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Abstract
Military and police power has proven time and again to be necessary but not sufficient to create and maintain an empire. Empires must employ a multitude of strategies to expand and survive, one of the most important of which is state-sanctioned public spectacles, ceremonies, and rituals. This dissertation examines the roles of these large-scale non-quotidian performances that are organized and directed by political agents, occur generally at specified times and locations, and include elements of the spectacular, theatricality, cosmological invocation, and feasting.

These, state-sanctioned public spectacles, ceremonies, and rituals, have received inadequate attention from archaeologists. Archaeologists traditionally focused on the development of administrative and economic systems, ignoring the roles of performances in imperial expansion, which have often been considered epiphenomenal.

My own research has focused on one of these empires, the Inka, and how it grew from a small single valley in Peru to a powerful polity ranging north to Ecuador and Colombia, south to Chile and Argentina, and east to Bolivia and Paraguay. This expansion occurred without many of the tools historically considered critical to such expansion, including a writing system, horses, and the wheel.

I analyze religious and state constructions and spaces for their roles in and as the settings for spectacles and ceremonies. Utilizing a performance-based perspective and theories of semiotics and pragmatics drawn from semiotic anthropology, I focus on a particular set of Inka performance spaces and their role in imperial expansion and control: the capital Cuzco and certain replicas of that capital constructed in other parts of the empire.

I suggest that these sites served as the settings for a calendar of ritual ceremonies and spectacles that referenced certain repeated physical attributes and were performed by and for an audience of the Inka themselves, and did not, like other performances in the empire, involve the meaningful participation of other social groups within the empire. I also suggest that these Cuzco replicas were strategically placed in areas of war and rebellion where the utilization of ritual performance to maintain, reinforce, inculcate and manipulate Inka ideology, identity, and power was a critical element of imperial strategy.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

May 1, 2003- When President George Bush landed on the USS Abraham Lincoln and announced the end of the Iraq war in front of a “Mission Accomplished” banner, his powerful performance moved and instilled pride in even the most cynical and anti-war Americans. While few remember his words, almost everyone remembers his dramatic jet plane landing onto an aircraft carrier, where he spoke in front of that memorable backdrop. Through his harnessing of this dramatic setting and a performance suffused with symbols of American power, greatness and ideals, President Bush caused his internal popularity ratings soared, and bolstered his reelection chances. The rest of the world also watched and saw the power and confidence of the American empire on display, though their reactions likely ran a broad gamut from respect and awe to disgust, fear and hatred. CNN described the speech as part of a continuing White House effort to showcase Bush as commander-in-chief.

In declaring the end of the Iraq war, President Bush confused military victory with hegemonic success. Iraq was neither stable nor pacified, much less an ally of the United States. Whatever the goals of the American invasion, they were and remain unmet, as the United States failed to win the hearts and minds of many segments of Iraqi society. Bush and his staff also failed to realize that the performance arena is a contingent and contested one, and that their sponsorship and control over the Mission Accomplished event itself did not guarantee the exclusive dissemination, use and interpretation of his performance.
Both domestic and foreign foes of President Bush utilized his performance to oppose and undermine his policies and presidency. Numerous headlines and parodies incorporated the airplane landing and the “Mission Accomplished” banner, and the performance became for many both inside and the outside of the United States a symbol of the failures of the Bush presidency and American policy in the Middle East. For some, particularly internationally, this performance represented not only the limits of American military prowess, but of the American ideal, transforming it for some from a beacon of democracy and hope to a failed, murderous empire.

This nexus of performance, power and domestic and international politics lies at the heart of this dissertation. Military and police power has proven time and again to be necessary but not sufficient to create and maintain an empire. Rather, empires must employ a multitude of strategies to expand and survive, one of the most important of which is state-sanctioned public spectacles, ceremonies, and rituals. This dissertation examines the roles of political and ritual theater in constituting, extending and manipulating political power in these empires and other complex societies. In addition to performances and spectacles, I focus upon the settings of these performances, the “theaters” in which they take place. Mission Accomplished would be another story without the banner and the aircraft carrier!

The effect of a dramatic presentation on an audience cannot be determined without consideration of the physical theater housing it. “Theater”
includes is any building, plaza, landscape, pilgrimage route, and/or other settings in which spectacles are performed. Consideration of a theater includes its performance characteristics or properties--size, shape, entrances and exits, location of the stage, set, lighting, sound, costumes, orientation, changes in elevation, audience capacity, and sound and viewing patterns of the performers and spectators. Nor should analysis end at the theater door--its location within a city or ceremonial center, the roads leading to it, and its relationship to other buildings and features are critical elements of the audience experience. Lastly, the examination must utilize such analysis and consideration to investigate the cultural meanings and roles generated by and associated with performance and its settings predicated upon historical and cultural context.

Empires employ a multitude of strategies in carrying out their expansion. One of the most important of these, state-sanctioned public spectacles, ceremonies, and rituals, has received inadequate attention from archaeologists. Archaeologists traditionally focused on the development of administrative and economic systems, ignoring the roles of performances in imperial expansion, which have often been considered epiphenomenal. The effects and implications of such gatherings require more serious consideration and inquiry. One need only consider the importance of dances in Puebloan societies and of carnivals in Brazil. The sense of a community, cultural values, and moral order in those societies can never be adequately understood without the consideration of such theatrical events. Public events, spectacle, and theatrical performance are
important for the operation of any type of society, but my focus here is on their critical implications and consequences for the development of centralized polities. Nowhere in the world did the development of a state equipped with impersonal, pragmatic bureaucracy and coercive, disciplinary force happen overnight, leaping directly from a small autonomous village, the integration of which was based primarily on face-to-face contacts among its members. Michel Foucault (1977) suggested that antiquity was a civilization of spectacle whereas modernity is a society of discipline. Although this may be a broad, overarching statement, the development of large, centralized polities would have been impossible in any historical context without frequent public events, in which agents of political power presented themselves in front of a large number of people, and participants shared experiences through their bodily co-presence in an environment that normally included pageantry, theatricality, sensory overload and alcoholic consumption.

My own research has focused on one of these empires, the Inka, and how they grew from a small single valley in Peru to a powerful polity ranging north to Ecuador and Colombia, south to Chile and Argentina, and east to Bolivia and Paraguay. This expansion occurred without many of the tools historically considered critical to such expansion, including a writing system, horses, and the wheel. Yet their growth was among the most rapid in history. This dissertation addresses some of the ways the Inka expanded so rapidly while retaining the support of their homeland and maintaining control or influence over conquered
peoples. I will also consider the effectiveness and cost of the Inka’s strategies for inculcating people into their ideology of empire.

This dissertation examines the roles of ritual theater in constituting, extending and manipulating political power in premodern complex societies, particularly empires. By ritual theater, I refer to large-scale non-quotidian performances that are organized and directed by political agents, occur generally at specified times and locations, and include elements of the spectacular, theatricality, cosmological invocation, and feasting. Drawing upon data from my research at such locations, my focus will be the Inka Empire of the central Andes in the 15th and 16th centuries. I analyze religious and state constructions and spaces for their roles in and as the settings for spectacles and ceremonies framed in a performatic approach. Diana Taylor (2003:6) defines “performatic” as “the adjectival form of the nondiscursive realm of performance”, meaning simply related to performance. She distinguishes this adjective from “performative” and “performativity”, which have come to be employed more in connection with discourse than performance itself, especially as used by authors such as Austin (1962) and Butler (1994). Rather than considering ritual and secular performances as epiphenomenal, I argue that they were part of a political and ideological discourse to create, maintain, alter and subvert power relations. The “power” of performance, its communicative and emotional imports and impacts, was dramatic and not to be underestimated.
Utilizing theories of semiotics and pragmatics drawn from semiotic anthropology (e.g., Parmentier 1994; Preucel and Bauer 2001, Preucel 2006), this paper analyzes a particular set of Inka performance spaces and their role in imperial expansion and control: the capital Cuzco and certain replicas of that capital constructed in other parts of the empire. According to historical sources, the Inka constructed their capital as a physical representation of their worldview. As they expanded, they replicated important features of Cuzco in a particular manner in a limited number of strategic locations throughout their empire. I argue that one of the principle roles of these sites was to serve as the settings for a calendar of ritual ceremonies and spectacles that referenced certain repeated physical attributes of these sites and were performed by and for an audience of the Inka themselves, and did not, like other performances in the empire, involve the meaningful participation of other social groups within the empire. I also suggest that these Cuzco replicas were strategically placed in areas of war and rebellion where the utilization of ritual performance to maintain, reinforce, and manipulate Inka ideology, identity, and power was a critical element of imperial strategy as the polity expanded from a single valley in the South Central Highlands of modern Peru to encompass much of Peru and Bolivia, and significant parts of Ecuador, Argentina, and Chile. My focus on large-scale Inka performance is not designed to privilege elite spectacles or ignore the agency of the many and diverse groups conquered by the Inka, but rather to consider the practice, role, and importance of such state directed performance as a critical
element of imperial strategy during a period of rapid imperial expansion and strife.

Such analysis will incorporate archaeological and historical evidence, the former from my research at the site of Incallajta, Bolivia as well as the research of numerous colleagues, and the latter from the rich early colonial chronicles of life in the Andes written by both Spaniards and natives. Such chronicles are important yet problematic sources of information on Inka life. The text sources are at times at odds with data from the archaeological record. Many of the chronicles are focused upon the Inka capital of Cuzco and its environs (Morris and Thompson 1985), and provide less insight regarding daily life or the exercise of imperial power in a particular region.

More particularly, this dissertation utilizes historical and archaeological evidence to analyze the so-called other or new Cuzco’s that according to some chroniclers were built by the Inka in certain locations of their empire. Utilizing Charles Sanders Peirce’s concept of replication and the notion of hyperstructure developed by linguistic anthropologist Richard Parmentier and others, the dissertation analyzes how and why Cuzco was replicated, and how changes in such replication over time and space represent ideological or political change.
Chapter 2: IMPERIAL EXPANSION AND STRATEGY

Studies of empires, including those of the Inka, have employed a variety of theoretical perspectives (Sinopoli 1994; Alcock et al 2001; D’Altroy 2001, Morris and Scheidel 2009, Smith and Montiel 2001). While some scholars, utilizing the classic perception of Rome, have associated empires merely with territorial control and sovereignty (Lattimore 1962, Pagden 1995), much recent analysis focuses upon strategies of imperial rule and the varying combinations and intersecting networks of military, political, economic and ideological power (Mann 1986, Smith and Schreiber 2005,2006). While military force and the threat of its application are a necessary condition for the creation of empires, their governance exhibits a wide range of strategies of control (D’Altroy 1992, Luttkwak 1976, Hassig 1985, Doyle 1986, Eisenstadt 1963, Berdan et al. 1996, Sinopoli 2001, Glatz 2009, Rivera 2010, Mackey 2010). Some scholars have distinguished between or placed on a continuum hegemonic empires that utilize a strategy that “keeps the costs of rule low, but a low investment in administration and physical facilities is offset by a relatively low extraction of resources and by limited control over subject peoples“ (D’Altroy 2002:7), as some have posited for the Aztecs (Hassig 1985, Smith 1996, 2001) and the Inkas (D’Altroy 1992, Alconini 2005, 2008), and territorial empires such as first century Rome that utilize direct rule requiring significant investment in administration, infrastructure and military strength. Imperial strategies also vary along this continuum within a
particular empire, as certain regions or ethnic groups are subject to more direct forms of control than others (D’Altroy 2002, Coben and Stanish 2005, Glatz 2009).

Scholars have considered the creation, reinforcement, manipulation, and subversion of imperial ideologies and state religions as among the important strategic elements in the study of empires (Conrad and Demarest 1984, Alcock and Morrison 2001, Goldstone and Haddon 2009). Such ideologies and religions and their accompanying rituals bring together individuals as a group, strengthen their communal bonds, and legitimate existing social orders and statuses (Durkheim 1915, Turner 1967, Brumfiel 2001). Through performances at monuments and other specially designated locales, rulers and ritual specialists transmit their worldview and social hierarchy in an emotionally and communicatively powerful manner, reinforcing its permanence, certainly and sense of naturalness (Brumfiel 1987, 2001 Helms 1993, DeMarraiss et al 1996, DeMarraiss 2004,). Ideology creates an integrative and common worldview across heterogeneous incorporated groups (Kolata 1981, Alcock and Morrison 2001) and exalts and legitimates the ruler to facilitate and ensure acceptance of his authority (Bauer 1996, Demarest 1981, McCormack 2001). Less frequently, scholars consider the ability of state religions to motivate and bind the ruling elites to strategies that enhance imperial unity and power (Baines and Yoffee 1998, Brumfiel 1998).
The practice and effect of ideological and practices will differ from empire to empire and within different regions of and through time over the same empire. Rulers may choose a variety from numerous combinations of potential religious actions, including the construction of monuments, performance of religions, and writing of texts (DeMarrais et al 1996). Different ideological messages might be sent to different groups within an empire (Brumfiel 1998, 2001) by a variety of means (Alcock 2001). The creation, invocation and manipulation of collective memories are a frequent tool in the shaping of such messages (Alcock 2001, Woolf 2001).

Much of the analysis of empires has focused upon their monumental structures. These constructions have been analyzed from a variety of perspectives, though rarely as an integral part of and setting for the performances and social actions within them. They are regarded as “reflections of style, …a material index of social labor, …or a passive backdrop to human activities reconstructed from other artifactual sets” (Moore 2003:243). Such constructions are considered indicators of a ruler’s control over labor and other resources (Trigger 1990, Marcus 2003), and as symbols of power that can attract followers and cow subject peoples (Neiman 1998), and as part of a program to create, manipulate and control ideology in order to integrate or dominate subjects within a polity (Demarrais et al 1996, Alcock and Morrison 2001). Many studies expressly considering ritual performances in these spaces utilize similar theoretical perspectives and reach similar conclusions as to its purpose.
(Demarrais et al. 1996, Brumfiel 2001). Brumfiel notes that different performances may be directed at different ethnic or social groups, and expressly recognizes that ritual performance may be designed to win the "hearts and minds" of such groups.

Susan Alcock (2001) considers imperial performance spaces with her concept of "memory theaters." Alcock suggests in some Greek influenced parts of the Roman empire, after the Roman conquest, many monumental spaces were reconstructed, utilizing or incorporating elements of ancient periods. These reconstructions created a sense of memory of times past among those performing rituals in spectacles in these particular spaces, reminding participants of their shared affiliation with that past. She notes importantly this strategy need not be centrally directed but may also be a strategy of resistance or provincial control, suggesting that these reconstructions were directed or influenced by local elites.

While energetics, resource control and allocation and ideological manipulation are important to the examination of these constructions and of empires themselves, limiting analysis to these factors misses the essence of what frequently transpires within them: dramatic ritual performance and the social action represented thereby. The effect of a dramatic presentation on an audience cannot be determined without consideration of the physical "theater" housing it. Consideration of a theater includes its performance characteristics or properties--size, shape, entrances and exits, location of the "stage", set, lighting,
sound, costumes, orientation, changes in elevation, audience capacity and viewing patterns of the spectators (Hall 1966, Carlson 1989, Moore 1996a:151-164, Inomata 2001, Pearson and Shanks 2001:127-28). Such spaces must also be viewed not only from the position of the “God’s eyes” (plan views) but also from those of performers and spectators in order to place these participants at the points of action and sensory perception (Bradley 1998:124, Pearson and Shanks 2001:134-35, Moore 1996a) Nor should analysis end at the theater door -its location within a settlement/city, the roads leading to it, and its relationship to other buildings and features are critical elements of the audience experience. Lastly, the examination must investigate the cultural meanings and social roles generated by and associated with performance and its settings predicated upon historical context (Schechner 1994, Barrett 1994, Bradley 1998).
Chapter 3: THE INKA EMPIRE-EXPANSION AND STRATEGY

The Inka Empire was a large and expansive state. In a 100-year period commencing around 1432, the polity expanded from one central highland Peruvian Valley to encompass most of Peru and Bolivia as well as portions of Ecuador, Colombia, Chile and Argentina (Figure 3.1). At its peak, the empire extended more than 4000 km in a north-south direction, and may have incorporated more than 1,000,000 km². Numerous different polities, ethnic groups and cultures were contained within its borders. The Inka empire was the largest in the pre-Hispanic western hemisphere.

