and vegetables of great importance . . . potatoes, *añus*, *oca*."²¹ Cieza de León saw no irrigation in the Collao within twenty years of the European invasion,²² and most of our chroniclers similarly make no mention of alpine crops when discussing irrigation.²³ In modern times, the geographer Schwalm, who did considerable field work in the area, reports that irrigation and fertilizers were applied to maize, while potatoes were grown *de temporal*, depending on rain.²⁴ LaBarre tells us that in Bolivia the high-altitude *luki* varieties receive no irrigation or fertilizers, although some of the others apparently do get assistance today.²⁵ Such rainfall cultivation means that lands must rest between crops; Schwalm reports for Titicaca that a field was cultivated for four years and lay fallow for seven.²⁶ This matches what Garcilaso tells us of sixteenth-century conditions: alpine crops had to be rotated, and lands left fallow, every year or two.²⁷

Despite their adaptation and probable domestication in high altitudes, even these alpine crops failed frequently through hail, frost, and drought. Polo de Ondegardo, who was for many years an administrator in the *puna*, claims that three years in five saw crop failures, but it is unclear which of the crops he is talking about; the chances are he means maize.²⁸ Even so, the subsistence margin was quite narrow; in the nineteenth century Tschudi reports that one good harvest in three is normal for the *puna*.²⁹ Cabello Valboa, an independent sixteenth-century source, indicates that famine stalked the land in years when the potato crop failed.³⁰ At such times the peasants ate wild roots or grasses. Fasting, sacrifices, and scapegoating were all employed in an effort to mitigate frosts and water shortages.

In such circumstances we note again how little potato or other alpine crop ritual has been recorded by our chroniclers. As indicated, their ceremonial calendars deal almost exclusively with maize. In our time there are elaborate ceremonies to protect and encourage the potato crop; these have been described in some detail by contemporary observers.³¹ Of course, it could be that such practices are post-Columbian; the absence of recorded sixteenth-century alpine crop rituals may indicate lack of anxiety over a local, well-adapted crop.³² However, this is unlikely since the ecclesiastic writers and idol-burners like Avila, Arriaga, and others who turned their attention to the Andean peasant community after 1600, report numerous instances of ritual concern over highland crops, quite similar to modern ceremonialism. Such

parallels are also present in the unique early report to have broken through the chroniclers' disinterest: only fifteen years after the invasion a priest gave in to the urging of his communicants and allowed a potato planting ceremony in his village. There was music and dancing with digging tools and some competitive behavior between the two moieties. A llama was sacrificed, and selected large seed potatoes were dipped in its blood. At this point the priest intervened and stopped what had apparently gone too far. Soon after Cieza de León came through the area and recorded the priest's story,³³ but it took the chronicler consistently most sensitive to ethnographic detail to get it.

The rarity of potato rituals in our sources may perhaps be due to the fact that the Andean crops, while they may have been staple, were also low status food. In the legends from Huarochiri collected by Avila in the early seventeenth-century, potato-eating was considered evidence of low status; a raggedy beggar was known as *Huatyacuri*, potato-eater.³⁴ In another story, recorded by Cabello Valboa, the hero is hiding from his enemies among "very poor herders" who cultivate "potatoes, *ulluco*, other roots and grasses."³⁵ In describing the *puna*-dwelling Colla, Huamán Poma³⁶ calls them "Indians of little strength and courage, with large bodies, fat and tallowy because they eat only *chuuu*" and contrasts them with the Chinchaysuyus (northern and coastal Peruvians), "who, although small in stature, are brave, as they are fed on maize and drink maize *chicha*, which gives strength."

Despite such attitudes, from all we can gather potato ceremonialism was early and general in the Andes. Why then should our sources miss it?

There is no likelihood that our chroniclers would ignore maize. Grain eaters themselves, familiarized with corn in the Caribbean and Mexico, they reported early and in detail the Pan-American distribution of this crop. Its absence in any given area was noted.³⁷ Some of them thought of maize as the Andean staple,³⁸ which is clearly erroneous given the ecologic picture; as Sauer has pointed out, "nowhere south of Honduras is maize the staple foodstuff it was further north."³⁹ In most of South America it was grown primarily for beer-making and ceremonial purposes.⁴⁰

The chroniclers communicate the feeling that in the highlands maize was a desirable, special, and even holiday food as compared with potatoes and *chuñu*. Maize was offered at village shrines.⁴¹ The An-

dean writer Huamán Poma gives us the text of a lament recited by the villagers "during frost or hail if it [the crop] be maize, when no water comes from the sky."⁴³ At harvest time the corn was brought home amidst great celebration; men and women came singing, begging the maize to last a long time. The villagers drank and ate and sang and for three nights kept vigil over Mama Zara, Mother Maize, a shrine erected in "every house" by wrapping the best cobs in the family's best blankets.⁴⁴

At the village level, corn is also an integral part of life cycle rituals, even if it is not locally grown. At the initiation of a peasant youth, when his hair was ceremonially cut and his name changed, maize, llamas, and cloth were among the gifts offered by his kinfolk.⁴⁵ At marriage, the families of the couple exchanged "seeds" along with cloth, spindles, pots, and ornaments.⁴⁶ Murúa, the sixteenth-century writer with the best information about women in the Andes, specifies corncobs as gifts to the bride. At death, corn meal was sprinkled around the deceased. On the fifth day, the widow and other survivors would wash at the meeting point of two rivers⁴⁷ where sacrifices were also offered after sowing.

The real contrast between the two crops and their associated ceremonies emerges as we move from the peasant community, where both are known though differentially valued, to the state, Inca level.

A considerable effort, both technologic and magic, was made by the state and its various agencies to ensure the propagation and harvest of corn. The Inca state origin myth gives credit to the royal lineage for the introduction of this grain into the Cuzco basin and refers to it as "the seed of the [Paqaritampu] cave" from which the dynasty was supposed to have emerged.⁴⁸ Mama Wako, the wife of the first (legendary) king, is reported to have taught the people how to plant it;⁴⁹ ever after, a plot near Cuzco called Sanscro was devoted to the production of maize to feed the queen's mummy and her retainers. The annual cultivating cycle was ceremonially inaugurated by the king himself, who on the appropriate date during August-September⁵⁰ went to Mama Wako's field to break the ground for the planting, with the help of the royal kin. Poma illustrates this inauguration: the king is working, assisted by three relatives to form the usual Inca quartet; an equal number of royal women are kneeling, facing the men, to break the clods, much as peasant women are shown doing it elsewhere. A

hunchbacked retainer is bringing refreshments to the royal workers.⁵⁰ The king's contribution was accompanied by vigorous singing of digging songs, on a triumphal, military refrain.⁵¹

The national church and its priesthood, whose top hierarchy belonged to the same royal lineage, also had many duties in and about maize agriculture. Each year the gods were asked if crops should be planted that year; "the answer was always affirmative." Priests were assigned to watch the movements of the shadow at a seasonal sundial near Cuzco to determine the right time for plowing, irrigation, or planting⁵² and to notify the peasantry of the approaching chore. If one missed the proper moment, the maize crop was in danger.⁵³ Priests also kept *kipus*, knot records of past seasons showing the succession of wet years and dry.⁵⁴ One group of clerics fasted from the moment maize was planted until the shoots were finger high. Cobo reports that the priests gathered at the sundial observatory and "begged the Sun to get there on time."⁵⁵ Processions were organized, the participants armed, beating drums, and shouting war cries to scare away drought and frost which threatened the maize more than any other crop.⁵⁶ The official state harvest began with the year's royal initiates going to reap on Mama Wako's terrace; then came the fields of the Sun, those of the king and queen. Sacrifices of llamas, fasting, thanksgiving offerings, and requests for future favors were all part of the harvest.⁵⁷

A perceptive observer, Polo noted that there were many more observances and anxious rituals in "advanced" areas, where the population was dense and state exactions numerous, than there were in marginal territories like Chiriguanas or Diaguita.⁵⁸ At the symbolic center of the state, at Intiwasi, the House of the Sun, the priests had planted among the living cornstalks golden reproductions, complete with leaves and cobs, to "encourage" the maize.⁵⁹ The temple's harvest was kept in heavy silver storage jars. Such attention and "nursery" care made it possible for the priests to cultivate maize at 12,700 feet, at the shrines near Lake Titicaca. They did not do as much for Andean crops; virtually all references to Cuzco ceremonials are about maize; there are none to potatoes in this context.⁶⁰