The first written accounts of the Inka empire are the historical chronicles prepared primarily by the Spanish in the 16th and 17th century. These consist primarily of historical narratives (Betanzos 1996 [1551], Cobo 1979 [1653], 1990 [1653], Sarmiento de Gamboa 1999 [1572]), personal observations (Cieza 1959 [1552] Polo de Ondegardo 1990 [1571]) and Spanish administrative documents, primarily visitas, systematic household surveys containing demographic, economic and historical information (Murra 1991[1568], Diez de San Miguel 1964 [1567]). These sources, with a few exceptions (Tito Cusi Yupanqui 1973[1570], Pachacuti Yamqui 1967[1613], Guaman Poma de Ayala 1980[1613], Salomon 1982), were prepared by Spaniards based upon interviews with indigenous informants, primarily Inkas but also members of other ethnic groups.
Other than some of the visitas, almost all of these documents, particularly the better known ones such as Cieza’s travelogue, Sarmiento’s history, Cobo’s synthesis of prior sources, Guaman Poma’s illustration-filled chronicle and Garcilaso’s commentary (1609) were focused upon the Inka empire. Their authors described sites and buildings encountered, social structures and practices, and Inka dynastic history. Adapting their own perspective of empire based upon an idealized Spanish model and likely augmented by Cuzco-based informants, these chroniclers ignored differences in regional governance, control and strategies in favor of a view of the Inka empire as homogeneous, monolithic and directly controlled. Other cultural groups were mentioned fleetingly and primarily in connection with the architectural descriptions of their sites and buildings (e.g. Cieza’s descriptions of Pachacamac and Tiwanaku). Not surprisingly then, the Spanish viewed the Inka empire as centrally controlled and administered with uniform strategies of expansion and governance, a view that, as described below, continues to pervade Inka archaeology.

Almost all research on the Inkas conducted prior to the middle of the twentieth century is based on these historical documents (Malpass 1993:2, Morris 1988:233). Studies of the Inka empire of this period, which relied primarily on the Spanish chronicles, characterized the Inka empire as monolithic and dominated by a strong central government (Baudin 1928, Métraux 1970, D’Altroy 1987, Stanish 2001). Julian Steward (1946) further cemented this characterization with the publication of Volume 2 of the Handbook of South
American Indians, entitled “The Andean Civilization”, which included John
Rowe’s (1946) seminal work on the Inka.

Utilizing primarily the historical narratives and documents related to the
Cuzco region, John Rowe (1944, 1945, 1946) developed a chronology of Inka
expansion and detailed descriptions of Inka culture, the capital Cuzco and its
surroundings. He sifted through numerous documents, comparing them to one
and other as well their authors’ sources and biases to produce chronologies and
descriptions of Inka lives and resolve contradictory accounts. Although
recognizing that these chronicles represented an “official” version of Inka history,
Rowe (1945: 268) asserted that these accounts presented an accurate version of
dynastic succession and the order and attribution of conquests.

Rowe’s resultant descriptions and chronology, with minor modifications,
still form the basis of much Inka scholarship today, and the chronology has for
the most part been verified by carbon dating (Bauer 1992, D’Altroy 2002; but see
D’Altroy 2007, Covey 2006a). Utilizing similar historical methods with
archaeological data, Protzen (1993) and Niles (1993, 1999) have distinguished
the architectural style of Pachacuti, the 9th Inka ruler, with Huayna Capac, the
11th. Julien (1993) has suggested a relationship between Inka ceramic styles and
particular Inka rulers associated with imperial expansion, and both Rowe and the
Burgers identified Machu Picchu as a royal estate of the ruler Pachacuti (Rowe
archaeologists consider any issue of Inka archaeology without addressing and
incorporating Rowe’s work and those historical documents that are relevant to their research design.

The historical documents as well as this tradition of ethnohistorical work thus reinforced early perceptions of a monolithic and centrally controlled Inka empire. Dorothy Menzel’s work was seminal to changing this perception. Menzel’s (1959, 1960) analysis of ceramic forms and styles in the Ica and surrounding valleys at the time of Inka occupation demonstrated convincingly that the Inka utilized differential strategies of occupation and control in different locations, not to mention local strategies of resistance, appeasement and alliance. Menzel posited that the nature and method of Inka control in a given region depended upon the pre-existing political structure in such region, and proved her hypothesis that the Inka exercised control both directly and indirectly through an examination of architecture and particularly ceramic forms and style. Her work represented a turning point for regional studies of the Inkas and their expansion (Stanish 2001).

John Murra and his students brought a different perspective to Andean research that began to flourish in the 1960’s. Utilizing ethnohistoric sources (Murra 1991[1568], Diez de San Miguel 1964 [1567], Ortiz de Zuñiga 1967[1562]), Murra (1975, 1982) highlighted the role of existing Andean social structures and organizations in Inka governance. Murra (1956, 1985) argued that the Inka economy was predicated upon reciprocity and redistribution, rather than trade. Perhaps most importantly, he also developed the model of vertical
complementarity or archipelagos, pursuant to which social groups established settlements or colonies at different elevations in order to control and have access to differential resources (Murra 1975, 1980). Murra also argued that this indigenous model, as well as other social and economic practices, were widespread and crossed ethnic group lines, and inspiring archaeological and anthropological research to test the archipelago model as well as other aspects of Inka governance (Mayer 2002; Stanish 1992, 2003, Van Buren 1996). He suggested that Inka policies of indirect rule frequently led to little or no change for local populaces (Murra 1980[1956]). Murra, along with Donald Thompson and Craig Morris, initiated the Huánuco project (Morris and Thompson 1985, Morris et al 2011), the first large scale project to “systematically integrate historical and archaeological research in a regional study” (D’Altroy 2002:22)

Others have also utilized the localized sources popularized by Murra, such as Maria Rostworowski (1977, 1987, 1992, 1998), who compared the social organization of the central coast of Peru in highland and coastal zones, and demonstrated that there was more extensive specialization of production and intercommunity economic integration on the coast (D’Altroy 1987a). Frank Salomon (1986) analyzed the relationship between local Ecuadorian chiefs and the Inka central administration to highlight differential relationships of control, resistance and interaction across the empire. He also suggested that pochteca-like traders, known as mindalaes flourished in northern Ecuador even when under Inka rule. Several scholars have analyzed the movement of mitimaes and
the redistribution of land in the Cochabamba and Pocona regions of Bolivia (Wachtel 1982, Julien 1998, del Rio 2010). Archaeologists have utilized *visitas* to study changes in social organization of ethnic groups under Inka or Spanish control (D’Altroy 1987b, 1992, Sanchez 2008, Stanish 2000). The *visita*-based analyses provide insight into differential economic and power relations across the Andes, highlighting the trade relationships between and the competitive strategies of diverse ethnic groups.
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The historical sources for the most part treat Inka religious practice and performance as uniform throughout the empire, with some exceptions that will be discussed below. Few if any regional analyses have focused upon the central role of spectacle and ritual performance as a strategy of Inka governance and expansion, and whether and how such role varies across the empire. This dissertation will focus on exactly that issue, how the Inka utilized performance as a central strategy in their rapid growth, and whether such strategy was dependent upon local circumstances. Prior to considering such questions, I turned to various theoretical frameworks that have been utilized in anthropology and archaeology to discuss the role of performance within society.
Figure 3.1 Map of the Inka empire
Chapter 4: SPECTACLE, THEATRICALITY AND COMPLEXITY

The traditional focus among archaeologists on the development of administrative and economic systems diverted their attention from the roles of public ceremonies, rituals, and performance, which have often been considered epiphenomenal in terms of political organization (Inomata and Coben 2006:11). The effects and implications of such gatherings in the past deserve more earnest inquiries. Just think about the importance of dances in Puebloan societies and carnivals in Brazil. The sense of community, cultural values, and moral order in those societies can never be adequately understood without the consideration of such theatrical events. Public events and theatrical performance are important for the operation of any society, but have particularly critical implications and consequences for the development of centralized polities. Nowhere in the world did the development of a state equipped with impersonal, pragmatic bureaucracy and coercive, disciplinary force happen overnight, leaping directly from a small autonomous village, where the integration of which was based primarily on face-to-face contacts among its members. Michel Foucault (1977) suggested that antiquity was a civilization of spectacle whereas modernity is a society of discipline. Although perhaps a broad, overarching statement the development of large, centralized polities would have been impossible in any historical context without frequent public events, in which agents of political power presented
themselves in front of a large number of spectators and the participants shared experiences through their bodily co-presence.

Richard Schechner (1994:623) has suggested that an actor is a quasi-shaman, a person of power that serves as a conduit for energies liberated by the theatrical event. In many early societies, the roles of religious and political specialists may have overlapped significantly with those of actors in later societies. Even in modern states with highly developed administrative systems, physical enactments of political ideologies and public gatherings continued to play important roles. Many countries, including Britain and Japan, still retain monarchs that embody national identities. In the United States, which does not have such symbolic figures with deep historical roots, the president with the help of television and other modern technologies plays a significant role in public performance by enacting the ideology of the “American way.” President Ronald Reagan observed that he did not know how someone who had not been an actor could be president.

This dissertation constitutes an attempt to bring the question of theatrical performance back to the central stage of archaeological inquiry. I examine the political implications of theatrical performance that took place as spectacles and public events in complex societies, particularly empires. More specifically, I focus upon performances and events involving multiple individuals or groups, which form a process and arena of political and ideological negotiation, competition, and collaboration. Two issues emerge as critical questions in this study: 1) the
moral integration and identities of a community; and 2) the creation, maintenance, and subversion of asymmetrical power relations. The examination of these questions requires both a sound theoretical ground and sensitivity to historical particularity.

The study of performance has become an important theme in social sciences and humanities, although it is only recently that archaeologists have begun to realize the potential of such an approach. Anthropologists, sociologists, and linguists have become increasingly aware of theatricality in social life, and theater scholars have explored human interactions outside of formal theater buildings. This breakdown of disciplinary boundaries has created a confusing situation, in which the concepts of performance used by various scholars comprise a wide range of meanings. Dell Hymes (1975:13) once noted that cultural anthropologists and folklorists tended to confuse matters by lumping what interested them under the term “performance.”

A similar tendency appears to exist in recent archaeological studies. Restrictive, inflexible definitions of performance, however, are counter-productive. Concepts of performance remain fluid, but the fluidity should not become an excuse for conceptual sloppiness. In order to critically evaluate term, concepts, and underlying assumptions, I examine the focus several potential theoretical frameworks related to “performance.”
Performance, Theater, and Theatricality

At one end of the spectrum is the notion of performance as an enactment of what it refers to with an emphasis on what human beings do. This view is represented by the concept of performative utterance in speech act theory, which strongly influenced the analysis of performance by folklorists, anthropological linguists, and culture theorists (Bauman and Briggs 1990; Parker and Sedgwick 1995). As in the title of J. L. Austin’s (1962) classic book by it is about How to Do Things with Words. The utterance by a priest in a matrimonial rite, “I hereby pronounce you man and wife,” does not simply describe the situation but effects the marriage. Jacques Derrida (1988) and Judith Butler (1994, 1993) have further developed the concept of performativity, emphasizing its aspect of citationality. As she argues that genders are shaped through performative acts, Butler (1993:12-13, 225) characterizes a performative not as a singular act performed through the voluntary will or creativity of an individual, but as a citation of iterable, regulatory norms. Most performatives, such as legal sentences, have a binding power. According to her, as the judge cites the law to authorize and install the situation he or she names, the binding power of a performative derives from the citation of a norm. The regulatory force of a norm is rooted in its own historicity, that is, the repetition and accumulation of processes in which it is cited as a norm (see Joyce 2000, 2005; Meskell 1999, Voss 2008) for archaeological applications). By emphasizing citationality, Butler focuses upon the discursive
and explicitly plays down the theatrical aspect of performative acts (Taylor 2003:6), which is a central concern for many performance studies, including this dissertation.

Also found near this end of the continuum is a broad concept of performance that includes informal daily activities as forms of human interactions and self-presentations. Erving Goffman (1959, 1967) has defined performance as “all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some effect on the observers” (Goffman 1959:22). Ian Hodder (2006:82) defines not just performance but spectacle “as just a showing and a looking.” In this manner, Goffman and Hodder have explicitly associated social actions in everyday life with theatrical acts, both of which are essentially communicative and expressive acts involving the presence of performers and observers. Goffman has pointed out that a person’s identities are flexible and situational in the sense that in everyday life a person presents different identities and images as an actor takes different theatrical roles.

Building on the original idea proposed by Gregory Bateson, Goffman (1974) also developed the important concept of “frame,” that is, an interpretive framework created by some activities or messages that guide the understanding of other simultaneous or subsequent acts. In a theater, the raising and lowering of a curtain, allowing the audience to distinguish theatrical acts from others, often mark such frames. Beeman’s (2007:277) definition of performance requires that
it take place within a frame with clear and culturally defined boundaries. His examples include games, plays, ceremonies, rituals and sporting events. John Emigh (2002: 262-263) suggest that this theatrical frame also frees the audience from the vicissitudes of daily life to devote all of their sensory and cognitive faculties to a performance.

These and other anthropologists prefer narrower definitions of performance than Goffman and Hodder (MacAlloon 1984:6). Hymes (1975:13-19) has argued that performance is not merely behavior but “something creative, realized, achieved, even transcendent of the ordinary course of events,” which is interpretable, reportable, and repeatable within a domain of cultural intelligibility. In Hymes’s view, what makes performance is its qualities that are consciously recognized by performers and audiences themselves, whereas Goffman conceptualized performance as something that is not apparent to the actors themselves and that researchers as outsiders find by placing it in their analytical frameworks. Kaeppler (2010) notes that some actors in rituals may not understand what they are doing, only that they must do it. Hymes has also noted that performance is cultural behavior for which a person assumes responsibility to an audience. Certain ritual activities can be viewed as performance even when they do not involve the physical presence of an audience, if gods, supernaturals, or performers themselves take the real or symbolic role of an audience (Schechner 1988:30). Thus, performance is a mode of communicative behavior (Bauman 1989).
The other end of the spectrum encompasses highly circumscribed and prescribed acts in formalized theaters, in which the performers and audience are consciously concerned with the theatricality of the acts and settings. Richard Schechner (1977:75; 1988:6-16; 1994) has written extensively on the characteristics of theater in comparison with other types of performance, such as rituals, sports, and games. According to him, theater requires the physical presence of an audience who are observers and evaluators, whereas ritual often involves the audience as more active participants who sing, dance, pray or present offerings. Another defining feature of theater is its focus on symbolic reality, in which the performers represent themselves in roles detached from their lives outside the performance (Beeman 1993:379). As Erika Fischer-Lichte (1992: 139-140; 1995) notes, theater has its own semiotic system that utilizes signs made available by a specific culture as its own. Alan Read (1993:10) adds that theater is an expressive practice through the medium of images at the center of which is the human body.

In contrast to the notion of institutionalized theater in modern societies in which most if not all of these characteristics are prominent, I would define theatricality as a more ambiguous, inclusive concept that suggests the degree to which some of these characteristics of theater are present in social action and practice. Hence, theatricality is prevalent in human life outside the walls of a theater. A requisite of theatricality is the physical presence of an audience. An audience often has multiple roles of observers, evaluators, and participants, and
even a part of the performing group can serve as an audience and vice versa (Beeman 1993:383-384, Dabashi 2005). These participants participate in a feedback or “performance loop”, with performers seeking to alter the state of consciousness of an audience while the audience’s reaction effects the performer (Beeman 2007:276). Thus, one dimension of theatricality concerns the comparative weight of observer and evaluator-roles of the audience. This relates closely to another dimension of theatricality, the level of emotional responses, if not entertainment, that performance triggers in the participants and audience. Although theatricality is often associated with the positive elevation of emotions (Beeman 2007), the spectacle of terror is also possible. Emotional responses of the participants and audience are never homogeneous, and they may at once involve positive and negative feelings, as well as disinterest (Schechner 1977). Another necessary condition of theatricality is the use of material images in dynamic motion as media of expression and communication. The human body takes a central role in this process. Although such animated objects as puppets, statues, and floats may take important parts, it is ultimately the human body that produces such motions and senses them. Finally, the dimension of symbolic reality is not a categorical marker of theatricality. As Goffman has demonstrated, a certain level of role-playing takes place in day-to-day interactions. In this sense, theatricality refers to the density, rather than the presence or absence, of signs used in a way comparable to formal theater (Pavis 1998:395). Theatricality is a critical concept in examining the communicative potentials of performance, the
construction of its meaning, and the emotional impacts on participants. It follows that the political implications of performance, in terms of the reproduction of power relations, the negotiation of ideologies, and the constitution of a community, as discussed below, are closely, but never in a straightforward manner, related to its theatricality.

My focus here seeks to utilize these diverse theoretical views, but tailored specifically for the issues of power and community. In this regard, Hymes's definition of performance provides a useful conceptual basis. I seek to address performance in this sense, considering public rituals, ceremonies, festivals, and elite interactions, which fall between the two extremes of the conceptual continuum. With the forgoing definition of theatricality in mind, I refer to these acts as theatrical performance. An important goal of my work is to examine political implications of theatrical performance that are culturally recognized by actors and viewers. My intention is not to demarcate the categorical boundaries of our inquiry. By using the term theatrical performance, I suggest a rather arbitrary degree of theatricality. Moreover, the social significance of any performance, from the broadest end of the conceptual spectrum encompassing daily practice or the narrowest end focusing on formal theater, is rooted in both its performativity and theatricality.

Spectacles and Public Events

While the foregoing discussion of the conceptual spectrum of performance crosscuts diverse sizes and forms of theatrical events, the scale of interactions,
including the number of participants, is also an important dimension of performance. In this regard, one end of this continuum represented by the concepts of spectacle and public event figures prominently in this dissertation. The primary feature of the spectacle is a gathering centered around theatrical performance of a certain scale in clear spatial and temporal frames, in which participants witness and sense the presence of others and share a certain experience (MacAlloon 1984b:243-246). The scale and grandeur of spectacles are not absolute measurements, but depend on the expectations of the participants and the cultural values of the themes presented in these events as shaped in specific social and historical contexts.

This definition of spectacle derives partly from the work of MacAlloon (1984b), but there are some differences. According to MacAlloon, the defining features of spectacle include: the primary of visual sensory; its certain size and grandeur; the institutionalization of distinct roles of actors and audience; its dynamic form, demanding movement and action; and participation by choice as opposed to duty as in the case of ritual. MacAlloon’s view seems too restrictive, reflecting his focus on the modern spectacle of Olympic games, as well as the etymology and common usages of the English word. For premodern societies, I prefer a broader concept of spectacle. In many traditional societies the distinction between duty and choice regarding rituals and other public events was not always clear-cut (Kaeppler 2010). In addition, as seen in carnivals and other festivals, a strict division between performers and spectators is not always a
defining feature of spectacle. I also place a less emphasis on the visual sensory as a distinctive feature of spectacles. The primacy of vision is often derivative of the scale of events, in which visual images are generally more effective means of communication to distant audiences than sounds and smells. With the help of modern technologies, such events as rock concerts that maintain the primacy of auditory sense can exhibit qualities comparable to spectacles in premodern societies.

Spectacles in this sense comprise many types of rituals, ceremonies, parades, public presentations, festivals, athletic events, and public execution and torture, which overlap significantly with what Don Handelman (1990) calls “public events” (Beeman 1993:380). Because the central figures or protagonists of public events are always highly conscious of the way they present themselves, such occasions inevitably involve certain elements of theatricality. Stephen Houston (2006:135) suggests that spectacles should induce “large reactions” and involve sensory overload. I deliberately use the terms of spectacle and public event rather than ritual or ceremony (and even when using the latter two terms I am talking about rituals and performances that are also spectacles and public events) to which anthropologists and archaeologists are more accustomed. In this way, I am able more to apply recent developments in performance theory, theater studies, and dramaturgic analysis to my archeological context, and also consider the common qualities and political implications shared among certain rituals and other types of spectacles (Moore and Myerhoff 1977).
Again, by primarily addressing spectacles and larger scale event I am not making a categorical typology. Rather, I emphasize that the physical forms and settings of a theatrical event are as important as the meaning of performance, as discussed in more detail below. My focus on large-scale events does not mean that I privilege them over smaller ones in terms of political significance. In this regard, I note certain parallels between the study of spectacle and the more traditional interests of archaeologists in monuments and monumental buildings. The social importance of monumental constructions, as well as that of spectacle, derives partly from their large labor investment (Trigger 1990), and the construction of such architecture creates spectacle of itself with planning and managing organizations (Mendelssohn 1974; Baines 2006). As monuments provide stages for theatrical events, their physical presence creates ordered space that defines social relations of participants (Barrett 1994:57-58; Bradley 1998; Thomas 1999:228-229, Wright 2007). Moreover, monuments mediate the construction and negotiation of the meaning associated with landscape and time in a unique manner comparable to spectacle, because of its extraordinary nature distinct from buildings tied to daily lives (Bradley 1993, Wright 2007).

Communicative and Creative Qualities of Performance

I seek to examine theatrical performance and spectacles not as a closed system of their own aesthetics, but as political actions in a broad social context. I explore how such acts and events relate to the domains of social relations and the perceptions of society. Important issues in this analysis include the process
of communication through performance and the process in which performance create identities and social relations.

*Communication, Meaning, and Structure*

Many early studies of ritual and related subjects dichotomized thought and action, and usually assigned the causal primacy to the former (Bell 1997:ix, Fogelin 2007). For example, Mircea Eliade (1978) proposed that ritual was a secondary reenactment of mythical events and stories told in a preexisting myth. The structuralism of Claude Lévi-Strauss (1969) examined the underlying, abstract structures that were generative of human behavior and organization. Thus, the focus in these studies was to read messages and symbols encoded in ritual and to uncover defining structures hidden under observable behavior. Such tendencies are also seen in pioneering work that later led to the development of performance theory. In his “dramatistic” approach to human interactions, Kenneth Burke (1945) focused on the human intent to affect others through symbolic action. His emphasized motives that made meaningful symbolic acts. Likewise, Goffman (1959, 1967) addressed the shifting images and roles of an individual managed by him or her, under which the existence of a stable inner core was assumed (MacAloon 1984a:7). Most scholars, however, have acknowledged that the meanings of ritual and other acts are highly complex. Victor Turner (1967:50), in particular, has argued that ritual performance is multivocal, representing different meanings for different people and in different situations. Schechner (1994:621) has also pointed out that the interpretation of performance often falls
into the trap of attributing some meaning that belongs to the interpreter’s own deeply held prior narratives. Stanley Tambiah (1979:124) and Valerio Valeri (1985:344-345) go further to contend that ritual does not communicate concepts in any direct manner or by conventional means.

Recent studies focus on the way ritual and other types of performance communicate. Valeri (1985:344), for examples, has suggested that ritual produces knowledge by producing model experiences, because it reproduces dispositions that are at the same time bodily, emotional, and mental. Some scholars turned to semiotics as a theoretical tool, employing Charles Sanders Pierce’s concepts of three types of signs: icons that involve formal resemblance, such as some road signs; indices that involve physical or actual connection, such as smoke for fire; and symbols that involve conventional associations, such as most words (Eco 1977; Elam 1980; Fischer-Lichte 1992; Parmentier 1994:129-134, 1997; Shoaps 2009:461). These approaches have recently converged toward a view that ritual contains a greater semiotic density than other human activities, involving interaction and relationships between indexical and iconic signs (Stasch 2011:160-161). According to Tambiah (1979:124), ritual produces indexical signs in structured patterns that lead the participant to reproduce concepts in their mind. I will address Peirce and semiotic approaches in more detail later. Roy Rappaport (1999:52-53; see also Robbins 2001) has argued that ritual communicates two types of messages: self-referential messages on the current physical and psychic states of the performer though indices; and
canonical messages, independent of the performer, about the nature of the world through symbols. Scholars also point out unique potentials of non-verbal communication through bodily performance. Seeing is believing. Images do not deceive while words can be easily manipulated (Rappaport 1999). Thus, theatrical performance may sometimes have more persuasive power than verbal communication. Moreover, bodily performance and music may be viewed as a more effective way to communicate with deities, supernaturals, and natural beings that do not talk to humans verbally (Basso 1985).

**Practice, Experience, and Creative Processes**

The study of performance now emphasizes more strongly its creative quality. Performance does not only communicate concepts but creates identities for the participants (both performers and audience) and constructs the world in which they live. Performance is not only a mode of communication but also a mode of social action. We need to focus on the active creation of meaning, identities, cognitive models, and social relations through the experience of doing and seeing (Palmer and Jankowiak 1996). An earlier version of such a view can be found among Cambridge classicists, including Jane Ellen Harrison (1962[1912]), who argued that myths, as well as Greek theater and Olympic games, originated in rituals. Also relevant is Victor Turner’s (1957, 1972) idea that rituals are social dramas with an emphasis on dynamic processes--rather than static structures--of social relations that unfold in ritual. In this sense,
performance is not just a mirror of social change but creates change (Schechner 1994:626-632).

Inspirations come from theories of performativity and practice. Some studies of ritual have explicitly applied the Austinian concept of performativity. Tambiah (1979), for example, emphasizes the performatory quality of ritual, by suggesting that symbolic expressions in ritual simultaneously create the sense of reality and act upon the real world as the participants experience it. In Maurice Bloch’s (1974:59-60) view, ritual creates and maintains a certain type of power relations among the participants not by transmitting messages but by catching them in a highly formalized situation that gives no options to challenge authority except by its total refusal. Many recent studies have contradicted Bloch’s statement that ritual’s formulaic nature prevent or impedes thought or agency (Stasch 2011).

Practice theory proposes that larger structures play out and are reproduced through social practices (Bourdieu 1977). In this theoretical framework, Marshall Sahlins’s (1985) analysis of Hawaiian ritual through the death of Captain Cook and Sherry Ortner’s (1978, 1989) study of Buddhist ritual among the Sherpas show how ritual practices mediate between enduring structures and the tensions of a particular situation, although they do not emphasize the term performance. Catherine Bell (1992, 1997:72-83, 1998) explicitly employs performance and practice theories and argues that the central quality of ritual is the primacy of the body that, through its movement and senses,
not only experiences and receives the values ordering the environment but simultaneously defines and imposes such values. Bruce Kapferer (2004) builds on practice theory through a focus on what he calls ritual dynamics, suggesting that the preparation, rehearsal and performance (though he does not employ that term) provides much of ritual’s transformative power.

Several scholars have recently explored the role of the senses in performance, particularly the auditory and visual. Drobnick (2004:10) describes a proliferation of studies about sound as an “sonic turn” that explores “the increasing significance of the acoustic as simultaneously a site for analysis, a medium for aesthetic engagement, and a model for theorization”. (See Samuels et al 2010 for a review of soundscape studies in anthropology). Archaeologists have produced soundscapes of building complexes (Kolar et al in press), outdoor platforms (Meddens et al 2011), considered the role of drums in spectacles (Moore 2006c) and more broadly sought to analyze soundscapes (Moore 2005) and create an archaeology of acoustics (Scarre and Lawson 2006). Sight has been and remains the most explored sense both generally and performatically (Porcello et al 2011). Drobnick (2005, 2006) has suggested considering the olfactory properties of buildings and spaces, a proxemics of smell. Somatic memories of performance help form power relations (Hamilakis 2002). Other scholars do not consider the senses individually but consider the multisensioral nature of ritual performance (Rick 2005, Howes 2005)
With the emphasis on the experiential aspect of theatrical events, scholars have also directed their attentions to the physical and sensual reality of performing, addressing the concepts of kinesthesia (Connelly 2011), the sensations experienced by the body in movement, and synaesthesia, a stimulus in one sense inducing sensations in other senses (Schechner 1977:99-107; Sullivan 1986:6-8).

Another related issue is the process of preparation and rehearsal. Although anthropologists traditionally focused on performance in ritual or other events, Schechner (1985; 1994:641-643) has shown that rehearsal processes have their own structures and affect relationships among the participants. The cultural importance of carnivals and other festivals, for examples, derives not only from the magnificence of the finished products but also from the long process of preparation.

The Study of Performance

Early studies of ritual and other performance categories tended to emphasize what specific performances meant. While most types of performance have some conventional meaning shared by multiple individuals, they also are multivocal and ambiguous at deeper levels. An important lesson of recent developments in performance theory is to focus more on how theatrical events communicate, how they generate meaning, and how different meanings are negotiated among participants, rather than simply assume the preexistence of fixed meaning. Such examination must include the formal properties of theatrical
events, rather than privileging meaning at the expense of form. While one should not connect certain forms of events with specific political effects in a straightforward manner, it is equally problematic to underestimate the political and social significance of the formal characteristics of theatrical events.

One must analyze the physical acts of performance and its material and social settings. This analysis should consider how such formal processes and characteristics of theatrical events shape, and are shaped by, meaning and emotion. This view also presents important methodological implications for archaeologists. The form, context, and process of theatrical events are accessible through archaeological research. By confronting the social significance of these aspects of performance, one can begin to explore how people create and negotiate meaning through their actions.

*Performance, Community and Politics*

The creation and enactment of cultural and moral values through performance take place in a wide range of occasions and contexts. Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Judith Butler (1990, 1994), in particular, have emphasized the importance of rather unconscious, routine daily practices that shape social relations. Under influence of these theories, archaeologists have recently directed a significant effort to the study of ordinary, daily lives. While fully embracing the significance of such an approach (Hodder 2006), highly conscious acts in extraordinary circumstances, particularly those that contrast with and diverge from daily activities, are equally important in shaping the operation and
organization of society. Time and space in traditional societies should not be considered homogeneous, monotonous continua (Bradley 1998:85-100). Spectacles and other public events may provide moments of disjunction from daily routines (Van Gennep 1960; Turner 1972). Practices by sovereigns and courtiers, while often representing the exemplary center of society, also frequently emphasize detachment from the norms of the rest of society. Whereas daily practices reflect--and create--larger structures usually in subtle manners, such extraordinary events and actors ostentatiously dramatize and play out the moral and aesthetic values of a society, and the participants often enact and experience ideologies, cultural ideals, and traditions in uniquely explicit ways (Singer 1959). Theatrical performances and spectacles in premodern societies comprise a wide range of activities and occasions, such as polity-wide gatherings with the ruler as the protagonist or sponsor, diplomatic ceremonies involving multiple political units, courtly activities with a relatively small audience, religious rites detached from governmental institutions, festivals at the village level, and pilgrimages that draw numerous participants of diverse political and social affiliations. These events have profound implications for the understanding of any society, particularly in terms of the integration of communities and the establishment and maintenance of asymmetrical power relations, which are intricately intertwined with each other.
Community

Benedict Anderson (1991:6) argues that “all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined,” in the sense that the members never know most of their fellow members or meet them, yet they bear the image of their communion. No such things as “true” communities exist. The concept of an imagined community implies contradictions and fluidity in identities, expectations, and perceptions of their members. How do a group of people come to bear the image of a community in their mind and to exhibit a certain level of order and coherence in their conduct, while still comprising internal heterogeneity and inconsistency? Anderson (1991:12-19, 37-46) privileges the role of written media both for the rise of modern nationalism and for the preceding religious communities of Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism. In particular, the sacred script of religious communities bound peoples of different languages and customs across time and space. In the premodern world, however, numerous imagined communities developed without the help of writings (Canuto and Yaeger 2000). Anderson (1991:19-36) adds two more elements that underlie premodern imagined communities: the belief that society was naturally organized around divine centers and monarchs, and the mythical concept that merges the origins of the world and humans. We, however, know that the authenticity of rulership and cosmology cannot be taken for granted. How does the legitimacy of sovereign and myth come to take hold of people’s minds?
No organization can exist without associated symbols, which give concrete, sensible forms to community identities (Kertzer 1988:15). In this regard, spectacles ostentatiously dramatize the central value of a community and present it in sensible forms. Milton Singer (1959, 1972) most clearly articulated the role of such events in his concept of cultural performance. According to Singer (1959:xii, 1972), cultural performance embodies central symbolic aspects of a cultural tradition, such as weddings, temple festivals, dances, and musical concerts, in which the cultural content of a tradition is organized and transmitted through specific cultural media and human carriers. They are reflexive occasions for the participants, for they can stand back and consider their identities, actions, and ideas (Turner 1986b:24). Roberto Da Matta’s (1984) study of Brazilian carnival and Handelman’s (1990:116-135) analysis of Palio of Siena have shown that, through these unique qualities of spectacles, people and communities reconstitute themselves. Kapferer (2004) suggests that the separation of ritual performance from the broader world creates the space and power for these potential reconstitutions. Moreover, Paul Connerton (1989:41-71) has argued that what he calls commemorative ceremonies through bodily enactment by participants sustain the social memory of a community.

These arguments of the community integration and the perpetuation of its cultural values owe much to Emil Durkheim (1965), who proposed that ritual brings together individuals as a collective group and strengthens their bonds to a society through the experience of collective representation and an appeal to
communal emotion. Numerous scholars followed, reworked and elaborated upon Durkheim’s thesis. While retaining the essential idea of Durkheim, Max Gluckman (1963:126-131) and Turner (1957, 1972) have emphasized the social tensions expressed through ritual. Turner (1972), with inspiration from Van Gennep (1960), has argued that ritual presents the state of liminality, or anti-structure that detaches people from the normal social order, and creates what he calls communitas. Ritual, according to Turner, is the process of recreation of a community rather than the simple perpetuation of its solidarity, involving possibilities for change. Ritual does not merely communicate or reflect social relations, it is critical to their production (Swenson 2011:287).