The existence and survival of a sociopolitical structure like the Inca state depends technologically on an agriculture capable of producing systematic surpluses beyond the subsistence needs of the peasantry. Under Andean ecologic conditions the anxiety of the state is under-

standable, and the solution devised is not always ceremonial. The irrigated coast was a major producer of maize and probably supplied an important and worry-free quota to the state warehouses. Unfortunately, we lack many details about the special features of coastal land alienation under Inca rule and the extent of maize-growing *corvée*.⁶¹ But most everybody has heard of the *mitmag* colonists resettled by the Inca for what are usually considered security reasons. I have elsewhere presented some evidence that a major function of this population transfer was actually the expansion of the maize-growing area.⁶² Bernabé Cobo tells us that wherever populations lived too high up on the *puna* they were "provided" with maize lands on the coast or in the *montaña*. Colonists and their families took up permanent residence in the new maize country. Such transplanted settlements remained within the jurisdiction of their traditional ethnic leader and provided their kin with corn, peppers, fruit, and other tropical produce in exchange for llamas, jerked meat, and *chuiñu*.⁶³

Terracing of the steep *quiñwa* slopes, irrigation works, and coastal fertilizer delivered to the highlands were all similar measures, providing revenues of all kinds but with an emphasis on corn. Potatoes and the other root crops may have produced the necessary surpluses, and *chuiñu* may have allowed their storage. However, the keeping qualities of maize are superior to those of *chuiñu*; so is its higher prestige. Grains and stockpiling and the redistribution of status are basic state preoccupations everywhere. In the Inca state many factors made stockpiling a major necessity: a growing court made up of ten to twelve royal families and their thousands of retainers, a bureaucratic and ecclesiastic hierarchy, the military needs of the numerous campaigns which expanded the kingdom from Ecuador to Chile within barely a century. And the army also "preferred" maize to other rations.⁶⁴

It is clear that in the minds of those who encouraged the production of corn there were also those other, redistributive considerations: the higher, semi-ceremonial status of maize, inherited from pre-Inca times, would add to the state's eagerness to obtain this commodity in the highlands. An issue of the rarer corn porridge would mean more than a dish of potatoes to a conscript soldier, and a mug of crown corn beer was a morale-building dispensation in a society where patterns of reciprocal generosity were still operative.

It is my contention in this article that in dealing with Inca times in the Andes we find not only two sets of crops grown in different climatic zones, but also actually two systems of agriculture. The staple crop and mainstay of the diet is autochthonous⁶⁵ and earlier in the highlands; grown by Andean mountaineers, it consists of plants domesticated locally, laboriously adapted to alpine conditions, grown on fallowed land and dependent on rainfall. The other crop is newer, imported; its culture is of holiday significance and centers around maize, an essentially warm weather crop, clinging to the lower and protected reaches of the highlands, handicapped though highly valued in Andean circumstances.⁶⁶

It is my further contention that tuber cultivation was essentially a subsistence agriculture practiced by lineage (*ayllu*) members who became peasants after the Inca conquest. Maize was undoubtedly known, in a ceremonial way, to the peasant *ayllu* for many hundred of years before the Inca, but its large-scale, economic field cultivation in the highlands becomes feasible only when the emergence of a state makes possible such public works as irrigation, terraces, fertilizer from the faraway coast, and gingerly priestly concern. In Inca times maize was a state crop.

The original under-reporting of Indian highland crop ritual, which prompted this inquiry, has become under the circumstances a hint to cultural and structural matters way beyond the actual rites.

The bulk of sixteenth-century writers associated with few Andeans beyond the royal families, the bureaucracy, the Quisling palace guards. These informants emphasized inevitably the recently obliterated glories of the past, particularly the state machinery; in the process they ignored the Andean village and *ayllu*, and their lack of interest matched that of most of the chroniclers. Only the most inquisitive, men like Cieza and Polo, tried to get beyond this idealized statement of bureaucratic claim. It is only later, when Andean writers begin to comment directly on their own past and when village descriptive material becomes available, that we get a glimpse of what agricultural ritual reveals: not only two systems of agriculture, but significant differences between two ways of life, one of which—the power-wielding Inca state—was in the process of incorporating and transforming the other, a process far from completed when the European invasion arrested its course.

NOTES

NOTE. For an explanation of the bibliographic system followed below, see Appendix to John H. Rowe, "The Origins of Creator Worship among the Incas," pp. 424-25 in this book.

- ¹ LaBarre, 1947, p. 102.
- ² Cobo [1653], IV.viii. Acosta reports one variety "accustomed" to coastal heat ([1590], IV.xvii; 1940, p. 270), and Salaman quotes Russian botanists who found wild varieties in the lowlands (1949, p. 34). While potatoes are known on the coast and are reproduced in coastal art (Salaman, 1949, pp. 15, 19; Yacovleff and Herrera, 1934, p. 299), there is no indication that they were a significant element in the food supply or the economy.
- ³ Cobo [1653], XII.xxxvii; 1890-93, p. 295.
- ⁴ P. Pizarro [1570], 1844, pp. 279-80; Cieza [1550], Lxcix; 1862, p. 442; R.G.I., 1881-97, II, 14, 21, 41, 59; Polo [1571], 1916b, p. 63; Garcilaso [1604], V.I. iv; 1943, pp. 226, 233-34.
- ⁵ LaBarre, 1947. For additional details on potato cultivation see Muelle, 1935, pp. 137-39.
- ⁶ Latham, 1936, pp. 81-82, 167; LaBarre, 1947; Salaman, 1949, pp. 54-55.
- ⁷ On botanical grounds, Troll anticipated the current expansion of Andean chronology. In 1931 he already felt that the chronologies of Uhle and Means did not allow enough time for the development of Andean agriculture. See p. 271.
- ⁸ Troll, 1931, p. 268; Sapper, 1936, p. 64.
- ⁹ The best description of *chunu* making will be found in Cobo [1653], IV.vii. Additional details in Schwalm, 1927, p. 186; Yacovleff and Herrera, 1934, pp. 297-98; Mejia Xesspe, 1931, p. 17; Latham, 1936, pp. 175-77; LaBarre, 1947, pp. 91, 96 ff; Valcárcel, 1943-48, pp. 85-86; Salaman, 1949, pp. 11, 35; Sauer, 1950, pp. 514-16.
- ¹⁰ Troll, 1931, p. 268; Sapper, 1936, p. 64.
- ¹¹ Bennett and Bird, 1949, pp. 29, 114-20, 126; Strong and Evans, 1952, pp. 22-45, 353.
- ¹² This is the Cupisnique period when Chavín influences are strong on the north coast (Lumina Bird in Bennett, 1948, p. 27). The suggestion has been made, after Tello, that maize, like the feline deity characteristic of this era, is of ultimate *montaña* derivation (Strong and Evans, 1952, p. 237; Valcárcel, 1945, pp. 66-71).
- ¹³ Strong and Evans, 1952, p. 9; Wiley, 1953b, pp. 16-17, 367, 394, Plate 54.
- ¹⁴ James, 1942, p. 150. In the protected bowl of Lake Titicaca, maize was grown in Inca and modern times even above the 12,540 foot level of the lake.
- ¹⁵ Schwalm, 1927, p. 180; Quelle, 1931, p. 163; Latham, 1936, pp. 115, 139-40; Cutler, 1946, pp. 265, 281, 286; Sauer, 1950, pp. 490-91.
- ¹⁶ Schwalm, 1927, p. 176; some varieties of quick-ripening maize, not requiring irrigation, were known even before the European invasion: Poma talks of *cochaca* or *nichica sura*, rainfall maize ([1615], 1936, p. 1164; see also pp. 260, 1127-38; Garcilaso, [1604], lxxxii; 1943, p. 112; see also Latham, 1936, pp. 139-40). Cutler found one modern variety that went from seed to silk in forty-four days (1946, p. 265), and Sauer reminds Mangelsdorf that in the rainy Urubamba valley, east of the Andes, irrigation is not required (1950, p. 493). See also Mejia Xesspe, 1931, pp. 13-14.
- ¹⁷ Garcilaso [1604], V.I. III; 1943, pp. 226-27, 229-30; Avila [1608], chap. xxxi; 1942, fols. 104r-105r.
- ¹⁸ B. Ramírez [1597], 1936, p. 38; see also Latham, 1936, p. 295.

- ²¹ Garcilaso [1604], V.1; 1943, p. 226. See also III.xxv; 1943, p. 183.
- ²² P. Pizarro [1570], 1844, pp. 291-92.
- ²³ Garcilaso [1604], V.1; 1943, p. 226.
- ²⁴ Cieza de León [1550], I.xxix; 1862, p. 442.
- ²⁵ See the highly revealing legend collected around 1600 by Avila in Huarochiri: Collquiri, a local *waka* connected with maize and irrigation, tried to reward his affinal relatives by emerging as a spring near their fields. But there was too much water; it threatened to flood their fields and all their *oga* and *kinowa* which had been laid out to dry. Everybody was very mad, shouting "We are used to little water!"; his wife's folk begged him to stop. Collquiri finally stuffed some of his clothes in the spring to stop it (Avila [1608], chap. xxxi; 1942, fols. 103v-104r).
- ²⁶ Schwalm, 1927, p. 184. See also C. M. Rick and Edgar Anderson, 1949, p. 406. This may not check with reports that artificial watering was used in pastures (Garcilaso [1604], V.1, xxiv; 1943, pp. 225-26 and 276-77; Poma [1615], 1936, p. 944) which were usually located at potato-growing altitudes. See also Quello, 1931, p. 165 and Schwalm, 1927, pp. 186-87.
- ²⁷ 1947, pp. 94-95, but see also p. 91.
- ²⁸ 1927, p. 186. See also Bandelier, 1910, p. 80; McBride, 1921, p. 7.
- ²⁹ Garcilaso [1604], V.1; 1943, p. 226.
- ³⁰ Polo [1571], 1916b, p. 156; [1561], 1940, p. 168.
- ³¹ Tschudi, 1918, L, 222.
- ³² Cabello Valboa [1586], III.v; 1951, p. 223.
- ³³ See Bandelier, 1910; Paredes, 1936; LaBarre, 1948; Salaman, 1949; Karsten, 1949; Tschopik, 1951.
- ³⁴ Malinowski, 1948, pp. 30-31; see also Homans, 1941.
- ³⁵ Cieza de León [1550], I.cxxvii, ci; 1862, pp. 454, 444.
- ³⁶ Avila [1608], chap. v; 1942, fol. 67r.
- ³⁷ Cabello Valboa [1586], III.xxxii; 1951, pp. 451-52.
- ³⁸ Poma [1615], 1936, p. 336.
- ³⁹ Cieza de León [1550], LLXXXIII; 1862, p. 431; see also Latham's compilation from R. G. I. reports, 1936, p. 151.
- ⁴⁰ Valverde [1539], 1865, p. 98.
- ⁴¹ Sauer, 1950, p. 495.
- ⁴² Willey dates the beginning of the "Peruvian co-tradition" from the "advent of maize agriculture" (1953a, p. 374). This may indicate some support for my proposed separation of alpine crops from corn agriculture, which is likely to seem culturally artificial to some, particularly North American archaeologists who have done most of their field work on the coast and who tend to think of maize and potatoes as part of a single "complex of traits" (Bennett, 1948, pp. 2-4).
- ⁴³ Avila [1608], chap. xxxi; 1942, fols. 102v, 105r; Arriaga [1621], chaps. II, IV, IX, XV; 1920, pp. 19, 46, 83, 193.
- ⁴⁴ Poma [1615], 1936, pp. 190-91; see also Arriaga [1621], chap. v; 1920, pp. 52-53; Cobo [1653], XIII.xxi; 1890-93, p. 77.
- ⁴⁵ Polo [1559], 1916a, pp. 20-21; this passage has been frequently copied by our other sources. Poma [1615], 1936, p. 245.
- ⁴⁶ Arriaga [1621], chap. vi; 1920, p. 58.
- ⁴⁷ R.G.I., 1881-97, II, 60; Murúa [1590], III.xxxii; 1946, pp. 240-41.
- ⁴⁸ Poma [1615], 1936, p. 297; Arriaga [1621], chaps. v, vi; 1920, pp. 51, 59-60.
- ⁴⁹ Belanzos [1551], chap. iv; 1880, p. 15; Molina [1575], 1943, pp. 66-67; Cabello Valboa [1586], III.ix, x; 1951, pp. 260, 269-70; Cobo [1653], XII.iii; 1890-93, p. 121; Montesinos [1642], II.1; 1882, p. 6.

³⁸ Women, and particularly the queens are credited throughout the Inca version of history, with the invention of onerous, new obligations to the state.

³⁹ Garcilaso [1604], VII; 1943, p. 278; Cobo [1653], XIII.xxviii; 1890-93, pp. 112-13.

⁴⁰ Poma [1615], 1936, pp. 250, 1153, 1156.

⁴¹ Valera or the Jesuita Anónimo [?], 1945, pp. 49-50.

⁴² King Pachakuti (see John H. Rowe's article, this collection) is credited by most sources not only with reforming the ceremonial calendar but also with the erection of Inliwatana, the seasonal sundial in Cuzco (Polo, 1940, pp. 131-32; contrast with dating by Cabello Valboa [1586], III.xix; 1951, p. 136, who assigns it to Pachakuti's son, Thupa). It is likely that such sundials are pre-Inca; see Avila's text which reports that villages in the Huarochiri area had men assigned to watch the sun's shadow and notify the inhabitants. Pachakuti may have set up a state observatory which could ignore the different planting times varying according to altitude and ecology. In the Cuzco valley August-September was "right," and it thus assumed the special features of a national event, much as the seeds and tubers from Cuzco enjoyed special prestige in the provinces. Garcilaso [1604], III.xx; 1943, p. 171.

⁴³ Poma [1615], 1936, p. 1152.

⁴⁴ Roman [1575], II.xvi; 1897, p. 68; Murúa [1590], III.xxv; 1946, p. 225.

⁴⁵ Cobo [1653], XII.xiii; 1890-93, p. 19.

⁴⁶ Murúa [1590], III.xix; 1946, p. 210; Poma [1615], 1936, p. 285.

⁴⁷ Betanzos [1551], chap. xv; 1880, p. 102; Trimbom's Anónimo [?], 1934, fol. 457v; Román [1575], Lxxi; 1897, pp. 226-30; Poma [1615], 1936, p. 243; Avila [1608], chap. xiii; 1942, fol. 78r.

⁴⁸ Polo [1559], 1916a, pp. 36-37.

⁴⁹ P. Pizarro [1570], 1844, p. 266; Cieza de León [1550], II.xxvii; 1943, pp. 107-8; *Relación de muchas cosas acaecidas en el Perú* [after 1552], 1943, p. 37; Garcilaso [1604], III.xxiv, VI.ii; 1943, I, 179, and II, 9; Cobo [1653], XIII.xii; 1890-93, p. 9. Gold and silver were ceremonial metals in the Andes.

⁵⁰ Though it may be significant that Garcilaso de la Vega does mention *kinowa*, the alpine grain, as being reproduced in the golden botanical garden of the Sun ([1604] V.ii; 1943, p. 227) which matches his assertion that maize and *kinowa* were grown in the same fields.

⁵¹ This point is discussed in Chapter II, "Land Tenure," of the author's unpublished dissertation, "The Economic Organization of the Inca State," the University of Chicago.

⁵² See *ibid.*, Chapter VIII, "From Corvée to Retainership," pp. 288-303.