E. E. Evans-Pritchard (1974:207-208), however, criticized Durkheim, arguing that people participating in ritual display a variety of feelings, including indifference, instead of a unified collective emotional ethos. Evans-Pritchard argued that what was paramount was that the essential acts of ritual be carried out. Tambiah (1979:124) also suggests that ritual does not directly evoke communal emotions but it affords the participants intense experience that reproduces concepts and implicit understanding in their mind. The ambiguity of meaning and the uncertainty of effects are indeed critical aspects of ritual and other public events (Fernandez 1972; Kertzer 1988:57-76; MacAloon 1984a:9). Bell (1992:221-222) points out that ritual tolerates a fair degree of internal resistance and indifference among the participants, while requiring their external consent, though participants are normally required to pay attention (Handelman
Ritual becomes effective because it grounds and displays a sense of community without overriding the autonomy of individuals. In this regard, David Kertzer (1988:76) reminds us of the original argument by Durkheim that people acting together, not people thinking together, produce solidarity.

The social effects of spectacle derive partly from the physical co-presence of participants, whether as performers, audience members, or both. Human sociality and identity are rooted in our sensory perceptions of the presence and actions of others. Not only do gatherings facilitate opportunities for exchanging goods, communicating information, and finding mates, but they create moments of something closest to “true” communities, in which a large number of individuals sense and witness the bodily existence and participation of other members. Performance on such occasions creates objectifications of experience that makes it accessible to others by transcending the limitations of individual experience (Rogers 1999:5). Public events thus do not simply express the solidarity of a group but they make a community. Communal identities associated with theatrical events are not the expressions of deeply held inner cores of community members but practical accomplishments achieved by means of performance, witnessing, and participation (Rogers 1999:9-10). Preparation and rehearsal leading to the final performance are also important parts of this process. It follows that the authenticity of community traditions and memories is not a timeless entity reenacted in spectacles (Anderson 1991; Hobsbawn and
Rogers 1983; Rockefeller 1999:123). Authenticity is something imagined, something created and recreated through the repetition of performance (Bailey 1996:13). Performance thus has the potential not only of maintaining collective identities but also of transforming them, subverting them, and resisting them.

Although Anderson stresses the importance of written media for the creation of imagined communities, Kertzer (1988) demonstrates that ritual and bodily performance play critical roles even in political organizations of the modern world. I suggest that in premodern societies without writing systems or with a large portion of the population being illiterate, theatrical performance may have had even greater social effects. On a relatively small spatial and demographic scale, we need to examine the centripetal force of spectacle that brings people together beyond the limitations of groups based on daily face-to-face contact. On a larger scale, we should explore the potentials and limitations of theatrical performance in reaching different ethnic groups beyond cultural and linguistic barriers (Futrell 1997).

*Domination and Resistance*

The importance of spectacles in creating a community suggest their potential as tools for ideological and political unification and thus for domination. As Adolf Hitler chillingly pointed out, no government can rule by force alone. Any form of power relation necessitates constant affirmation and maintenance through the acts of performance and witnessing (Scott 1990:49). Ideologies that underlie social relations do not appear from thin air, but need to be generated
and maintained through practice. While this is true for any society, such processes for the maintenance of power relations are particularly important for the understanding of premodern societies. Many early polities, even ones that may be called states, probably lacked coercive force to control their entire population effectively. Some early anthropological theories overstated the importance of physical force (e.g., Carneiro 1970). Although warfare and coercive force are critical aspects of virtually all centralized societies, the subordinates in many cases still had an option of fleeing from the spheres of dominant power when subjected to excessive oppression. In addition, military force of states or other centralized political institutions was often directed toward other polities, and a larger concern for central authorities of many early polities was to attract their followers (e.g., Tambiah 1976). Many early states did not have a developed bureaucracy, and the royal court operated as the main apparatus of administration and domination primarily through fluid personal relations (Elias 1983; Inomata and Houston 2001). For such political institutions, one cannot overemphasize the importance of performance in establishing, affirming, manipulating, and maintaining power relations between elites and non-elites, as well as among elites themselves (e.g., Brown and Elliott 1980). Foucault (1977:187) notes that in premodern Europe, before the technologies of discipline developed, state power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested.
Many studies concerning the relationship between theatrical performance and politics draw to varying degrees on Marxist theory. Elizabeth DeMarrais and colleagues (1996) have argued that public performance materializes ideologies by giving them concrete forms, thereby facilitating the propagation of dominant ideologies across space and social groups. John Baines and Norman Yoffee (1998:235) have proposed that courtly performance constitutes part of what they term high culture, the production and consumption of aesthetic items for and by the top elites, through which they appropriate meaning. These views emphasize theatrical performance for and by the dominants as conveyors of their versions of worldviews, history, cultural ideals, value systems, and social order, which serve to define and maintain structured social relations among different classes, genders, and interest groups (Demarest 1992). Such messages from the dominant are delivered through the centripetal forces of spectacles, wrapped in the attractions and excitements of theatrical performance. The conspicuous consumption of material goods that often accompanies theatrical performance may also help impress the subjects and force them into the debt of the dominants (Clark and Blake 1994; Hayden and Gargett 1990).

While the dominant used theatrical display for their political purposes in many historical contexts, rituals and public events rarely work in so unambiguous ways. The inherent multivocality of theatrical signs makes the propagation of dominant ideologies difficult, if not impossible. James Scott (1990:77-90) contends that the subordinate rarely subscribes blindly to dominant ideologies.
The weak may give the appearance of hegemonic submission in public, but they often show acts and voices of disobedience behind the scene. According to Scott (1990:2-19), the “public transcript” enacted on public stages is the presentation of elites as they want themselves to be seen. Both elites and non-elites have their own “hidden transcripts” played out off stage, which diverge from and contradict the public transcript. The gray area between the public and hidden transcripts is a critical arena of political struggles where subordinates express their defiance through disguise and anonymity. The weak may even take advantage of the public transcript that presents elites as their benefactors. The primary purpose of the public transcript, Scott (1990:67-69) argues, is not to gain the agreement of subordinates but rather to awe and intimidate them into a durable and expedient compliance. The dominant is also an audience of the performance of the public transcript, which works as a kind of self-hypnosis within ruling groups to back up their courage, to improve their cohesion, and to convince themselves anew of their high moral purpose. The rupture of the public transcript may become evident, according to Scott (1990:172-175; see also Bakhtin 1968; Kertzer 1988:144-150), in carnivals and similar public events, in which the populace is released from the normal social order and openly expresses dissents from and resentments toward the dominant. In addition, some theatrical events, particularly when conducted by subjugated or excluded subsections of a society, may generate powerful forms of resistance, as seen in the cases of cargo cults and ghost dances. In short, Scott examines the ambiguity and multiple voices
involved in performance, yet he still sees the public transcript essentially as a tool of the elite.

A different approach is seen in the study of divine kingship following the tradition originating from James Fraser (1925). In this view, the ruler, as well as other elites, are also bound by royal ceremonialism and the notion of divine kingship. The primacy of kingship over the king is epitomized in the practice of regicide: the ruler who embodies the well-being of the kingdom must remain strong; thus the ruler must be killed when he or she becomes ill or weak (Feeley-Harnik 1985). Fraser examined the Babylonian rituals of Akitu and Sakaia, in which the ruler was slapped and humiliated, the roles of slaves and masters switched, and a criminal was put on the throne only to be killed later. Fraser interpreted this ritual as representing the theme of regicide, in which the king is killed symbolically. Although many scholars question the evidentiary bases of these Babylonian rituals, similar practices can be found ethnographically. Evans-Pritchard (1964:205-206) noted that in the accession ceremony of the king of the Shilluk in Sudan, the new king conducts a mock battle with the army of the cultural hero, Nykang, in which the king is defeated; thus kingship captures the king. The Shilluk are also said to have practiced regicide. In the royal ceremony of Ncwala of the Swazi kingdom, normal behavior becomes taboo. The main theme of the sacred songs in this ritual is hatred of the king and the rejection of the king by the people (Kuper 1961:197-225). There has been much debate about the reality of regicide and the interpretation of the Ncwala ceremony (e.g.,
Beidelman 1966; Gluckman 1963:119-225; Lincoln 1987). Nonetheless, these examples show that carnivalesque attitudes can appear even in the public transcript sponsored by the dominant elite. The liminal sphere created through rituals is potentially dangerous for the dominant, as daily social structures may be challenged, threatened, or subverted, at least temporarily. Moreover, the sovereign and other elites may be prisoners of cultural traditions and royal ceremonialism. As much as theatrical pageants are the rights and tools of the ruler and courtiers, they are their duties. In many societies, politically dominant groups do not always cunningly manipulate ideologies through spectacles, but they are also bound by their system of cultural and aesthetic values (Bloch 1986:177; Inomata and Houston 2001).

Another important analytical perspective emphasizes the power and effect of theatrical performance to define political reality and social relations (Turner 1967). In this approach, theatrical performance is not empty ritual behind which the real mechanism of power works. Performance itself is a critical part of politics (Bell 1992:197-223; Kertzer 1988:77-101). Mary Douglas (1966:62) suggests that social rituals create a reality that would be nothing without them, for it is impossible to have social relations without symbolic acts. Bourdieu (1977:95) argues that in daily interactions the concessions of politeness always contain political concessions, and thus such symbolic acts shape political relations.

Bloch (1974:59-60) has suggested that the formalized discourse of ritual, which does not allow deviation, creates and maintains what Max Weber called
traditional authority. Clifford Geertz (1980:123-135) goes further to claim that theatrical performance *is* the politics. He argues that in historical Bali, theatrical performance was the state’s primary purpose. In this view, the elaborate and stupendous dramatization of cultural themes through royal ceremonies was not a means to a political end, but the end itself. Thus, Geertz has advocated the poetics or aesthetics of power rather than the Weberian notion of the mechanics of power (see Smith 2000, 2006; Reese-Taylor and Koontz 2001 for archaeological applications).

In the context of emergent centralized polities, the preparation of large-scale spectacles, along with the construction of theatrical space, may also promote the development of hierarchical organization by requiring dramaturgical and logistical organizers (Hill and Clark 2001). In addition, ritual specialists always have potentials to become politically powerful figures through their appropriation of means of symbolic production and objectification (Moore 2005).

The opposing themes regarding spectacle and theatrical performance--the appropriation of meaning by dominant groups versus multivocality, the imposition of asymmetrical structures versus the liminal subversion of the daily order, and the theater for the state versus the state for the theater--should not be considered as alternative, mutually-incompatible models. Rather, they are the co-existing aspects of every society. The inherent ambiguity in its meaning and effect suggests the paradox of theatrical performance: that even those designed for the purpose of the dominant simultaneously empower those who are to be
subjugated through emotional elevation, the affirmation of their social identities, and the renewed affinities to a community (Fernandez 1972). Theatrical performance does not work for the effect of asymmetrical power relations if it is perceived as not amenable to some degree of individual appropriation (Bell 1992:207, 221-222). The analytical task is to examine how such multiple dimensions of spectacles and theatrical performance articulate with each other in specific social and historical contexts.

*Into the Ancient Theater*

The analysis of theatrical performances poses a challenge to archaeologists who cannot directly observe such actions. Yet, in the last few decades such other "unobservable" subjects as meaning, ideology, and identity have become central concerns for archaeological studies (Demarest 1992; Hodder 1982; Miller and Tilley 1984; Claessen and Oosten 1996). The study of theatrical performance places a stronger emphasis on physical acts and the immediacy of material presence, which should be more directly accessible through archaeological research than abstract concepts. Three issues are particularly important for this purpose: theatrical space, images, and objects used in performance. These issues converge at the questions of social contexts and effects.

*Performance and Material Culture*

Schechner (1994:618-620) observed that the theater is a cultural place, which obtains meanings through performances that takes place there and evokes
the memory of past events and thus prior experience, ideological messages, and power relations (Coben 2006). The natural landscape can be transformed into a theater by means of the enactment of theatrical themes and the attachment of the lore of performance by ancestors (Schechner 1994:618). The construction of theatrical space, including plazas, certain types of temples, and palaces, is a critical part of preparation for theatrical events. In premodern societies, builders of such architecture were often participants in and audience of spectacles rather than disinterested contract workers. Thus, the estimate of labor investment and the cycle of its renovation should not be overlooked in examining the social implications of theatrical events. Moreover, the scale, location, and distribution of such buildings in relation to other structures point to the political importance of theatrical events.

Whether one takes a phenomenological approach or a more “scientific” one, an essential component of the analysis of performance and theatrical space is the human body as the point of action and sensory perception (Moore 1996a:153-167; Pearson and Shanks 2001:134-135; Tilley 1994:16). Such spaces must be seen not only from the position of the “God’s eyes” (plan views) but also from those of performers and spectators (Bradley 1998:124). Three-dimensional reconstruction of theatrical space with computers is significant in this regard (Coben and Boulifard 2006). Proxemics developed by Edward Hall (1966; see Moore 1996a:153-164; Pearson and Shanks 2001:127-128) also presents a useful tool. According to Hall, the spatial setting, particularly the distance
between the performers and audience, defines what kinds of communicative acts—verbal and musical performance, facial expressions, and body movements—were within the capability of human perception. More specific analysis of spatial configurations, including stages, backdrops, lighting, visibility, and acoustics, help understand the theatrical effects and actual communicative potential of certain performance (Carlson 1989). The size and configuration of space provide a basis for estimating the number of performers and audience, which is a critical parameter in examining the political implications of theatrical events (Bradley 1998:101-115; Moore 1996a:151-153). Moreover, the analysis of visibility between the stage and audience, between performers, and between spectators, provide clues to the nature of performance and to the intended audience (Inomata 2001). Analyses of sound in performance spaces have similar potential benefits (Meddens et al 2011, Kolar et al in press).

Images of performance preserved as sculptures, figurines, murals, or ceramic paintings provide specific information on certain aspects of theatrical performance, including the identities of performers, the appearance and posture of actors, the spatial settings of performance, and the emic notions of sensory perceptions (e.g. Miller 1986; Houston and Taube 2000, Smith 2006). Any representations involve elements of idealized notions of theatrical performance, which may hinder our access to the reality of historical events, but may provide clues to cultural notions and ideals in this matter. In addition, graphic representations may be intended as the documentation of specific historical
events, serving as the means for reexperiencing theatrical acts or for engraving ephemeral theatrical experiences perpetually in the personal and social memory (Bergman 1999:14). Certain iconographic depictions may have served as guides for future performances. As the analysis of rehearsal is an indispensable part of theater studies, it is equally important to examine processes after theatrical events, that is, how people remembered them and how people maintained or changed their meaning. In this regard, we should note that the production and exhibit of images also constitute performance.

Material objects are often important components of theatrical presentation. Like theatrical spaces and images, such materials may serve as repositories of narrative and practical knowledge associated with theatrical events. These artifacts, however, are rarely left on the localities of performance, which may pose difficulties for archaeological research. The identification and analysis of certain objects used in theatrical events may require the help of iconographic or documentary evidence. Yet, performance paraphernalia found in storage, domestic, or mortuary contexts may provide information on performers, sponsors, and their assistants.

*Social Contexts and Effects*

The inquiry into the political implications and effects of theatrical events needs to be based on a contextualized understanding of the nature and settings of such events. Superficially similar performances with comparable scripts, choreography, and backdrops may deliver significantly different meanings and
effects in different social circumstances. Awareness of and sensitivity to cultural and intersubjective diversity is critical. Instead of assuming the pre-existence of fixed meanings, our study should be directed toward the questions of: how spectacles provide an arena for the creation of and resistance to dominant discourse; how different groups and individual use theatrical performance and are bound by its traditions and its performative effects; and in what social contexts such events have social and political effects.

One important question in the study of social contexts and effects of theatrical events is the relations among participants and the roles they play. In certain theatrical events, the roles of the participants as performers and spectators, and thus the division between them, are relatively well defined. On other occasions, where such roles are not clearly predetermined, a person can potentially assume diverse or multiple roles, or indeed the classification may be without merit. In certain societies participants may not be restricted to humans. Supernaturals, ancestors, animals, architecture, and objects may take central roles as either performers or audience. In many religious ceremonies, deities and the dead often constitute the primary audience, and human spectators become critical participants in the performance. Without the active participation of human viewers, the communication with supernaturals may be unsuccessful. Furthermore, deities and ancestors may assume active roles as performers, often through their material symbols and impersonators, as seen in the processions of mummies in Inka rituals and those of saint statues in Catholic rites.
More broadly we need to examine the relations of theatrical events with their social and physical settings, including their intersections with political institutions, economic activities, and the physical environments. We should not treat performance as a closed system defined by its own aesthetics. This requires consideration of a more dynamic issue of how the nature of theatrical events, their social and political importance, and the relations among the participants changed through time and space in the shifting social and natural environments, an area in which archaeology with its long temporal perspective can potentially make a unique contribution. In this manner, we should examine not only what kind of performance specific societies created but also how spectacles and theatrical performance created and transformed society.