⁵³ Cobo [1653], XII.xxiii; 1890-93, pp. 226-27; see also Sancho [1534], 1917, p. 196; Cieza de León [1550], Lciii-civ; 1862, pp. 445-46; [1550], II.xvii; 1943, p. 63; P. Pizarro [1570], 1834, p. 280; Morales [?], 1868, p. 467 n. 1; Polo [1571], 1916b, p. 156; [1561] 1940, p. 177; Poma [1615] 1936, p. 852. One wonders if such contacts and trade in corn with the coast did not exist before the Inca conquest; it is likely that the kings took over the institution by expanding the maize-growing colonies and by incorporating the earlier trade within their redistributive apparatus.

⁵⁴ Garcilaso [1604], VII.ii; 1943, pp. 86-87. In contrast Latham states that the army ate *cocari*, a kind of *chuwu*, but indicates no sixteenth-century references (1936, p. 176).

See indications of content in Inca warehouses: of 287 references to storage by 28 chroniclers, 86 deal with food. (The actual percentage is lower, as not every one of these is an independent source; several also list more than one crop. It was

nevertheless assumed that the actual naming of a particular crop was significant.) Nine are rather general; of the remaining 77, 29 deal with maize and 7 with maize beer, 36 in all. Seven more list *chuiño*, and one mentions scarcity of maize but abundance of "vegetables and roots." There is only one specific reference to potatoes in the warehouse context. Of course, potatoes as such do not keep well and cannot be stored at the state level, but 7 *chuiño* references to 36 for maize when describing the state warehouses, is suggestive.

⁹² Similar views of this historical relationship, based on different criteria, can be found in Tello, 1920; Valcárcel, 1925a, pp. 74, 90; 1925b, pp. 164-65; 1937-41, I, 27-28, and II, 23, 76-80; 1945, pp. 38, 68; 1943-48, II, 97-101; Trimbora, 1928.

⁹⁴ One should not confuse ceremonial limits, such as achieved by the priests at Titicaca (12,700 feet) with altitude of effective cultivation. The upper limit of any given crop, and particularly maize, is affected by many factors not all of which are ecological; the dryness of the southern Andes raises the upper limit at which annuals will grow; topographic features like protection against winds or good exposure to daylight may have a good deal to do with the effective upper limit, but none of these compare with cultural motivation; if tended like a rose, maize will of course grow anywhere. See Weberbauer, 1945, p. 624; Bowman, 1916, pp. 52-54; Schwalm, 1927, p. 183; Troll, 1931, p. 270.

REFERENCES

- Acosta, José de la. 1940. *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*... [1590]. Mexico.
- Arriaga, Pablo José de. 1920. *Extirpación de la Idolatría del Perú* [1621]. Colección de libros y documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú, Series 2, Vol. 1. Lima.
- Avila, Francisco de, ed. 1942. *De Priscorum Huarochiriensium Origine et Institutis* [1608]. Ed. by Hipólito Galante. Madrid.
- Bandelier, A. F. A. 1910. *The Islands of Titicaca and Kouti*. New York.
- Bennett, Wendell C., ed. 1948. *A Reappraisal of Peruvian Archaeology*. *Memoir, American Antiquity*, Vol. 13, No. 4, Part 2.
- Bennett, W. C., and Junius Bird. 1949. *Andean Culture History*. *American Museum of Natural History, Handbook No. 5*. New York.
- Betanzos, Juan de. 1880. *Suma y Narración de los Incas*... [1551]. *Biblioteca Hispano-Ultramarina*, Vol. V. Madrid.
- Bowman, Isaiah. 1916. *The Andes of Southern Peru*. New York.
- Cabello Valboa, Miguel. 1951. *Miscelánea antártica* [1586]. *una historia del Perú antiguo*... Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Facultad de Letras, Instituto de Etnología. Lima.
- Cieza de León, Pedro de. 1862. *Primera parte de la crónica del Perú*... [1550]. *Biblioteca de autores españoles. Historiadores primitivos de Indias*, Vol. 2. Madrid.
- Cobo, Bernabé. 1890-93. *Historia del Nuevo Mundo* [1653], ed. by Marcos Jiménez de la Espada. *Sociedad de Bibliófilos Andaluces*. Seville.
- Cutler, Hugh C. 1946. "Races of Maize in South America," *Botanical Museum Leaflets*, Harvard University, 12:No. 8:257-91.
- Garcilaso de la Vega. 1943. *Comentarios Reales* [1604], ed. by Angel Rosenblatt. Buenos Aires.
- Homans, George C. 1941. "Anxiety and Ritual: The Theories of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown," *American Anthropologist*, 43:No. 2:164-72.
- James, Preston. 1942. *Latin America*. New York.

- Jiménez de la Espada, Marcos, ed. 1881-97. *Relaciones Geográficas des Indias*. 4 vols. Madrid.
- Karsten, Rafael. 1949. A Totalitarian State of the Past. *Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, Vol. 16, No. 1. Helsinki.
- LaBarre, Weston. 1947. "Potato Taxonomy among the Aymara Indians of Bolivia," *Acta Americana*, 6:Nos. 1-2:83-103.
- Latcham, Ricardo E. 1936. *La Agricultura pre-Colombina en Chile*. Santiago, Chile.
- McBride, George McC. 1921. *The Agricultural Indian Communities of Highland Bolivia*. American Geographical Society, Research Series, No. 5. New York.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1948. *Magic, Science and Religion*. Glencoe, Illinois.
- Mojta Xesspe, M. Toribio. 1931. "Kausay: Alimentación de los Indios," *Wira Kacha*, 1:No. 1:9-24.
- Molina, Cristóbal de. 1943. *Relación de las fábulas y ritos de los Indios [1575]*, ed. by F. Loayza. *Los Pequeños Grandes Libros de Historia Americana*, Series I, Vol. 4. Lima.
- Montesinos, Fernando de. 1882. *Memorias Antiguas Historiales del Perú [1642]*. Colección de Libros Españoles Raros y Curiosos, Vol. XVI. Madrid.
- Morales, Luis (?) de. 1868. Letter in *Colección de Documentos inéditos del Archivo des Indias*, ed. by Torres de Mendoza. Madrid. Vol. 7, pp. 467-68.
- Muelle, Jorge C. 1935. "Restos hallados en una tumba en Nievería," *Revista del Museo Nacional de Lima*, 4:No. 1:135-82.
- Murra, John V. 1956. "The Economic Organization of the Inca State." (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago.)
- Murra, Martín de. 1946. *Historia del origen y de la genealogía real de los Incas [1590]*, ed. by Constantino Bayle. Madrid.
- Paredes, Manuel R. 1936. *Mitos, Supersticiones y Supervivencias Populares de Bolivia*. 2 vols. La Paz.
- Pizarro, Pedro. 1844. *Relación del Descubrimiento y Conquista de los Reynos del Perú [1570]*. Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, Vol. V. Madrid.
- Polo de Ondegardo, Juan. 1916a. *Errores y Supersticiones; Linaje de los Incas; Ceremonias y Ritos...* Colección de Libros y documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú, Series 1, Vols. III-IV. Lima.
- . 1916b. *Relación de los fundamentos acerca del notable daño que resulta de no guardar a los Indios sus fueros [1571]*. Colección de Libros y documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú, Series 1, Vols. III-IV. Lima.
- . 1940. Report to Brivesca de Muñatones [1561], ed. by Carlos Romero. *Revista Histórica*, Vol. XIII. Lima.
- Poma de Ayala, Huamán. 1936. *Nueva Corónica y Buen Gobierno [1615]*. Institut d'Ethnologie. Paris.
- Quelle, Otto. 1931. "Künstliche Bewässerung in Süd Amerika," *Ibero-Amerikanisches Archiv*, 5:No. 2.
- Ramírez, Baltasar. 1936. *Descripción del Reyno del Pirú [1591]*, ed. by H. Trimborn. *Quellen zur Kulturgeschichte des präkolumbischen Amerika; Studien zur Kulturkunde*, Vol. 3. Stuttgart.
- . 1943. *Relación de muchas cosas acaecidas en el Perú [after 1552]*. *Los Pequeños Grandes Libros de Historia Americana*, ed. by F. Loayza. Series I, Vol. IV. Lima.
- Rick, C. M., and Edgar Anderson. 1949. "On some Uses of Maize in the Sierra of Ancash," *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Gardens*, 36:No. 4:405-42.
- Román y Zamora, Jerónimo. 1897. *Repúblicas de Indias [1575]*. Colección de

- Libros Raros o curiosos que tratan de America, Vols. XIV-XV. Madrid.
- Salaman, Redcliffe N. 1949. *The History and Social Influence of the Potato*. Cambridge, England.
- Sancho de la Hoz, Pedro. 1917. *Relación de lo Sucedido en la Conquista [1534]*. Colección de Libros y documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú, Series I, Vol. V. Lima.
- Sapper, Karl T. 1936. *Geographie und Geschichte der Indionischen Landwirtschaft*. Hamburg.
- Sauer, Carl O. 1950. "Cultivated Plants of South and Central America," in *Handbook of South American Indians*, VI, 319-45. Bull. 143, Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, D.C.
- Schwalm, H. 1927. "Klima, Besiedlung und Landwirtschaft in den Peru-nord Bolivianischen Anden," *Ibero-Amerikanisches Archiv*, 2:17-74, 150-96.
- Strong, W. Duncan, and Clifford Evans, Jr. 1952. *Cultural Stratigraphy in the Virú Valley*. Columbia Studies in Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. IV. New York.
- Tello, Julio C. 1920. Introduction to Peruvian translation of C. R. Markham's *The Incas of Perú*. Lima.
- 1942. "Origen y Desarrollo de las Civilizaciones Prehistoricas Andinas," Papers, 27th Congress of Americanists. Lima.
- Trimborn, Hermann. 1928. "Die kultur-historische Stellung der Lamazucht," *Anthropos*, pp. 656-64.
- Trimborn, Anónimo. 1934. "A Letter to the King [?]" with facsimile reproduction. Published by H. Trimborn in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*.
- Troll, Karl. 1931-32. "Die geografische Grundlagen der Andinen Kulturen und des Inka-reiches," *Ibero-Amerikanisches Archiv*, 5:258-94.
- Tschopik, Harry, Jr. 1951. *The Aymara of Chucuito, Peru: Part I, Magic*. Anthropological Papers, American Museum of Natural History, 44:2. New York.
- Tschudi, J. J. 1918. *Kultur-historische und sprächliche Beiträgungen [1891]*. Vienna. Peruvian translation in Colección de Libros y documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú. 2 vols. Lima.
- Valcárcel, Luis E. 1925a. *De la vida Incaica*. Lima.
- 1925b. *Del aillu al imperio*. Lima.
- 1937-41. *Mirador Indio: Apuntes para una filosofía de la cultura incaica*. Lima.
- 1945. *La Ruta Cultural del Perú*. Mexico.
- 1943-48. *Historia de la Cultura Antigua del Perú*. 2 vols. Lima.
- Valera, Blas (also known as Jesuita Anónimo). 1945. *Relación de las Costumbres antiguas [?]*. Los Pequeños Grandes Libros de Historia Americana, ed. by F. Loayza. Lima.
- Valverde, Vicente. 1865. "Letter to Carlos V [1539]," in *Colección de Documentos Indéditos del Archivo de Indias*, 3:pp. 92-137. Madrid.
- Weberbauer, August. 1945. *El Mundo Vegetal de los Andes Peruanos*, Lima. Peruvian translation of *Die Pflanzenwelt der Peruanischen Anden* (1911, Leipzig).
- Willey, Gordon R. 1953a. "Archaeological Theories and Interpretations: New World," in Kroeber et al., *Anthropology Today*, pp. 361-85.
- 1953b. *Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the Virú Valley*. Bulletin, Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, D.C.
- Yacovlevi, Eugenio, and F. L. Herrera. 1934. "El Mundo Vegetal de los Antiguos Peruanos," *Revista del Museo Nacional de Lima*, 3:No. 3:241-322.

**Social Structural
And Economic Themes
In Andean Ethnohistory**

JOHN V. MURRA

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York

Reprinted from the ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY
Volume 34, Number 2, April, 1961

SOCIAL STRUCTURAL AND ECONOMIC THEMES IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

JOHN V. MURRA

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York

Although Andean ethnohistory has long been the source of much speculation about the region's social and economic structure, paradoxically, this very concern has made it difficult to raise some of the questions which in other areas are taken for granted. It has been particularly difficult to achieve a setting for the discussion where preoccupations derived from European economic history—whether the Inca were socialist or feudal, a welfare state or one with "patriarchal" slavery—give way to an anthropological analysis, based on what we have learned ethnographically, in the field, about non-European civilizations, with cities, state controls and public revenue systems but also with kinship institutions and ethnic values enduring and functioning at all levels of the society.¹

The search for Utopia in the Andes is in part due to the sources at hand. Misunderstanding the internal organization of the ethnic peasant community, the continued vitality of reciprocity and kinship bonds, and relying too heavily on their informants among the Inca elite, the European chroniclers consistently attributed to the Inca state what were actually age-old peasant reciprocity functions. This was strengthened early in the seventeenth century when Garcilaso de la Vega, the most widely read and translated of our sources, wrote his *Commentaries*² to impress his European readers with the excellence of the system his maternal ancestors had created and his paternal kin had destroyed.

There is no need to undertake a survey of our sources. They have frequently been classified and evaluated by others.³ If one is primarily interested in the European invasion and what in Peru is called "colonial history", obviously one's evaluation of the

¹The original breakthrough in this field came in the late XIX century when Heinrich Cunow (1891, 1896, 1937) thought of looking at the Inca in the light of ethnography. See also Trimborn, 1927; Rowe, 1946; Kirchhoff, 1949; Murra, 1958a.

²Garcilaso de la Vega, [1604], 1943.

³Means, 1928; Rowe, 1946; Porras Barrenechea, 1955.

various sources will be quite different from that of a student concerned with Andean social and economic structures.

However, I would like to call attention to two kinds of sources in Andean ethnohistory which seem to me not to have received all the study they deserve:

1) Those describing a particular valley, a tribe, a town or a set of villages as opposed to those trying to "explain" what "the Incas" as a whole were like. Descriptions like those collected in the four volumes of the *Relaciones Geográficas de Indias*⁴ were made most frequently within a bureaucratic setting, being answers to questionnaires circulated by the European colonial administration. Some of the earlier ones were made soon enough after the invasion for many of the respondents to have been functioning adults under the Inca regime.

2) Those written or compiled later in the sixteenth or early in the seventeenth centuries by authors whose ancestors, or at least the maternal ones, were Andean Americans, as opposed to earlier writers who were mostly Europeans. Although differing enormously among themselves in aims, personality and sensitivity to their European readers, they frequently have in common an interest and a familiarity with local, village conditions which allows their use as supplements and checks to both the administrative records, above, and to the more familiar chroniclers.

I would like to illustrate the value of this new evidence by commenting on one document each from the two kinds of sources. The first is Inigo Ortiz de Zúñiga's report on his inspection trip to Huánuco in 1562, just thirty years after the invasion; the other is a better known collection of folklore from Huarochiri, in the mountains above Lima, collected in the first decade of the seventeenth century by a native of Cuzco, Francisco de Avila.⁵

Although the publication in the *Revista del Archivo Nacional de Lima* of Ortiz' survey and questionnaires began as long ago as 1920, it was interrupted for thirty years and was not renewed till 1955.⁶ It is still incomplete, but enough is now available to allow

⁴Jimenez de la Espada, editor; 1881-1897. A writer like Rowe, 1946, has made most efficient use of this source.

⁵Trimborn, 1939, 1942, 1952. For additional comment on Avila see Polo, 1906; Porras Barrenechea, 1955, pp. 32-3, 54-5; Rowe, 1957, p. 185.

⁶Ortiz de Zúñiga, 1920-25, 1955 to date. An even earlier 1549, report is available for this area, see Hilmer, 1955.

us to state that after Huaman Poma's *Corónica*⁷ this is the most important single source on Inca social and economic structure published in the last forty years. Its virtue consists in recording the prudent but not unassertive statements of several score Huánuco chiefs of varying ranks, when asked by Ortiz to compare Inca conditions with those of 1562. The document also includes the first house-to-house census available to us from the Andes.