Archaeology of Performance

As a result of our research interests and a desire to bring performance out of the realm of epiphenomenality, Takeshi Inomata and I co-edited *Archaeology of Performance: Theaters of Power, Community and Politics* (2006). Robert Preucel in the series editor’s foreword described the volume as “the first attempt to bring together a series of essays on performance in premodern society”. Many of the chapters, or scenes, that appeared in that volume are cited throughout this dissertation chapter, and much of this chapter quotes and is adapted from *Overture: An Invitation to the Archaeological Theater*, the introduction to that volume.
Other scholars have also brought a performatic lens to their archaeological analyses from a broad variety of perspectives. Scholars have begun to study feasting as a performed ritual or spectacle (Mills 2007, Norman 2010). Edward Swenson (2008, 2011) analyzes changes in northern Peruvian performance spaces to describe how power relations were formulated and contested in the Late Formative and Moche periods (see Wernke 2012 for a similar analysis in the Inka and colonial periods).

Final Thoughts

Spectacles and other theatrical events are not epiphenomenal for social processes. Nor are they superficial mystifications of the real political machinery that works behind the scene. Such symbolic events and acts make and transform social relations. They are arenas and processes of collaboration, conflict, and negotiation for the creation, transformation, and subversion of a community and asymmetrical power relations. Although theatrical performance continues to be a critical part of modern politics, its importance in premodern societies cannot be overemphasized. Archaeology should be able to make significant contributions in the study of performance and power through the analysis of theatrical space, iconography, and material objects by placing theatrical events in specific social and historical contexts.

To contextualize deeply these theatrical events, I examine the site of Incallajta, utilizing primarily a Peircean semiotic approach, discussed below.
Chapter 5: A SEMIOTIC APPROACH TO THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PERFORMANCE: PEIRCEAN REPLICATION AND HYPERSTRUCTURE

In the last thirty years, “semiotic anthropology has been transformed by approaches that have moved beyond Saussure to explore the work of the American philosopher and semiotician Charles Sanders Peirce” (Preucel and Bauer 2001:88). Such exploration responded in part to the perceived shortcomings of anthropological analyses based upon the semiology of Ferdinand de Saussure (Singer 1978, Hodder 1991). Milton Singer (1978) and Michael Silverstein (1976) both advocated Peircean frameworks, arguing that a focus on the pragmatics and indexicality of language and culture allowed for more contextualized analyses of social action. A Peircean framework also can incorporate a variety of other theoretical paradigms, including those of Bourdieu, Foucault and Gibbons (Mertz 2007:344).

Semiotic anthropologists such as Richard Parmentier (1994, 1997) have utilized a Peirce-based approach to study ritual performance and related aspects of material culture. These approaches have recently converged toward a view that ritual contains a greater semiotic density than other human activities, involving interaction and relationships between indexical and iconic signs (Stasch 2011:160-161). Robert Preucel and Alexander Bauer (2001:92) argued strongly for the use of a Peircean analytic framework in archaeology, suggesting it “allows us to acknowledge how meaning varies in social practice” and answered the
criticisms of postprocessual archaeologists such as Hodder (1992) that Saussaurean linguistic models were unable to account for multiple and potentially ambiguous meanings.

In 2006, Preucel published the seminal Archaeological Semiotics, in which he laid out the case for a Peircean approach to archaeology, including two case studies. Preucel cited only one previous example of an archaeological study that incorporated an expressly Peircean approach, that of the author (Coben 2006) which forms the basis for this dissertation. A few other archaeologists have taken up Preucel’s call, such as Matthew Llebbmann’s (2008) study of dual-plaza, dual-kiva at three Revolt-era pueblos, Christopher Watt’s (2008) ceramic comparison of Iroquois and Western Basin ceramic assemblages from the late Woodland Period, and Charles Stanish’s (in press) study of Inka landscapes and solstice markers.

Peircean Replication

In this dissertation, I utilize a semiotic framework to analyze certain Inka state-sponsored performances and the theaters in which they take place. I focus particularly on the concept of Peircean replication associated with the first trichotomy of signs (qualisign, sinsign and legisign) described by Peirce (1931-5). The qualisign is not relevant to my analysis and will not be discussed herein. A sinsign “is an actual existent thing or event which is a sign”, while a legisign “is not a single object but a general type” (Peirce 1931-35:142-143). Sinsigns are actual material instantiations, while types/legisigns are archetypes or classes of
objects and not tangible in Peirce’s structure. Examples of legisigns include the noun “book” and the concept of architectural order, while sinsigns would include a particular book, diagram, or blueprint (Parmentier 1994:18).

Legisigns instantiate themselves through replicas, indeed “to be a legisign is to be something that produces tokens of its type” (Parmentier 1994:18). A Peircean replica is the object through which a legisign, or “general type, …signifies itself through an instance of its application” (Peirce 1931-35:143). The replica is thus a sinsign, or token of the legisign, an actual manifestation, though one with particular and distinct characteristics.

Peircean replicas are not copies of some specified original, but rather are icons of their legisigns. Icons are “signs whose grounds involve formal resemblance” (Parmentier 1994:17); that is, there is a significant degree of likeness between the replica/sinsign and the type/legisign it instantiates. Each replica of a particular type will to some degree be iconic with every other replica of such type. For example, every materially manifested book is a replica of the type or legisign “book” and shares certain characteristics, yet every book is not identical nor a copy of some original. Peirce utilizes the linguistic example of the word “the”, which may occur several times on a page (Peirce 1931-35:143). In all of these occurrences, “the” is one and the same word, or the same type/legisign. Each single instantiation of “the” is both a sinsign and a replica.

As an instantiation, every Peircean replication is by definition contextualized--it occurs at a particular time and place and in an ideological and
political setting. Replication is not an abstract notion of copying, but instead occurs upon encounter or experience with a sign or signs by a person or persons. The word "the" only carries meaning and is a replication when seen, heard or spoken. Meaning is generated and made manifest by contextualized encounters at a particular time and place.

Replication is thus a diachronic analytic framework, requiring that meaning be analyzed and determined in its historical context. An excellent example is the beginning of the United States Constitution, “We the people” (Urban 2001). The referent of this phrase in 1788 would be white male landowners. A replica of that phrase today for most Americans encompasses a broader class of people. Replication is not a static concept, and just as the meaning of a supposedly concrete phrase may change depending upon context, so may the meaning of a supposedly concrete building, setting, sacred precinct, city or landscape or combination of any or all of them, or a ritual or theatrical performance.

This paper will focus upon the replication of an idealized city and cosmological center across the Inka Empire, and the role of these replicas as sacral theaters. With respect to a city, replication incorporates more than the architectural features, topography and layout of an idealized legisign/type. Also subject to replication are the social actions, performances and rituals performed in the city's designated spaces, including the various calendars that govern such performances and to varying degrees theatrical characteristics or “properties” such as movement, lighting, set and sound. Replication may also be linguistic-
the city’s name, districts, streets, hills and plazas may carry the same or similar names as their counterparts in the idealized city legisign. And if a city is imbued with ideological or religious significance or meaning, as in the case of a cosmological center, such significance may also be replicated to some degree. Iconicity (likeness or resemblance) of material culture potentially suggests iconicity of experience, action and meaning, though the latter must be demonstrated rather than assumed.

The legisign of the idealized city is not constant. The idealized city type changes over time through ideological manipulation or historical circumstance, such as a change of ruler. Any physically embodied Peircean replica of this new type would reflect such change, and be an icon of the new legisign. Significant changes in the physical layout or major structures of a group’s cosmological center should be reflected in any other replicas constructed thereafter. For example, post-Reformation, the idealized Protestant church and its physical manifestations differed from the Catholic church from which it evolved, though substantial iconicity remained both linguistically (“church” or its equivalent in other languages), in architectural form and related symbols such as the cross shape and in ritual practice and belief.

Hyperstructure

Roy Rappaport (1967:18) defines religious ritual as “the prescribed performance of conventionalized acts manifestly directed toward the involvement of nonempirical or supernatural agencies in the affairs of actors”, and remarks on
the reliance of this definition on the formal characteristics of the performance.

Stanley Tambiah (1985) notes that ritual performance has several characteristics that appear across cultures, including segmentation, hierarchical organization and stereotypy. Almost every observer commenting on ritual performance notes its highly structured and patterned nature, what Rappaport (1992:14) has called “among the most perfectly recurrent social events”.

The intensive replication of performances enhances their power by calling attention to their highly structured nature. Parmentier (1994:129-30) observes that

…[R]ituals are not just structured; they are ‘hyperstructured’ in that these cultural forms literally call out: behold the structure! …[R]itual can be interpreted as hyperstructured social action, in which segmentation, hierarchy, and stereotypy are not just contingent aspects of performance but are the means of calling attention to the structuredness of action.

Hyperstructured performances are highly indexical and self-referential-in other words, they call attention to themselves and the structures that they represent and embody. They are “so conventionalized that they highlight or call attention to the rules, that is the pattern [or] model or … which the ritual action instantiates” (Parmentier 1994:133). These performances invoke and powerfully ground themselves in a society’s cosmology, worldview and ideology, the sources of such rules and structures and of existing societal order.

The power of a ritual is not maximized by a highly patterned event alone, or from the mere decontextualized performance of a ceremony (Parmentier
Rather, I suggest that when a regimented performance takes place within a replicated theater according to a fixed ceremonial calendar, such event maximizes the hyperstructured nature of the performatic action is and the invocation of the cosmology from which it emanates. In other words, power is maximized when performances are both maximally patterned and contextually anchored in other patterned structures. Such performance

... Is a token which is an instance of a general regularity, that is, a Peircean replica that brings into context the legitimized authority, divine precedent or mythological charter behind ritual action. ... Ritual performance signals not just cultural conventions but conventionality itself (Parmentier 1994:133)

These hyperstructured performances call attention to and emphasize their culturally derived cosmological, religious and ideological underpinnings, highlighting and institutionalizing the existing order. They are “the contextual anchoring of hyper conventional...forms which have regimenting power due to their association with original or transcendent cultural types” (Parmentier 1994:134).

I will discuss and demonstrate that the Inka produced highly patterned sacral theaters, Peircean replicas of their capital and cosmological center Cuzco, that served as powerful contextual anchors for highly structured performances. I will then consider the implications of performances in these spaces.
Chapter 6: THE POCONA REGION

Incallajta is located in the Machamarca River Valley, approximately nine km (almost 20 km by modern road) northwest of the municipality of Pocona, province of Carrasco, in the department of Cochabamba, Bolivia. The city of Cochabamba, the capital of the department and its largest city, lies 82 km to the west. From Cochabamba, the site is about 130 km by modern road, proceeding east on the old Cochabamba-Santa Cruz highway (Highway 4) to an exit about 6 km past the town of Monte Puncu, Bolivia, and then nine km to a turnoff into the Machamarca River Valley (Figure 6.1).

Geography, Geology, Demography

A series of parallel chains of Ordovician sandstone hills form several northwest-southeast oriented valleys in this area, one of which is the Machamarca River Valley. The hills in this valley reach more than 300 m above the valley floor. The valley is seventeen km long and its floor ranges from fifty to two hundred meters wide. The valley floor is covered with thick vegetation, primarily alder trees (\textit{Aldus acuminata}), fagara coco trees (\textit{Zanthoxylum coco}), and \textit{Polylepis besseri} trees mixed with liana vines and parasitic plants (Andersen et al 1999, Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:11). The polylepis trees have been present in the region for thousands of years (Williams et al. 2011:66). The vegetation diminishes rapidly as one leaves the valley floor and proceeds up the slopes of the hills, with only grasses found on the ridges and the hilltops. Fauna
in this area includes the Andean fox (*Lycalopex culpaeus*), skunk (*Conepatus chinga*), and numerous species of birds (Andersen et al 1999).

The Machamarca Valley contains five communities, which together form the Incallajña Subcentral. The Subcentral is the political entity that deals with land and water issues in the valley, and represents the community with respect to the site of Incallajña. These five communities are Quirusillani (44 families), Machamarca (80 families), Vacas K’uchu (30 families), Leuque (40 families) and Inka Baja (40 families). Approximately 1000 people live in these communities (Muñoz 2007:18), while almost 13,000 live in the entire municipality of Pocona (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 2001, 2010). Almost all of the valley residents speak Quechua, while approximately one-third speak Spanish.

These communities suffer from high levels of poverty. Data for 2008 for the broader area of the Municipality of Pocona show a Human Development Index of only 0.475, a rating of “Bajo” in the Bolivian Index of Municipal Health (a measure of the satisfaction of basic human needs), and a Bolivian poverty index rating of indigent. Only 24 percent of households have running water and only 40 percent have electricity (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 2001).

Local farmers primarily grow potatoes, wheat, and maize. The potato fields are found on or near the hilltops of the area’s valleys, usually at altitudes greater than 3500 meters above sea level. Farming in the Machamarca valley itself takes place primarily on ridges or promontories about 50 meters above the valley floor, primarily on the north side of the river. Little cultivation occurs on
the south side, where the valley wall is much steeper with fewer cultivable areas. Members of the local communities planted crops immediately to the north of Structure 13 (defined below) and to the north and east of the Zigzag Wall (defined below).

The agricultural intensity in the valley is much greater near its eastern end, which is flatter and more open, and where it opens into the larger, wider Pocona Valley. More than 80 percent of the Pocona Valley is irrigated and planted, primarily with corn and wheat. The Pocona Valley is thinly populated with fewer than 800 people in the four small towns of Pocona, Collpa, Layminia and Chiuchi.

These valleys have likely produced similar crops for hundreds of years. In 1575, in order to feed the camayocs and mitayos who were harvesting coca in the nearby yungas, “a group of 97 tributaries were to cultivate a community chacra of maize, potatoes, and beans and other foodstuffs” in the Pocona area although the exact location of this chacra is unknown (Julien 1998:137). Mercedes del Río (2010) notes that the maize, potatoes and to a lesser extent wheat were grown extensively in the Pocona and surrounding valleys.

The Pocona and Machamarca valleys lies approximately 30 km south and west of regions of the yungas where coca has been grown from Inka times until the present (Julien 1998, del Río 2010, Sanchez 2008). The yungas are forests along the eastern slope of the Andes at an altitude of approximately 1,000-2000 meters above sea level. Their climate is warmer, rainier and more humid than
the higher Pocona and Machamarca valleys. Various pitted fruits are also grown in this area.

While climatological data is not available for the site itself, temperature and rainfall data for the nearby town of Pocona are available. For the last 20 years, average maximum temperatures range from a low of 20.0 degrees Celsius in July to a high of 25.1 degrees Celsius in February, while average minimum temperatures range from a low of 2.2 degrees Celsius in July to a high of 9.3 degrees Celsius. Rainfall during this period averaged 530 mm per annum, with more than 80 percent falling during the five-month period of November through March. January has been the wettest month, averaging 136 mm of rain, while July is the driest month, averaging 3 mm.

The site also lies in an earthquake zone (United States Geological Survey, 2012). On May 22, 1998, an earthquake of 6.2 magnitude with its epicenter less than 50 km southeast of the site struck the area, causing damage in the towns of Pocona, Totora and Aquile. Numerous other earthquakes have occurred in the area. We felt significant tremors on three occasions during our fieldwork.

*The Inka Presence in the Pocona Valley Region*

Both archaeological and ethnohistorical evidence confirm a pronounced Inka presence in the Pocona region. This presence is manifested archaeologically by roads, tambos, storage facilities, other structures and agricultural fields and terraces, and ethnohistorically most prominently (as discussed above) in the 1557 Spanish administrative survey of the region, the
Visita a Pocona (Ramirez Valverde 1970), as well in other administrative documents and chronicles of Inka history that point to Pocona as an Inka center for coca and maize production.

Two significant Inka sites, Incarracaycito (also known as the Tambo de Pocona) and Paja Huasi (also known as C’uchu or the Pukara of C’uchu), are located on Cerro C’uchu, southwest of the modern town of Pocona (Cespedes 1982, Pereira 1982). Both sites lie about 9 km south of Incallajta on the well-preserved Inka road that runs west from Pocona to the modern town and Inka tambo of Vacas (Figure 6.2).

Incarracaycito, at an altitude of approximately 2900 m above sea level on the flank of Cerro C’uchu, covers an area of approximately 2 ha. The site consists of thirteen long, narrow rectangular structures and 21 circular ones (Cespedes 1982:95). Seven of these rectangular structures measure 21 m by 4 m (Cespedes 1982 95-6). Cespedes states that all of the rectangular structures have doors facing south, though on our visit these doors appeared to low ground level ventilation windows of a type frequently associated with storage facilities (colcas). According to newspaper accounts, Muñoz excavated one of these structures in 2005 and found a drainage or ventilation system. Cespedes described the round structures as colcas, and notes the presence of a corral. He identifies Incarracaycito as the tambo described in the Visita de Pocona as well as other ethnohistorical documents.
Cespedes (1982:95) describes Paja Huasi, located on the peak of Cerro C'uchu at 3,300 m above sea level, as a large cyclopean wall surrounding a leveled area with numerous foundations of round structures. He identifies these as colcas. Upon our visit to the site, we located these colcas on a flat area supported by a retaining wall of the type described by Cespedes. A second retaining wall is found below this wall, though currently it does not support a terrace or other flat surface. Further up the hill, we encountered an extensive series of rectangular structures, plazas and platforms. These remains likely constitute the area described by Cespedes as the Pucara of Pajahuasi. This site spreads over several hectares, and has a formal door on its western flank that connects the site to the Inka road to Vacas.

In addition to the colcas described above, three sites dedicated exclusively to storage are found in the Pocona Valley. Cerro Tumuyo, about 6 km northeast of the modern town of Pocona, lies on a low hill in the center of the valley. Several rows of round foundations, oriented northeast to southwest, line this hill at altitudes ranging from 2,640 m above sea level to over 2700 m above sea level (Cespedes 1982: 96). Six or seven m separate the rows. Cespedes interprets these structures as storage facilities. He states that their average diameter is 2.90 m. While Cespedes counted 63 foundations during his reconnaissance, we counted over one hundred.

The not previously registered site of Colquehuayrachina lies about 2700 m above sea level on a low hill where the eastern end of the Machamarca Valley
meets the Pocona Valley, about 7 km southeast of Incallajta. Several rows of round stone foundations atop low terraces, oriented northeast to southwest, line this hill. We counted over 100 foundations, which we interpret as colcas. The diameter of these foundations was about 3 m. Some of the foundations had remnants of stone structures atop them, some as high as 40 cm. On the summit of this hill, we found a portion of a poorly constructed stone wall.

Just southeast of the modern town of Pocona, near the modern cemetery, is the site of Hatun Mokho (Cespedes 1982:96). Hatun Mokho contains 16 small rectangular structures in a row, on a platform formed by two retaining walls. Cespedes interprets these as storage facilities, stating they are the only rectangular colcas found to date in the Cochabamba region.

Walter Sanchez (2008:122) suggests that the landscape of the Pocona Valley reflects Inka organization. According to Sanchez, the orthogonal pattern of fields in the Pocona Valley reflects an Inka redistribution of land to mitimakuna in this area as part of a policy to manage and control maize production. Sanchez argues that the Inka distributed rectangular or square bands of territory to particular ethnic groups across various small valleys in this region (Pocona, Conda, Chimboata etc), similar to their redistribution of land in the Central and Lower Valleys of Cochabamba. He contrasts this distribution pattern with that of Cochabamba’s Upper Valley, which is asymmetrical and according to Sanchez reflects an association with the Cuta ethnic group and the Urus of the altiplano.

David Periera (1982) and Ramón Sanzetenea (1979) recorded and
extensive Inka road network in the Pocona Valley. They identified numerous roads connecting the nearby Inka town of Pocona with other sites and important Inka tambos and centers throughout the region such as Mizque, Aquile, Totora and Taraco, and noted that these roads likely continued into the coca-producing yungas zone to the north and east and the silver mines of Potosí in the south. A major road, referred in the Visita a Pocona as a royal road (Ramírez Valverde 1970), connected Pocona with Vacas, the Inka tambo to the west. This latter road’s paving stones are still visible near Pocona, though most of the road is now covered by a modern one. These authors and others recorded an extensive road network throughout the modern Department of Cochabamba (Hyslop 1984:138–149).

Prior to our fieldwork, no one had identified any roads that led to the site of Incallajta. We found a previously unreported double road, traced from above the modern town of Vacas to a point approximately 1 km west of Incallajta, which likely led to the Zigzag Entrance in the Zigzag Wall (Figure 6.3). This road also may have served as part of a route to Incallajta from Tiraque, Cochabamba, and other points west.

Near Iskayhuasi, to the east of Vacas, we located a 5 km long portion of pre-Columbian road. Except for a few short stretches, it is a double road, with the two segments separated by about 30 m (Figure 6.4). Both segments range up to 4 m wide, and run for the most part on the sides of hills.

The road is well made, with some evidence of formal Inka-style
construction. On some of the hillsides, retaining walls of three or four rows of stones support the road (Figure 6.5). In flatter areas, rows of large stones border each branch of the road. Near one of the quebradas by the road we observed some ruins that might have served as the foundation of one end of a bridge. Some corrals and the remnants of a few other structures were also found in association with the road. One of these may have been a small Inka tambo.

Both branches of the road meet at a structure known as Mamahuasi K’asa, which we are calling a guardhouse. This structure is located strategically in a pass between the eastern end of the valley of Iskaywasi and the western end of the valley of Mamahuasi. The opposite end of the Mamahuasi valley is the entrance to both the Machamarca valley floor, above which Incallajta is located, and the plateau above the site’s core, where the Zigzag Wall is found. This outpost consists of a long rectangular structure approximately 15 m by 7 m, and two circular rooms or structures of approximately 2.5 m in diameter. Ceramics of a local Inka style with a red slip was found at this site. On the other side of the guardhouse the two branches of the road divide again, disappearing completely in the fields about 100 m east of the guardhouse. Nearby are two large round corrals, approximately 15 m in diameter, which appear to be of the same period as the guardhouse.

At the eastern end of the valley, situated in a small pass near the pueblo of Mamahuasi, lies a large Inka-style structure known as Incahuayco. This structure appears to have been characterized originally by two or three large
enclosed walled platforms or rooms, each about 18 m by 9 m. The remaining walls included a niched partial western wall approximately 9 m long and a ruined wall about 4 m long (Figure 6.6). Both Inka and local Late Horizon style diagnostic ceramic potsherds were found at this site. The Incahuayco River, which is the source of a waterfall near the western edge of Incallajta’s core and which merges with the Machamarca River immediately below the site, emerges from the ground at this point. The Incahuayco structure may be associated with the appearance of this important and significant water source that flows past Incallajta, in addition to marking the entrance to the Machamarca valley.

From Incahuayco a traveler could either follow the river and pass below Incallajta or proceed on the plateau above it. We encountered occasional ceramic scatters and a few possibly prehispanic structures on the high and the low routes, as well as some minimal evidence of prehispanic fields and platforms. Only on the upper plateau did we encounter any evidence of the road, a single ten-m stretch marked by parallel lines of stones approximately two m apart. This small segment was located approximately two km west of the Zigzag Entrance to the Incallajta site. We posit that this road led to the Zigzag Entrance in the Zigzag Wall. This road to Incallajta is the only reported double road in the area surrounding Incallajta or in the entire Department of Cochabamba.
Figure 6.1 Modern route to Incallajta
Figure 6.2 Inka sites in the Pocona region
Figure 6.3 Map of the road to Incallajta
Figure 6.4 The double road from Vacas to Incallajta
Figure 6.5 Retaining wall of the road to Incallajta
Figure 6.6 Incahuayco
Chapter 7: INCALLAJTA

The site of Incallajta is found between 2,900 and 3,100 meters above sea level, to the north of the Machamarca River. The lower part of the site is located upon an ancient alluvial fan (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:11) that slopes from north to south. Sandy-clay sediments mixed with clastic boulders and rocks of various sizes form this fan (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:11). This fan advances almost to the Machamarca River’s edge. Two small rivers crossed the original cone. The western of these two rivers is called Pajcha Huayco and the eastern Fuerte Huayco (see Figure 7.1). Both the Pajcha Huayco and the Fuerte Huayco flow north to south and intersect with the Machamarca River. These rivers divide the ancient fan into three distinct areas that contain parts of the site of Incallajta, defined below as the Central Sector, Western Sector and Eastern Sector.

Prior to describing Incallajta, I discuss certain element of Inka spatial design, planning, architecture and construction in order to place the site better in the greater context of the Inka empire.

Inka Spatial Design and Planning

The Inka planned the locations and designs of their significant spaces and settlements in great detail. A specially trained class of experts was responsible for such planning (Cobo 1990[1653]). These experts decided the location, spatial allocation and placement of buildings and compounds within a settlement (Hyslop 1990:27). Betanzos (1996[1551]) describes the capital Cuzco as being rebuilt
from a master plan, and Morris (1990:35) has described the “elaborate pre-
conceived plan” of the Inka administrative center and other Cuzco of Huánuco 
Pampa.

These plans often followed certain structural principles. While all of these 
principles are not manifested at every Inka site, archaeological and 
ethnohistorical evidence confirms their presence at many Inka sites (Hyslop 
1990). These principles, many of which are described more fully below, include 
the bi- and quadripartitioning of sites by roads, a radial partitioning scheme known 
as the ceque system, ushnu (ritual platform) complexes associated with main 
plazas, on plazas and waterworks and drains. I will define and discuss these 
terms and principles below.

The application of many of these structural principles incorporated 
features of both the site and the landscape without distinguishing between them. 
Hyslop (1990:281) observed, "landscape modeling should be considered an 
integral part of an Inka space’s architecture". The Inka made models of these 
spaces that included not just structures, but streets and “the countryside with 
high hills and low, flats and ravines, rivers and streams” [Garcilaso 1987 
[1609]:124). Roads and plazas partitioned Inka spaces, and buildings were often 
oriented toward sacred rocks and mountains or aligned with astronomical 
phenomena. The flow of water in rivers and streams was often a critical element 
in Inka spatial design. Large stones, often in the shape of mountains, were often 
placed upon or integrated into ushnus (ritual platforms) or otherwise incorporated
into the planning and directional orientation of Inka ritual spaces (Hyslop 1990).

*Inka Architectural Forms and Terminology*

Numerous scholars have extensively studied and classified the standard elements and units of Inka architecture (Gasparini and Margolies 1980, Niles 1987a, Hyslop 1990, Protzen 1993, 2000). I define and discuss these units below.

The fundamental unit of Inka architecture is the freestanding rectangular building without internal subdivisions (Hyslop 1990:5, Nair 2003:76), where building is defined as “a relatively permanent enclosed construction over a plot of land, having a roof (Merriam-Webster 2011). This undivided space within a building is a “room”. The rectangular building generally has only one story and its doorway (used interchangeably herein with “door”) or doorways are on its broader side (Protzen 2000: 199).

Kanchas are walled enclosures with a central four-sided courtyard, surrounded by three or four rectangular buildings with doorways facing the courtyard (Gasparini and Margolies 1980: 185, Protzen 1993:53). Hyslop (1990:16) describes the kancha as the basic composite form” of the rectangular building. A kancha normally has only one external entrance. For purposes of meeting this definition, an L-shaped building in the corner of a walled enclosure shall count as two rectangular buildings. Two or more kanchas could be placed next to each other and share a wall to form a “block”, with no internal connection from one to any other (Hyslop 1990:17, Protzen 1993:53). As Niles (1987:46)
notes that many examples of this form do not include the enclosure wall, I shall refer to a kancha without such a wall as an “Unenclosed Kancha”.

At Incallajta, we also find walled enclosures containing a patio and fewer than 3 rectangular buildings. This form is not defined in other studies of Inka architecture, and not common at other sites. I shall refer to this type of enclosure as a “media-kancha”.

Kallankas, sometimes referred to as great halls or galpones, are found in numerous Inka sites. Kallankas are notable for their great length. Muñoz’s (2007: 257) definition of kallanka requires a length of at least 40 m, though scholars have applied the term to buildings as short as 17 m long (Lescano 2010:170). In this dissertation, I will use the definition of kallanka proposed by Gasparini and Margolies:

“...a great rectangular hall, very long, with a gabled roof supported by a series of pillars set the entire length of the long axis. One of the longer sides, with various doorways, always opens onto the main plaza...[T]he interior is undivided: a single very large space covered by a thatched roof over a wooden framework. On the wall opposite the doors that face the plaza, there is no communication, but rather a continuous sequence of niches or windows. The short sides of this rectangular great hall always have stone gables, which sometimes terminate in adobe” (Gasparini and Margolies 1980:96).

Trapezoidal (ranging from almost rectangular to sharply angled) niches, windows and doorways are a common characteristic of Inka buildings (Niles 1987a, Niles 1987b). These features are wider at their sills than they are at their lintels. Protzen (2000:197) describes them as the “unmistakable hallmark” of
Inka architecture. Niches and windows are typically located part way up of a structure’s walls (Niles 1987:215). A “niche” is a trapezoidal or rectangular recess in an interior wall, a “window” is an opening in the wall of a building for the admission of air or light or both that is not a doorway, and a “doorway” is a passageway through a wall.

Protzen (2000:197) notes that “to cover their buildings, the Inka carpenters built hip, gable and shed roofs”. All three types are common on Inka buildings. Hip and shed roofs are found most commonly on smaller buildings, while gable roofs are found equally on small buildings and larger ones (Gasparini and Margolies 1980: 160-178). Gables are always placed on the shorter sides of the rectangular form, and may be made of stone or adobe (Gasparini and Margolies 1980:163). While in smaller structures the ridgepole rests on the gables’ apexes, in longer buildings, such as kallankas, wooden columns were used to support a series of ridgepoles and the entire roof structure (Gasparini and Margolies 1980: 163-165). Inka gable roofs had slopes as steep as 60 degrees, resulting in roofs that could be more than three times hire than their building’s long wall (Protzen 2000:197). A thick layer of clipped thatch covers all three types of roofs. A “hip roof” slopes down to the walls on all four sides of a building, and a “shed roof” slopes in a single direction. A “gable” is the portion of a building wall enclosed by the end of a pitched roof, a “gable roof” is a pitched roof that slopes in two opposite directions with a gable at each end, and a “ridgepole” is the horizontal timber or member at the top of a roof.
The Inka frequently arranged their settlements around a central plaza, and several sites have multiple plazas (Hyslop 1990:234). Plazas are found in varying sizes and shapes, including rectangular, trapezoidal and irregular forms. Many plazas have an east-west alignment on their longer axes (Hyslop 1990:238). “Plazas” are bounded open spaces abutting but not within a structure and not including corridors. “Structure” is defined as any of a platform (defined in the next paragraph), rectangular building, media-kancha, Kancha, block or kallanka, and a “corridor” is a passageway between two walls.

Many Inka settlements contain central platforms, frequently referred to as ushnus. Numerous platforms, regardless of their location, context or form, are described in the archaeological literature as ushnus. In light of the importance of platforms and ushnus to Inka performance, I discuss this concept extensively in Chapter 9. For descriptive purposes, I define “platform” as a constructed horizontal surface raised above the level of the surrounding area.

I define a “perimeter wall” as a wall that surrounds all or a portion of the site. "Revetment wall" and “banquette” both refer to a low wall or step flush against another taller wall, and narrow windows set at an oblique angle to a perimeter wall are “arrowslits”, though use of the term does not have any functional significance. A canal is a constructed waterway to channel water, and a “pool” is a constructed space for holding water.
**Inka Masonry**

Susan Niles (1987a 207-215, 1987b) created a tripartite system of classification for Inka stone masonry construction. The Cusco tradition “includes well-fitted coursed or polygonal blocks, sometimes beveled …in other places so smooth as to show almost no trace of a seam (Niles 1987a:207). Most of the blocks are large. The Cusco tradition is rarely encountered outside of Cuzco, and only on buildings interpreted to be “important”. The second tradition Niles describes as “intermediate”, is “composed of worked or partially worked blocks that may be fitted, coursed or simply accommodated to form the walls of structures” (Niles 1987a:212). Niles notes that this style is found at sites know to be associated with royal activity and at many provincial sites. The final tradition consists of walls of “locally available fieldstone set in a matrix of clay” (Niles 1987a:209), and associated with lower status residential areas and storage structures.

All of the stone masonry at Incallajta, except in a few locations as noted below, is of the intermediate tradition.

**Site Description**

Incallajta lies 2950-3150 m above sea level in the Machamarca River Valley of central Bolivia. The site is located approximately 85 km (17° 36’ S, 65° 25’ W) east of the modern city of Cochabamba, in a small side valley between the Inka administrative centers and modern towns of Vacas and Pocona. The site’s structures spread across an area of about 26 hectares.
Most of the structures are found on an approximately 10-hectare north to south sloping central promontory (the “Central Sector”), bounded by and above quebradas (ravines in which streams are flowing) to the east (Fuerte Huayco) and west (Pajcha Huayco) and to the south by the Machamarca River. These streams flow 30-50 m below the level of the structures. The west quebrada includes a waterfall at the northwest corner of the “Central Sector”. This waterfall originates about 25 m above the structures of the Central Sector, falling about 80 m. Structures are also found on a small promontory immediately to the west side of the Pajcha Huayco (the “Western Sector”) and to the east of the Fuerte Huayco (the “Eastern Sector”). A large hill, Cerro Colque Huayrachina, rises about 200 m above the north side of the Central Sector. Additional structures and a long Zigzag Wall (defined and discussed below) are found on the top of this hill, and constitute the “Northern Sector”.

A perimeter wall (the “Perimeter Wall”) borders the southern and eastern sides of the Central Sector. The eastern Perimeter Wall contains some unusual features, including niches and arrowslits in its northern and an interior revetment wall in much of its central and southern portions. We identified at least four doors in the eastern Perimeter Wall that provided entrance to the Central Sector.