Since it will not be possible in a short space to present all the evidence dredged up by Isidro Ortiz' questionnaire, I have selected one aspect of Inca and Andean social organization on which our information before was notoriously contradictory and incomplete: the status, functions and revenues of the *kuraka*, the traditional ethnic leadership in the Andes. After the Inca conquest these men were drawn into the administrative system of the state. What their duties, rights and privileges had been within the ethnic community remained a matter of speculation.⁸ There is no reason to assume a uniformity throughout the Andes of such duties and rights, for one expects to find cultural differences between coast and highlands, between herders' chiefs and those of irrigated oases; also because *kuraka* is a rather vague term covering offices differing enormously in power and responsibilities, from men in charge of small valleys with a few settlements to the king of Chimú.

Our traditional sources have also been weak on the details of arrangements prevailing once the *kuraka* were incorporated in the Inca administrative, political and revenue-producing machinery. We knew that upon incorporation the *kuraka* lost some of their old privileges such as that of initiating warfare; we also knew that they were confirmed in their jobs by the conquerors if there was no reason to doubt their allegiance and that the lineage could expect to retain access to the position even though an individual did not manage to obtain Inca confirmation of the appointment.

The document under consideration is a lucky find in view of our

⁷ Poma, [1615], 1936.

⁸ See Rowe, 1946, p. 261; Kirchhoff, 1949, where distinction is drawn between "commoners" and "nobles" but where *kuraka* are neglected; Murra, 1936, Chapter II, Land Tenure; Chapter V, Peasant Corvée and the Revenues of the State; Chapter VI, Allocation of Surplus or the Redistributive State.

effort to understand these traditional ethnic leaders since the men interviewed were mostly local people, tied to the population of a relatively small area by an endless web of kinship, ethnic loyalties and obligations. They were of various ages and dispositions and the older make reference to personal experiences and travel to Cuzco in Inca times; several were obviously still enjoying many of the perquisites of their traditional rank.⁹

The Huánuco area was occupied in Inca times by four *waranqa*, four census units of about a thousand households each.¹⁰ Within this arithmetic uniformity, familiar to us from the chroniclers but still a matter of conjecture when it comes to understanding the functions and nature of the decimal divisions,¹¹ the *visita* of 1562 reveals a variety of populations. Many were local people—Chupachos or Yachas, which may well be ethnic names, since they do not refer to a particular settlement but to groups of villages and hamlets, with their dependent colonies in the warm *kuka*-growing country and pastures on the cold *puna*. But the *waranqa* included also *mitmaq* settlers transplanted by the crown for strategic and maize-growing purposes. Other groups took care of state herds grazing in the neighborhood. While the *waranqa* chiefs were all local people, we discover that their functional jurisdiction did not really extend over the newcomers although the latter were enumerated with the indigenous population for census purposes: "the said *mitimaes* have their own chief, from Cuzco, and never did the main chief of this division have any lordship or power over them, on the contrary the *mitimaes* had power over these since they were placed there as overseers of the Inca."¹²

The Huánuco questionnaire confirms the point that the ethnic leadership came to office along kinship lines: Joan Chuchuyaure, principal *kuraka* of Yachas succeeded his relatives on the job and it (the succession) "comes from very far back".¹³ There is no evidence here of the point made a decade later by Sarmiento de Gamboa and Francisco de Toledo that the Inca appointed out-

⁹Rowe, 1954, 1957.

¹⁰Rowe, 1946, pp. 263-4; 1958.

¹¹Murra, 1958a, pp. 33-34.

¹²Ortiz de Záñiga, [1562], 1920, I, p. 162.

¹³Ortiz de Záñiga, [1562], 1956, XX, pp. 302, 311.

siders to *kuraka* jobs; only *nitmaq* settlements had non-local leadership.

One aspect of *kuraka* succession which receives its clearest statement in this document is the absence of primogeniture or any other method for the automatic devolution of the job—"the man who was the man for it" being picked among the lineage members. In discussing the top job soon to become vacant, Nina Paucar remarked to the interviewer that the lineage heir would be selected "if he were a man (fit) to rule and, if not, they will make another chief because in each *waranga* there are chiefs' sons who could do it. . . ."¹⁴

Given the date when this information was recorded, the Huánuco material is no better than our standard sources on pre-Incaic functions of ethnic leaders—the bulk of the data deals with obligations to the state. However at least one informant mentions the distribution of "new" lands as well as those left ownerless, a *kuraka* duty till today.¹⁵ Welfare functions which the European and European-influenced chroniclers attribute to the king are here located where we think they belong—in the hands of the leaders of the kin group. *Kuraka* also saw to it that the lands of an old woman, alone and too old to work, were planted for her;¹⁶ at times they also distributed llamas,¹⁷ which were scarce but highly valued in Huánuco.

Chiefs were in turns the beneficiaries of traditional reciprocity: they had access to a variety of services from all households, including those of craftsmen.¹⁸ We are told that the community gathered and the work was divided among the households who provided farming, weaving, herding, house building and hauling services. The enumeration of these duties is not very different from the available sources. Its importance consists in confirming what some students have long suspected: the model for

¹⁴Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1920, I, pp. 184-5. We are obviously dealing here with administrative and political choice and not ethnic or kinship leadership, since the four *waranga* were a territorial division including local groups of very distinct antecedents. This is the first time that a *kuraka* administering a quartet of *waranga* has been reported in our sources.

¹⁵Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1920, pp. 25, 45-6. For contemporary ethnography see Nuñez del Prado, 1949 and unpublished reports from elsewhere in Cuzco and Puno.

¹⁶Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1957, XXI, p. 327.

¹⁷Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1921, II, pp. 223, 227.

¹⁸Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1957, XXI, pp. 69-70.

the revenues of the state are the revenues of the *kuraka*; there are no contributions in kind, only in time or labor; like the *kuraka* the king will try to live up to the reciprocity expectations of the citizenry—all hands working for somebody else, including higher authority, must be wined and dined while on *corvée*; the wool for the cloth to be woven was supplied by the beneficiary.¹⁹

The most novel feature of *kuraka* privilege that emerges from Ifiigo Ortiz' report is the presence in the community of chiefly retainers whose economic and social status differed from those of other villagers. The above mentioned Chuchuyaure, of Yachas (350 households in Inca times), declared that he had four men "de servicio", two young and two married. The bachelors were away (one with the llamas, the other in warm country) and are not enumerated; the married men turn up some pages later, in the house-to-house census. They are the only men in the community beyond the chief who are exempted from paying tribute to their European *encomendero*, since they are part of the personal, full-time staff of Chuchuyaure; even after thirty years of European control²⁰ the *kuraka* is free of *corvée* duties, just as he was in Inca times, and able to protect his privileges and those of his domestic staff. One of these retainers, Liquira, in house no. 73, had not even bothered to be baptized; he had no lands of his own, but worked those of his master, and was able to feed two wives and four children with an unspecified share of the crop. To get the clothing needed for his family he bartered agricultural produce.²¹ He and his partner living in house no. 81, mention as their other duties weaving for Chuchuyaure's household and trading on his behalf at Chinchacocha. There is no indication where Liquira is from or how he got into his present circumstances. When questioned, he said he served of his own free will, but the question was a leading one and Liquira had been an adult at the time of the European invasion. There is no indication that these men suffered any disabilities. Furthermore their polygynous households, as well as the responsibilities entrusted to them, do not seem to imply that we are dealing here with a servile,

¹⁹Morra, 1956, Chapter V, "Peasant *Corvée* and the Revenues of the State".

²⁰Rowe, 1957.

²¹Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1957, XXI, pp. 318, 326.

low-status group. The only hint of dissatisfaction emerges when Liquira indicated that although landless he *had* time to cultivate.²²

The question which arises here, is: what relation is there between such full-time "servants" as Liquira and the *yana* retainers of the king?²³ Are we again confronted with a pre-Incaic pattern on which the later, state institution is modeled? The data are inconclusive, but the hint is worth remembering.

In addition to the four men, Joan Chuchuyaure had four women sharing his own house, no. 84: a senior wife with five children and three younger women "de servicio", with six more offspring by don Juan between them. They spun the wool and cotton to be woven by the male retainers.²⁴ Four women were about par for a *kuraka* in Huánuco. I have not yet had the time to study the composition of the many households enumerated by Ortiz, but my impression is that polygyny was not frequent and four women were clearly a sign of considerable status.