For consistency, my descriptions will utilize the sector, group, and numbering system of Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977), with modifications as deemed necessary for clarity of presentation (Figure 7.2). These sectors, defined above, divide the site into four geographically distinct areas, while the
groups are an arbitrary division of the Central Sector into smaller areas (Figure 7.3). The dimensions for structures, platforms and plazas will in most cases not be included in the text but will be found in Figures 7.4-7.19.

**The Central Sector**

**The Plaza Group**

The Plaza Group consists of Structures 1, 100, 101, 20, 21, 22, 30, a canal, a pool, and two large plazas, defined below as the Upper Plaza and the Lower Plaza (Figure 7.4). Structure 1, a kallanka, dominates the Central Sector of the site. Structure 1 is 79.9 m long, 25.3 m wide, and the peak of its roof, none of which survives today, was likely 18 m above the ground. Portions of the gable that supported the roof remain on Structure 1’s east wall. Structure 1 lies on an east-west axis, with twelve doors and windows on the south side abutting a large plaza (the “Upper Plaza”). The interior east and north walls contain 10 and 44 large trapezoidal niches respectively, while the south wall contains 24 smaller niches. The east gable wall contains four rectangular windows above its ten niches, and based on the observations of Vincent Lee, the west wall was probably similar (1998:50). The northern wall doubles as a retaining wall for a passageway directly north of it, now interpreted (see Chapter 9) as a canal (the “Canal”). The Canal serves to drain water off the uphill side of the roof and terminates in a pool adjacent to the building's west wall. Low revetment walls are present on the south side of both the northern and southern walls. A small
square opening, apparently a water conduit (the “Structure 1 Conduit”), emerges to the south from Structure 1’s southeast corner.

Structure 1’s twelve doors open to the Upper Plaza, the larger of two contiguous trapezoidal plazas located to the south (Figure 7.5). The Upper Plaza is 98 m long on its northern side, 135 m long on its southern side, and about 63 m at its central north-south axis, with an area of approximately 8200 sq m². Structure 100 is a platform that sits at the center of the northern border of the Upper Plaza. Structure 100 backs upon and likely could have been mounted through one of the doors (the sixth counting from the southeast corner (Door 6)) of Structure 1. The platform’s perimeter base is constructed of stone and is in the shape of an Andean cross or chakana, similar to an inverted stepped pyramid when seen in plan view. A large boulder sits atop the center of the platform. A large, flat-topped rock, known as the "sacrificial stone", sits in the center of this Upper Plaza, while an approximately 2.5 m diameter circular depression, now filled with loose stones, sits a few meters in front of Structure 100. The Upper Plaza is supported at its southern end by a 2.5-3 meter high retaining wall (the “Upper Plaza Retaining Wall”), which also serves as the northern boundary for a second plaza (the “Lower Plaza”) located immediately south of and lower than the Upper Plaza (Figure 7.6). Two badly eroded stone stairways connect the Upper Plaza to the Lower Plaza.

The Lower Plaza measures 98 m long on its northern side and about 35 m wide on its central north-south axis, with an area of approximately 8,000 m².
Structure 101 is an earthen platform topped by several large stones, and sits at the base of the center of the Lower Plaza’s northern wall. Near the southeast corner of the Lower Plaza lies the foundation of the circular Structure 20. A low retaining wall and two rectangular buildings, Structures 21 and 22 lie to the south of Structure 20. The south side of this Lower Plaza is bordered by several small round structures of varying diameters not exceeding 3 m (30), which lie on the southern edge of the site above the Machamarca River. Two rectangular buildings, Structures 31a and 31b are located against the Perimeter Wall in the Lower Plaza’s southwest corner. A modern entrance to the site is found between these structures, though erosion and the poor state of the Perimeter Wall in this area make it impossible to determine whether this was an entrance in Inka times.

Group G

Group G lies immediately to the north of the Canal (Figure 7.7). The east side of this group is bounded by the site’s Perimeter Wall (most of which contains niches and arrowslits), while the west side is bounded by a 4-meter high retaining wall (the “Group G Retaining Wall”) that lies at the base of Cerro Colque Huayrachina. Group G consists primarily of seven rectangular multi-doored structures (Structures 2-8) of varying sizes and in poor condition. All of their doors face south. Structure 2 has four doors while Structures 3-8 have three. These structures are oriented on the same east-west axis as Structure 1. Structures 3 and 5 are significantly narrower than the others. Four niches remain in Structure 5’s eroded northern wall, which in places is still 2.5 m high. Structure
6’s northern wall is well preserved and contains twelve niches. A two-tiered platform (the “Group G platform”) lies to the west of Structure 3 against the Group G Retaining Wall. The lower tier of this platform is almost 5 m long and over 2 m wide at its widest point. The second tier is smaller, approximately 2 m by 1.5 m. The Group G platform is almost 2 m high.

A trapezoidal plaza with an area of approximately 625 m² (the “Group G Plaza”) lies to the north of Structure 8 (Figure 7.8). This plaza is bounded to the south by Structure 8’s northern wall, to the east by a long, narrow rectangular building with four doors on its western side (Structure 11) to the north by a single doored rectangular building (Structure 12), and to the west by the Group G Retaining Wall. The northern wall of Structure 11 serves as the southern wall of Structure 12. The Perimeter Wall doubles as the eastern wall of Structure 11. Structure 10 consists of two small square rooms in the southwest portion of the Group G Plaza.

A small corridor (the “Group G Northern Corridor”) formed by the west wall of Structure 12 and the Group G Retaining Wall provides entry into the northwest corner of the Group G Plaza from a small 87 m² plaza to the north (the ‘Group G Entry Plaza’). The Group G Entry Plaza is formed to the south by the back wall of Structure 10, to the west by the Group G Retaining Wall, and to the north by the back of a rectangular building (“Structure 13”). The primary entry to the Group G Entry Plaza is to the east.
Two narrow passageways link Group G to the Upper Plaza. One (the “Upper Plaza Northeast Corridor”) passes between the east wall of Structure 1 and the east Perimeter Wall. The second (the “Upper Plaza Northwest Corridor”) is found at the southern end of the Group G Retaining Wall, through a narrow right-angled passageway blocked in part by a large stone. This corridor runs 9 m west and 26 m south, with a width of approximately 0.9 m.

**Group J**

Fifty m north of Structure 13 are a series of four low terraces supported by low retaining walls (Figure 7.9). These terraces contain the foundations of eight or nine rectangular structures (14), the largest of which is 11 m by 5 m and the smallest of which is 4 m by 3 m, and several dozen round structures (15) of varying diameters ranging from less than 1 to almost 3 m.

**Group H**

Group H lies on a finger-like extension of the Central Sector to the southeast of the Lower Plaza (Figure 7.10). The northern part of Group H consists of a 388 m² plaza (the “Group H Northern Plaza”) bounded by low retaining walls to the north (the “Group H North Retaining Wall”) and south (the “Group H South Retaining Wall”), the Perimeter Wall to the west and a rectangular three-doored building (Structure 23) to the east. This plaza is entered through an opening in the center of the Group H North Retaining Wall. Structure 23 has three doors facing the Group H Northern Plaza, and a narrow door.
(approximately 0.6 m) in its southeastern corner. Two doors in the Perimeter Wall are found immediately to the north and south of Structure 23.

Immediately south of the Group H Northern Plaza lies a smaller plaza (the “Group H Southern Plaza”). The 229 m² Group H Southern Plaza is bounded to the west by the Perimeter Wall, to the south by the back of two multistory buildings (Structures 24 and 25 described below), to the east by a wall separating this plaza from one of the entrances to the site and to the north by the Group H South Retaining Wall. The Group H Southern Plaza is irregularly shaped on its eastern wall. We were unable to locate a door or opening between the Group H Northern Plaza and the Group H Southern Plaza, though the Southern Retaining Wall is only a few cm above the surface and could easily be stepped over.

To the southeast of the Group H Southern Plaza lies a kancha (the “Group H Kancha”) formed by Structures 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 (all defined below) and the Perimeter Wall. The Perimeter Wall encloses Group H Kancha’s west side. Structure 24 and 25, the only identified two story buildings on the site, bound the Group H Kancha’s north side, though they lie on a northeast-southwest axis. Group H Kancha’s patio has an area of 902 m². Structure 24 contains a row of holes approximately 2 m off the ground could have held timber supports for a second floor, and niches on the south and east wall (6 in total) almost 3 m above the ground. The surviving walls of these structures are almost 4 m high in places. Structure 24’s northern walls and Structure 25’s northern wall are connected by another wall that extends between them on the same east-west
axis, sealing the northern side of the Group H Kancha. This wall is constructed in Nile’s fieldstone tradition, and does not appear on Nordenskiöld’s (1957) map. The doors of Structures 24 and 25 face each other rather than the kancha’s courtyard. Structure 25 now has a small second room on its western end, though this room does not appear in the prior maps of Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977) or Nordenskiöld (1957), and is of a different type of construction of lower quality than Niles’ fieldstone tradition, with the stones haphazardly piled and none of the stones dressed.

The eastern side of the Group H Kancha is bounded by two rectangular multi-doored structures. Structure 26 is a rectangular building with two doors facing the Group H Kancha’s courtyard, and runs on a northwest-southeast axis. The southernmost corner of Structure 26 abuts the northeastern corner of Structure 27, a rectangular building running on a north-south axis with three doors facing the Group H Kancha’s courtyard. The Perimeter Wall serves as the rear, eastern wall of both Structures 26 and 27. Structure 28, a rectangular building, abuts the southern end of Structure 27 and encloses the eastern half of the Group H Kancha’s courtyard’s southern edge, while a low retaining wall with two openings, on the same east-west axis as the southern wall of Structure 28, demarcates the western half. The Group H Kancha’s courtyard has two large low circular stones at its center. The Group H Kancha’s courtyard is accessed in its northwest corner by a corridor formed by the west wall of Structure 25 and the
Perimeter Wall, and in its southwest corner through the two openings in the low wall described above.

Immediately south of the Group H Kancha is a large semi-circular patio (Structure 29 or the “Semicircular Patio”, and the portion of the Perimeter Wall enclosing it the “Semicircular Wall”) that occupies the southernmost portion of the extension of the Central Sector. The Perimeter Wall encloses this plaza, which has an area of 422 m². Several terraces are found on the steep cliff below the Semicircular Patio. These were the only terraces found on the sides of the cliffs below the Central, Eastern and Western Sectors of the site. We found a large (19.5 meter by 16.5 meter) rectangular platform (Structure 29a) at the base of these cliffs.

*Sacerdotes Plaza Group*

The Sacerdotes Plaza Group consists of a long trapezoidal plaza (the “Sacerdotes Plaza”) immediately to the west of the Upper Plaza (Figure 7.11). This trapezoidal plaza is bounded to the east by the Upper Plaza, to the north by Group C, to the west by Group D and to the south by Group A (these three groups are defined and discussed below), with an area of 1913 m². Two doorways in the western retaining wall of the Upper Plaza lead into the Sacerdotes Plaza, as does a 2.5 meter wide corridor formed by the southwest corner of the Upper Plaza and the eastern wall of Structure 40A (defined below). Two large stones sit near the narrow west end of the Sacerdotes Plaza.
Group C

Group C consists primarily of three media-kanchas on a large foundation terrace to the north of the Sacerdotes Plaza, and incorporates Structures 32, 33, 35, 36, 37 and 38, and a retaining wall (Structure 34 -the “Group C North Retaining Wall”) (Figure 7.11). A 15.4-meter long by 1.7-meter wide corridor (the “Sacerdotes-C Corridor”) runs north from the northwest corner of the Sacerdotes Plaza to Structure 38. The walls of the Sacerdotes-C Corridor are as high as 1.4 m and were certainly higher at the time of their construction. Structure 38 is a rectangular building with a single door on its eastern side. Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977:21) reported finding significant traces of plaster in this building, though none were present at the time of my research.

Immediately east of Structure 38 lies a media-kancha (“Media-Kancha 37”) formed by a rectangular building (Structure 37) on its north side and three stone walls on the west, south and east sides. These walls reached up to 1.5 m above the surface. Structure 37 is a rectangular building with 3 doors in its southern wall opening onto Media-Kancha 37’s patio. Three windows are preserved in Structure 37’s south wall and 11 niches remain in the interior of its north wall. The east and west walls each contain one window. The northern wall is approximately 2.7 m high while the southern wall is about 1.7 m high. Media-Kancha 37 has two entrances---one through a wide corridor formed by the west wall of Structure 37 and the east Wall of Structure 38, the other through a narrower corridor formed by the east wall of Structure 37 and Media-Kancha 37’s
eastern wall. The door of Structure 38 opens into the western of these corridors. Media-Kancha 37’s patio measures 29 m by 18.5 m with an area of 576 m².

Adjoining Media-Kancha 37 to the east is Media-Kancha 36, formed by a rectangular building (Structure 36) on its north side and three stone walls on the west, south and east sides. These walls were up to 1.5 m above the surface. Media-Kancha 36’s west wall doubles as Media-Kancha 37’s east wall, and also as the west wall for Structure 36. Structure 36 is a rectangular building with 3 doors opening onto Media-Kancha 36’s patio. Two windows are preserved in Structure 36’s partially-destroyed south wall and 8 niches remain in the interior of its north wall. The east and west walls each contain one window. The highest remaining point on the northern wall is approximately 2.4 m high while on the southern wall it is about 1.8 m high. Media-Kancha 3 has one entrance, through a corridor formed by the east wall of Structure 36 and Media-Kancha 36’s eastern wall. Media-Kancha 36’s patio measures approximately 22.5 m by 22 m with an area of 510 m².

Immediately east of Media-Kancha 36 is Media-Kancha 35, formed by Structure 35 on the north side, Structure 33 on the east side, and stone walls on the west and south sides. These walls were up to 1.5 m above the surface. Media-Kancha 35’s west wall doubles as Media-Kancha 36’s east wall, and also as the west wall for Structure 35. Structure 35 is a rectangular building with 4 doors opening onto Media-Kancha 35’s patio. Four windows and four niches are preserved in Structure 35’s south wall. The northern wall is in poor condition,
though we were able to observe 3 niches. The west wall is well preserved and contains one window, and slopes downward from north to south like the east and west walls of Structures 36 and 37. Structure 35 has the same approximately 3.1 meter width as Structures 36 and 3 but is 26 m long, (7 m longer than Structures 36 and 37). Media-Kancha 35’s patio measures approximately 27 m by 24.5 m with an area of 721 m².

Structure 33 is a long, narrow rectangular building on the eastern side of Kancha 33 in a poor state of preservation. The highest remaining wall, on its east side, stretches to a height of 2.5 m. Structure 33’s western wall extends to the north almost 4 m past its northwestern corner. The northern end of this wall and the southeastern corner of Structure 35 form a corridor that provides access to Media-Kancha 35.

Structure 32 is a rectangular building that lies just to the north and east of Structure 33. Its west wall contains one door, two windows and four niches. One must pass between the west side of Structure 32 and the east side of Structure 35 to reach the entrance of Media-Kancha 35.

Media-Kanchas 35, 36 and 37 share a southern wall, which doubles as a retaining wall for their shared foundation terrace and whose base is found on the northern border of the Sacerdotes plaza. A 0.35-meter high revetment wall is located on and supports the southern side of this retaining wall.

A long east-west corridor runs immediately to the north of Structures 38,37,36,35 and 33 (the “Group C Corridor”). The Group C Corridor is bounded
by those structures to the south and the Group C Retaining Wall to the north, and is 1.4 m wide. This retaining wall runs the length of the corridor, a distance of 96 m. This corridor runs from the northwest corner of Structure 38 to the northeast corner of Structure 33, and must be walked on if one desires to enter any of Media-Kanchas 35,36 or 37.

*Group D*

Group D lies to the west of the Sacerdotes Plaza and consists of a kancha ("Kancha D") formed by Structure 39 on its east side, Structure 42 on its north side, Structure 43 on its west side and a poorly preserved stone wall (maximum height: 1.3 m) on its south side (Figure 7.12). Kancha D is entered through a short corridor ("Corridor D") commencing immediately west of the southern end of the Sacerdotes-C Corridor. Corridor D is approximately 7 m long and widens as one proceeds north. Its west wall is about 2.65 m high, while the west wall of the Sacerdotes-C Corridor doubles as the east wall of Corridor D. This corridor opens into a small rectangular courtyard (9.5 m by 6 m), which in its southwest corner contains a doorway into Kancha D’s patio. Kancha D’s trapezoidal patio measures has an area of 569 m².

Structure 39 has three doors that face west, eight niches and four windows in its western wall and fourteen niches in its east wall. Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977:22) report abundant plaster in these niches, little of which was present at the time of our investigations. The north and south walls each
contain two niches. A small remnant of a gable lies on top of Structure 39’s south wall.