On another front *kuraka* intervened as judges and arbitrators in a variety of situations: land disputes, theft, violence, adultery. The information is unfortunately imbedded in a description of justice and administration in Inca times and emphasizes the fact that "federal", Cuzco officials frequently intervened in local judicial matters, confirming decisions and apparently acting "on appeal", ordering people to be lectured in public, whipped and even killed. It is hard to tell from the evidence how the jurisdiction was split; chances are that short of rebellion or refusal to work off one's *corvée* obligations, *kuraka* carried on as of old between the periodic visits of the Cuzco inspectors.

In general, the Huánuco material is most revealing in the area of *kuraka*-Inca relations. The ethnic leadership may have been selected along kinship lines and confirmed by their peers, but "they did not dare to sit on the *"fiara"* of rank until they received

²² Ibid., p. 318.

²³ Trimbora, 1927; Kirchhoff, 1949, pp. 299-300; Nuñez Anav'arte, 1955; Murra, 1956, Ch. VIII, "From *Corvée* to Retainership".

²⁴ Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1957, XXI, p. 327.

²⁵ Since the answers of the *kuraka* are available to us only through the filter of the interpreter and the recording clerk, we cannot here corroborate the suggestive distinction drawn by Rowe between "provincial governors" or *ʔagr̄k̄aq* and inspectors or *tukuy-rikoq*. See Rowe, 1946, p. 264 and Rowe, 1958, pp. 500-1.

the sanction of "the Inca."²⁵ "Ability" or "skill in ruling" were now evaluated by the state as well as the community and we are told that leaders of all ranks required such sanction. Since such omniscience by the center is difficult to visualize, given the size and newness of the Inca state, one is pleased to hear from one of the informants that it was the local Inca "governor"—the inspector and representative of central authority—who did the actual confirming,²⁶ a degree of decentralization which is not astonishing but which had not been documented previously. In the same context, we hear that sons of the *kuraka* in office spent one or two years at the "governor's mansion", matching the Cuzco indoctrination reported elsewhere.

While state confirmation was required to hold the job, and the inspector's visits are reported to have been frequent, our informants try to give the impression that they were removed from office only rarely. One of them says that it happened only "for very great offenses",²⁷ while another, Pulca of Auqumarca, insists that only if a person were guilty of one or more of "five very principal lapses" did he lose his job. These five are listed as: disregarding orders from the Inca governor, attempted rebellion, neglect in collection or forwarding of crops raised on state lands, carelessness in organizing the sacrifices required three times a year, and to have used the peasants at weaving or other tasks beyond the customary labor services.²⁸ Although Pulca is our only source for such a list, it is a suggestive one; we are beginning to get away from the idealized version of Inca social organization.

The details presented are sufficient, I think, to indicate that we are dealing here not only with new information but with a hitherto unused kind of source, one which illuminates the functioning of Inca society at the local level. Since there is every reason to be-

²⁵Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1920, I, pp. 38, 158 and 1955, XIX, p. 197.

²⁶Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1955, XIX, p. 207.

²⁷Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1956, XX, p. 301.

²⁸Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1562], 1920, I, p. 157. The first three are expectable from other sources; the fourth is new and further details should shed much light on the relations of the state church to the conquered ethnic groups; the fifth is, in a way the most provocative: it indicates possible intervention of the crown into traditional *corvée* arrangements by acting as "protector" of the peasantry. It does confirm a claim of Garcilaso's which I must confess I always considered part of his apologetics. See Garcilaso, [1604], III, V, ch. ii; 1943, p. 227.

lieve that additional questionnaires of this kind²⁰ for the period before the 1572 reorganization can be located, our hopes of someday reconstructing the local peasant version of Inca social structure are high.

My comments upon my second source need not be as elaborate since it is familiar to the anthropological world through the efforts of Prof. H. Trimbora, who has published the Quechua text collected by Avila, its German translation and several commentaries.²¹ As a source on economic and social structure it is very different from the Huánuco report, since it is a collection of folklore. However, the two sources have one thing in common: they deal with life in a limited area and do not attempt any generalizations about the Andes as a whole. Thus, both provide a localized check on the broad canvass; both also give us unique material, unavailable in the chronicles.

One of the most controversial and poorest documented of Andean institutions is the *ayllu*, the kinship unit in the local social organization.²² The chief deficiency in our study is the absence of materials on the functioning of the *ayllu* in particular circumstances. In the Huarochiri material, the *ayllu* is taken for granted; it is, alas, insufficiently described, but it does appear in a wide variety of cultural contexts: ceremonial, economic, historical.

Tradition records which *ayllu* broke off from which;²³ some kind of seniority was observed between maximal and minimal lineages: "the Tutayquiris . . . were the last born of the Quinti and the Chica treated them with contempt since they were the youngest".²⁴ Since many modern commentators see in the Inca *ayllu* primarily the localized, territorial community, it is interesting to

²⁰We are aware of at least one other document submitted to the *oidores* of Lima in response to this questionnaire, that of Polo de Ondegardo, published by C. A. Romero, 1940. We do not know how many *visitadores* like Íñigo Ortiz were sent out; since the questionnaire came from the king, in Europe, and was meant to apply to the whole *audiencia* of Lima, there is no reason to suppose that the Huánuco *visita* was unique. Santillán was one of the *oidores* at the time. See Santillán, [1663-64], 1927.

²¹Trimbora, 1939, 1942, 1952. The folio references below are to the photostatic copy of Avila's manuscript published by Galante, 1942.

²²Rowe, 1946, pp. 253-56; Kirchhoff, 1949, pp. 294-99. A Peruvian historian Mrs. María R. de Díez Cansaco is now engaged in an archival study of royal *ayllu* or *panaka*. Information on such status lineages is more readily available than on peasant *ayllu*, and should be very useful.

²³Avila, [1608], ch. VII, folio 71v; ch. XI, folio 77v.

²⁴Avila, [1608], ch. XI, folio 77v; ch. XXXI, f. 105v.

note that Sutca *ayllu* was reported to have died out at San Damian but was still surviving at Suesacancha and Tumna.³⁴ Various community-wide tasks such as cultivating shrine lands, or providing sacrificial llamas, were undertaken "ayllu by ayllu", on rotation.³⁵ Avila notes that each *ayllu* and town was likely to have its own version of the folkloric material recorded.³⁶

Marriage is another institution on which functional information is very rare. While Iñigo Ortiz' material does give support to the reports that the state intervened in marital matters,³⁷ in Huaro-chiri folklore there is no mention of such intervention. Marriage is here seen in the context of village and kin group initiative. A *qhapaq hatun apu*, a powerful *kuraku*, can treat his daughter as disposable and promised her in exchange for being cured of a chronic illness.³⁸ In case of conflict over irrigation waters between two *ayllu*, marriage is a way of reconciling the conflicting claims.³⁹ One should consult the woman's father before carrying her off, even with her consent. Her kin were indignant, and even promises of houses, fields and llamas did not seem to mollify them. Eventually, the groom, who turns out to be a local deity, provided them with a subterranean canal for the irrigation of their crops.⁴⁰ This also confirms the probability of bride wealth hinted at in other materials.⁴¹ Marriage with male outsiders did take place, but their foreign origin was remembered.⁴²

Economic matters are also illuminated in this source. Access to land is established by kinship claims, and conquest is accompanied by efforts to wipe out the potential claimants.⁴³ Agriculture is the object of considerable ritual observance, with major magical effort being exerted over irrigation and the llama herds.⁴⁴ In addi-

³⁴Avila, [1608], ch. XXVI, f. 96v. Since these texts were recorded seventy years after the invasion and thirty after Toledo's resettlement, it is possible that such dispersion of *ayllu* members is a post-European phenomenon.

³⁵Avila, [1608], ch. XIX, f. 84v; ch. XX ff. 84v-85r; ch. XXIV, f. 92v.

³⁶Avila, [1608], ch. XIII, f. 79r.

³⁷Ortiz de Zúñiga, [1582]. See also Murra, 1953a, p. 33.

³⁸Avila, [1608], ch. v, f. 68r.

³⁹Avila, [1608], ch. XXX, ff. 99v-100r.

⁴⁰Avila, [1608], ch. XXXI, 103r.

⁴¹Murra, [1956], ch. I.

⁴²Avila, [1608], ch. XXIV, f. 92r.

⁴³Avila, [1608], ch. XXXI, ff. 101v-102r.

⁴⁴Avila, [1608], ch. VII, f. 71v; ch. XXIV, ff. 91r-v.

tion to peasant holdings, we find, in Huarochiri, land apportioned to local shrines;⁴⁵ Pachacamac, the well known coastal deity, had pastures reserved for him, and herds "in every town".⁴⁶ Inca economic exactions are mentioned only casually but even here the information provides dimensions absent elsewhere. The Inca confirmed tenure in llamas and pastures claimed by local shrines;⁴⁷ locally-grown state crops were used for offerings to these deities in addition to the libations and sacrifices of the community; so was state cloth woven by the local women.⁴⁸

The Inca also intervened by assigning "servants" described as *yana* to the several local shrines. Pariacaca was granted fifty "servants" for helping the Inca king against his enemies.⁴⁹ Elsewhere in the text we hear of thirty men from Yauyos who also worked for Pariacaca's shrine.⁵⁰ Pachacamac had "many hundreds" of such retainers;⁵¹ various religious specialists and *waka* caretakers are mentioned in an *ayllu* context, but it is impossible to say if full-time retainers are pre-Incaic or not.

Status differences are pronounced. The powerful (*qhapaq*) are people who can claim the assistance of many women and men for such various tasks as house building, dancing or hauling grass on llama-back.⁵² The weak (*waqcha*) are potato eaters⁵³ and can be readily recognized by their torn and grimy clothing. To discover that the father of one's child was *waqcha* was enough to drive a female deity to suicide.⁵⁴

The points listed above should be enough to indicate the wealth of social and economic data to be found in such early folkloric material, collected in Quechua by the Andean writers of the turn of the seventeenth century. Even where their ostensible purpose was the destruction of Andean culture and religion, their intimate knowledge of the language and their roots in the culture they were destroying make them a very important source.

⁴⁵ Avila, [1608], ch. XIX, f. 84v, but see ch. XXIV, f. 105v, where the Cloncha, who were considered Pariacaca Tutayquiri's "youngest sons", were sparing with assigning lands to his shrine. See translation in Trimborn, 1942, p. 149.

⁴⁶ Avila, [1608], ch. XX, f. 85v; ch. XXII, f. 89v.

⁴⁷ Avila, [1608], ch. XX, f. 85v.

⁴⁸ Avila, [1608], ch. XVIII, f. 83r.

⁴⁹ Avila, [1608], ch. XVIII, f. 83v.

⁵⁰ Avila, [1608], ch. XXII, f. 89r.

⁵¹ Avila, [1608], ch. XXII, f. 91v.

⁵² Avila, [1608], ch. V, ff. 68v-69v.

⁵³ Avila, [1608], ch. V, f. 67r. For status differences among crops and foods, see Murra, 1960.

⁵⁴ Avila, [1608], ch. II, ff. 64v-67r.

I am optimistic about our chances in years to come to extend our knowledge of the economic and social structure of the Inca state. We may not find any new Cuzas or Cobos; but I know that many more such local surveys as Inigo Ortiz de Zuñiga's have been neglected and we have just begun to study the Quechua text of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. I submit that we will find these sources to be even more revealing than the traditional ethnohistoric sources on the Andes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AVILA, FRANCISCO DE—*De Priscorum Huarochiricium*. . . .
1608—All folio references are to Galante edition, Madrid, 1942. See below, Galante, 1942. First transcription was Trimborn, 1939.
- GUNOW, HEINRICH
1891—*Das Verwandtschaftssystem und die Geschlechtsverhaende der Inka*. *Das Ausland*, vol. 54.
1896—*Soziale Verfassung des Inkareiches*.
1937—*Geschichte und Kultur des Inkareiches*. Amsterdam.
- GALANTE, HIPPOLYTUS
1942—*De Priscorum Huarochiricium*. *Biblioteca Nacionalis Matritensis* edidit Hippolytus Galante. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Instituto Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo. Madrid.
- GARCILASO DE LA VEGA, EL INCA.
1604—*Primera parte de los Comentarios Reales*. . . . Angel Rosenblatt, editor. 1943 Buenos Aires edition.
- HILMERT, MARTE
1955—*Travaux*, Tome v. Institut Francais de Recherches Andines. Lima-Paris.
- JIMENEZ DE LA ESPADA, MARCOS, (ed).
1881-97—*Relaciones Geograficas de Indias*. 4 volumes. Madrid.
- KIRCHHOFF, PAUL
1949—*The Social and Political Organization of the Andean Peoples*. *Handbook of South American Indians*, volume V, pp. 293-311. Washington.
- MEANS, PHILIP A.
1928—*Biblioteca Andina*. *Transactions, Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, volume XXIX, pp. 271-525.
- MURRA, JOHN V.
1956—*The Economic Organization of the Inca State*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
1958a—*"On Inca Political Structure"*, *Systems of Political Control and Bureaucracy in Human Societies*. Proceedings, 1958 meeting, American Ethnological Society.
1958b—*Review of The Ancient Civilizations of Peru*, by J. Alden Mason. *American Anthropologist*, 60: 4.
1960—*Rite and Crop in the Inca State*. *In Culture and History; Memorial Volume for Paul Radin*.
- NUÑEZ ANAVITARTE, CARLOS
1955—*Teoria del Desarrollo Incásico (interpretacion esclavista-patriarcal de su proceso historico-natural)*, Tomo I, partes i, ii. Cuzco.

- NUÑEZ DEL PRADO, OSCAR
1949—Chinchero, un pueblo andino del Sur. *Revista Universitaria*, Cuzco, volume XXXVIII, no. 97, pp. 177-230.
- ORTIZ DE ZÚÑIGA, IÑIGO
1562—Visita hecha por mandado de su magestad . . . por Iñigo Ortiz de Zúñiga. . . 1562. . . *Revista del Archivo Nacional del Perú*, Lima, 1920-25, 1955 to date.
- POLO, JOSÉ T.
1906—Un Quechuísta. *Revista Histórica*, Lima, I, no. 1, pp. 24-38.
- POMA DE AYALA, HUAMÁN
1615—*Neuva Corónica y Buen Gobierno*. Paris edition, 1936.
- PORRAS, BARRENEGHEA, RAÚL
1955—*Fuentes Históricas Peruanas*. Lima.
- ROMERO, CARLOS A.
1940—Informe del licenciado Juan Polo de Ondegardo al licenciado Briviesca de Muñafones sobre la perpetuidad de las encomiendas en el Perú, [1561] . . . *Revista Histórica*, volume XIII, pp. 125-96.
- ROWE, JOHN HOWLAND
1916—Inca Culture at the Time of the Spanish Conquest. *In Handbook of South American Indians*, volume II, pp. 183-330. Washington.
1954—El movimiento nacional inca del siglo XVIII. *Revista Universitaria*, Cuzco, No. 107.
1957—The Incas under Spanish Colonial Institutions. Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, *Hispanic American Historical Review*.
1958—The Age-grades of the Inca Census. *In Miscellanea Paul Rivet*, pp. 499-522. Mexico.
- SANTILLÁN, HERNANDO DE
1563-64—Relación del origen, descendencia, política y gobierno de los Incas. *In Colección de libros y Documentos referentes a la historia del Perú*. Serie 2, vol IX, 1927.
- TRIMBORN, HERMANN
1927—Die Gliederung der Stämme im Inkareich. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, vol XIX, pp. 303-44. Paris.
1939—Dämonen und Zauber im Inkareich. Leipzig.
1942—Dämonen und Zauber im Inkareich, Nachtrage zum Ketschua-werk des Francisco de Avila. *Zeitschrift fuer Ethnologie*, vol. 74.
1952—El Motivo Explanatorio en los mitos de Huarochiri. *Mar del Sur*, Lima, vol. VII, no. 21, pp. 21-32.