Structure 42 has four doors that open into the patio to its south. Eight niches remain in its northern wall that reaches in places over two m high, while only one niche and one window remain in its deteriorated southern wall.

Structure 43 is the second longest rectangular building on the site, measuring 35.5 m long and 7.2 m wide. Its state of preservation is poor. Four doors were identified in the mostly destroyed eastern wall. We were able to identify only two niches in the western wall, though there were likely more.

**Group E**

Group E lies to the north and west of Group D (Figure 7.13). A three meter wide east-west corridor (“Corridor D-E”) separates these two groups. Group E consists of a kancha (“Kancha E”) formed by Structures 44 and 45, a large rectangular building (Structure 48) abutting a plaza (the “Group E Plaza”), and a rectangular building (Structure 49) with 4 rooms.

Kancha E is bounded on the west and south sides by an L-shaped building (Structure 44), to the north by Structure 45, and to the east by Cerro Colque Huayrachina and a structure of indeterminate type. The Kancha E patio’s area measures approximately 225 m². A large stone is found in the center of this patio.

Structure 44, in poor condition, measures 18.7 m east-west on the southern part of its “L-shaped floor plan”, 14 m north-south on the western part of
its ‘L’, and approximately 4 m wide in both directions. The walls of this structure reach more than 3 m high in some places. We identified three doors and three windows facing the patio. Structure 45 is one of the wider buildings at Incallajta, with a width of 7.8 m and a length of 20 m. The north wall of Structure 45 is 3.20 m high while the south wall is 2.7 m high, and its floor appears to be higher than that of the patio. The building’s north wall contains 11 niches, while two remain in the west wall and three in the east. Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977:22) note an abundance of plaster on both the interior and exterior of this structure, though none remained at the time of my research. A few wall remnants of an indeterminate type of structure were found in the southeastern portion of the patio, next to and atop a large stone outcropping at the base of Cerro Colque Huayrachina. While we were not able to determine the shape or type of this structure, a few small walls appear here on Nordenskiöld’s map (1957). Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977:23) report the remains of a rectangular structure in this area.

A large rectangular building, Structure 48 (26 m by 7 m), lies 3 m north of Kancha E. Structure 48’s western wall is over 4 m high in places. We found two intact niches and remnants of seven or eight others in this wall. We also identified one niche on each of the eastern and western, and remnants of one or two more. The eastern wall was almost completely destroyed.

Structure 48 has four doors in its east wall that open onto a plaza (“Plaza E”). A large stone sits in Plaza E in front of the center of the Structure 48’s east
wall. Plaza E is trapezoidal and measures approximately 36 m long, 18 m on its southern end and about 4.5 m on its northern end. The southern wall of Structure 48 extends to the east approximately 3 m past the building’s eastern façade. Nordenskiöld’s (1957) map shows a circular structure several meters to the east of this wall, but no traces of that structure remain today.

*Group F*

Approximately 35 m to the northwest of the north wall of Structure 48, in the direction of and almost bordering the waterfall, lays Structure 49 (Figure 7.14). Structure 49 is a rectangular building divided into four rooms. We were unable to locate any exterior or interior doors. The level of Structure 49’s floor is almost 20 m higher than Plaza E, and about 25 m below the origination of and 50 m above the end of the waterfall in the Pajcha Huayco.

*Group B*

Group B lies immediately above the intersection of the Pajcha Huayco and the Machamarca River (Figure 7.15), to the south of and below Group D, separated from it by a retaining wall. Group B, which is in a poor state of preservation, consists primarily of a kancha (the “Group B Kancha”) with a slightly trapezoidal patio measuring about 9.5 m on all sides with an area of about 90 m². The Group B Kancha was entered through a doorway near the western end of its northern wall. The northern building of this kancha (Structure 41n) retains a portion of its northern wall that stretches to 1.7 m high. Structure 41n also has a single door facing the patio, and a wall dividing it into two rooms.
We were unable to identify any other doorways in this kancha. Nordenskiöld’s (1957) map shows that the Kancha 41’s eastern building (Structure 41e) had a door in its northern wall. Kancha 41’s southern building (Structure 41s) today is divided into a larger central room and two very small rooms, though the maps of Nordenskiöld’s (1957) and Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977) show only one room.

*Group A*

Group A lies to the south of and extends the length of the Sacerdote Plaza (Figure 7.16). This area is poorly conserved, and most of the walls are low and haphazardly constructed. We were frequently unable to locate doorways, and the layout of this area does not conform to any of the patterns found elsewhere in this site. In addition, our map of this area shows significantly more structures than those of Nordenskiöld (1957) or Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977).

Group A consists of seven or eight smaller rectangular and almost square buildings (Structures 40a-40h). The surviving portion of Structure 40a’s northeast wall reaches to 2.5 m high. Structure 40d is the best conserved of the buildings in Group A, and has portions of a gable and a window. Below the gable are two niches. Structure 40b’s northeast wall reaches a height of 2.5 m, and its northwest wall has two doors. Other than Structure 40a’s and Structure 40d’s walls described above, construction in Group A is of a lower quality than Nile’s fieldstone tradition, with the stones haphazardly piled and none of the stones dressed.
Western Sector

The Western Sector sits roughly 50 m above the Machamarca River, at the base of Cerro Quiruisllani, the hill immediately adjacent and to the west of Cerro Colque Huayrachina (Figure 7.17). A perimeter wall (the “West Perimeter Wall”) follows the eastern edge of this promontory directly above the Quebrada Pajcha Huayco.

The Western Sector contains a block (the “West Block”) consisting of two kanchas-Kancha 51 to the east and Kancha 52 to the west. There are no doors or corridors that connect these two kanchas. Kancha 51 and 52 share a high southern wall (the West Block Southern Wall”), which extends below their floor levels to a trapezoidal-shaped terrace below it (the “West Terrace”). The West Block Southern Wall is 4 m high. This wall contains 3 recesses, identical in form to niches, the only recesses on an exterior wall at the site. The southern end of this terrace is bounded by an almost 4 meter high stone retaining wall, which connects to the West Perimeter Wall. The West Block measures 44.5 m by 25.5 m.

The West Block’s western wall also rises to 4-5 m high. The northern and western sides of Kancha 52 contain an L-shaped building (“Structure 52nw) with four doors facing the patio (area of 200 m²), two on its east wall and two on its south wall. The east wall doors are about 2.75 m wide, almost three times greater than the other doors in the West Block. Ten trapezoidal niches remain in its western wall and nine in the opposite eastern wall, while only two remain in its...
partially destroyed northern wall. Four of the western wall niches had plaster and red pigment inside. The floor of the northern part of the “L” of Structure 52nw’s is about 0.7 m higher than the western part.

The northeast corner of Kancha 52 contains a small rectangular building (Structure 52ne) with a door at the southern end of its western wall. Two niches remain in Structure 52ne’s eastern wall. One enters Kancha 52 via a corridor (the “52 Corridor’) formed by the east wall of the northern part of the “L” of Structure 52nw and the western wall of Structure 52ne.

The eastern side of Kancha 52 contains a rectangular Structure (Structure 52e) with 3 doors on its western wall facing Kancha 52’s patio. Structure 52e’s northern wall also serves as the southern wall of Structure 52ne. Structure 52e’s eastern wall contains 7 trapezoidal niches, while its western wall contains 6. Remnants of a gable and a window are found near the top of Structure 52e’s southern wall.

Structure 52e shares its eastern wall with the western building (“Structure 51w”) of Kancha 51. These two buildings are mirror images of each other, except that Structure 51w has only two doors in its eastern wall. The gable described for Structure 52e continues on the south wall of Structure 51W. In other words, Structure 52e and Structure 51w share a gable. Structure 51w has window in this gable, and four niches remain in Structure 51w’s western wall.

A quadrangular Structure (“Structure 51e”) is located on the east side of Kancha 51. Structure 51e’s longer axis is slightly west of north, following the line
of the West Perimeter Wall and the edge of the Quebrada Pajcha Huayco. The West Perimeter Wall serves as Structure 51e’s eastern wall with two doors in its western wall facing Kancha 51’s patio.

A rectangular Structure (“Structure 51s”) is located on the south side of Kancha 51. A portion of Structure 51w’s eastern wall constitutes Structure 51S’s west wall, a portion of the West Perimeter Wall serves as Structure 51s’s east wall, and Structure 51e’s southern wall serves as the eastern part of Structure 51s’s northern wall. Structure 51s has two doors in its northern wall facing Kancha 51’s patio (area of 143 m²).

The northern side of Kancha 51 contains a rectangular Structure (“Structure 51n”). Structure 51n’s western wall is shared with Structure 52ne, and the western portion of its southern wall is shared with Structure 51w. The southern wall, though in poor condition, still reaches at points to 3 m and contains 3 doors and 6 niches. The northern wall contains 10 niches, while the eastern and western walls contain two niches each.

Kancha 51 is entered through an irregularly-shaped corridor (the “Kancha 51 Corridor”) in its northeast corner. This corridor has a north-south portion, formed by the east wall of Structure 51n and the West Perimeter Wall, which is 0.75 m wide at its narrowest point and 1.9 m at its widest. The Kancha 51 Corridor also has an east-west segment approximately 1.3 m wide, formed by the northern wall of Structure 51e and the southern wall of Structure 51n.
Immediately north of the West Block is a trapezoidal almost triangular plaza (the “West Plaza”), with an area of just over 1500 m² and three large stones in its southern half. Cerro Quirusillani bounds the West Plaza to the north and west and the West Perimeter Wall bounds it to the east. Jesus Lara (1967:46) reports a circular retention wall to the west side of the West Plaza of which only a small segment remains today. The West Plaza measures 49 m on its central north-south axis and 34.5 m on its central east-west axis.

Fifteen m northwest and almost 50 m above the northwest corner of the West Block is a semicircular crenellated structure (“Structure 53”) of five panels, overlapping so as to create an irregular or teeth-like surface. Structure 53 has a height of 4.65 m and its five faces have a total length of 6.80 m. About 5 m above Structure 53 are remnants of a foundation of a structure with a similar shape and size as Structure 53.

The Eastern Sector (Group I)

Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto (1977:28) note this sector is characterized by “smaller structures than the other groups, the poor quality of construction, the high level of destruction...” These constructions are built in Nile’s fieldstone tradition, Only foundations and walls less than 0.5 m high remain in this sector. Three groups of Unenclosed Kanchas (70,72,73) surround their respective courtyard-like spaces (Figure 7.18). Where doors could be identified, they faced these courtyard-like spaces. Approximately 120 m south of these three groups are two small square and about two dozen round buildings (74).
Northern Sector

The Northern Sector, on top of Cerro Colque Huayrachina, is dominated by the zigzag wall (the “Zigzag Wall”) that stretches from above the waterfall in the Pajcha Huayco northeast to and then east across the summit of Cerro Colque Huayrachina, and southeasterly down this peak to the entrance to the Group G Retaining Wall (Figure 7.19). The distance from the Zigzag Wall’s westernmost point to the Zigzag Entrance (defined below) is approximately 180 m, while from the Zigzag Entrance to the easternmost point is approximately 300 m. Given the Zigzag Wall’s shape, its actual length is of course longer, particularly to the east of the Zigzag Entrance. The Zigzag Wall blocks access to the northern side of the Central Sector, other than a small steep area above and slightly east of the top of the waterfall. The Zigzag Wall is almost 5 m high at certain points, with a thickness of almost 2 m. The interior of most of this wall has a banquette. The Zigzag Wall contains no niches or windows.

The Zigzag Wall contains two entrances. The first is completely destroyed, and known only from the prior maps of Nordenskiöld (1957) and Lara (1967). The second (the “Zigzag Entrance”) is 1.8 m wide. Both of these entrances are baffled. Baffled entrances are openings or gates in defensive walls that “form an indirect and flanked entrance passage” (Keeley et al 2007: 62-63, Fig 3). Embedded into the Zigzag Wall in the east wall of this entrance are two large, vertical stone slabs, almost 3 m high, known locally as “letreros” (signs), which are not found anywhere else on the site. Flanking the entrance inside the
doorway are two small rectangular structures (Structures 65 and 66). Structure 65 is north of the Zigzag Entrance, has an east-west longer orientation and parallels one east-west segment of the Zigzag Wall. Structure 65 has one door in its south wall. Structure 66, south of the Zigzag Entrance, consists of two small rooms with a door between them. We were not able to locate any other doorways in this structure.

South of the Zigzag Entrance are the foundations of 40 round structures, with the largest having a diameter of about 3 m. We found several piles of round river cobbles in this area. Approximately 35 m east of the southernmost round structure a 1.5-2 meter high wall (the “Small Zigzag Wall’) runs for 135 m toward the southwest off one of the corners of the Zigzag Wall. The Small Zigzag Wall zigzags once, contains two doorways, and from its southern end one can look down and see the Central Sector of the site.

Prior Research at Incallajta

The first literary references to the site now known as Incallajta are likely contained in the historical chronicles, although the issue is not completely clear. Incallajta, usually glossed from Quechua as Inka place, village, town or village (see Salomon and Urioste (1991:23) for further discussion of the meaning of “llajta”) was likely not the Inka name for this site (Gasparini and Margolies 1980:208), and the toponym “Incallajta” does not appear in any of the chronicles. Nonetheless, chroniclers detail the Inka wars and conquest of the Pocona region (Cabello de Balboa (1951:62, Cobo 1979:154, Sarmiento de Gamboa 2007:175)
where Incallajta is located, and some modern scholars (Nordenskiöld 1957, Querejazu 1998) have suggested that references to a “ortaleza” (fortress) in the Pocona area in those accounts must be Incallajta. Several chroniclers suggest that Incallajta was originally constructed by the ruler Topa Inka, who ruled from approximately 1463-1493, and then reconstructed in its present form by his son, the ruler Huayna Capac, who ruled from 1493-1524. For instance, Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa (2007:175) writes that after visiting Cochabamba, Huayna Capac “went to Pocona to organize the frontier against the Chiriguanos and to rebuild a fortress that his father had constructed.” Similarly, Bernabe Cobo (1979:154) notes, “from Cochabamba, he [Huayna Capac] went on to Pocona, to visit the border there. He gave orders for a fortress to be repaired; it was one that had been built on the orders of his father.” Miguel Cabello de Balboa (1951:62) has a similar account. There are no other early colonial references to Incallajta, even in the accounts of the 16th century visits to and surveys of the Pocona and the surrounding region by Polo de Ondegardo (1990) and Melchor de Horozco y Fray Francisco del Rincon (Ramirez Valverde 1970:269-308).

The first potential modern reference to Incallajta occurs in 1901 in the Diccionario Geográfico de Bolivia by Federico Blanco. This dictionary makes reference to the remains of a fortress or parapet near Chiuchi (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:7, Querejazu 1998: 155, Nordenskiöld 1957:6), though Lara (1967:64) suggests that this is a reference to smaller ruins closer to Pocona.
The Swedish explorer Erland Nordenskiöld conducted the first scientific studies at the site in 1913 and 1914. Nordenskiöld (1957) mapped the site with a compass and tape, and prepared detailed maps of certain structures. He conducted excavations in four known locations: Structure 1, Structure 43, one of the round buildings that make up Structure 30 and a now lost round structure in the northwest sector to the east of Structure 48. He excavated the latter two structures as well as in other unspecified locations in the hope of encountering tombs (Nordenskiöld 1957:9) No cultural material was encountered in Structure 1. There were no remains of Structure 1’s roof and its west wall was had already collapsed by the time of his visit. He encountered a few potsherds slightly beneath the surface in Structure 43 (Nordenskiöld 1957:10), though the location of these fragments is now unknown. Bennett (1936:389) suggested the fragments represented typical Cuzco-Inka forms, such as a spoon with a handle in the shape of a bird, a shallow bowl with handles, and a small pedestal pot. Cespedes Paz described and drew 11 fragments from Nordenskiöld's excavations, 9 from bowls and one each from a pot and a handle (Cespedes Paz 1982 1-53). He also found some stone grinders in Structure 43.

Nordenskiöld observed that many of Structure 1’s stone walls, both interior and exterior, were plastered and likely painted red. He also noted that the upper gable of the eastern wall, on which the roof would have been supported, was made of adobe. He remarked upon the similarity and defensive nature of the
zigzag wall to that found at Sacsayhuaman in Cusco. He prepared an accurate map of the entire site using a tape and compass (Nordenskiöld 1957: Fig.16).

Nordenskiöld also noted that in addition to the name Incallajta, which he translated as “Inka town”, the local inhabitants referred to the site as MachacaMarca, which he stated was Aymara for “new town”. According to Nordenskiöld (1957:11), this toponym and the ceramics of the nearby Mizque region confirmed that Aymara people had lived in the Pocona region in the past, because for them Incallajta was a new town.

Based on research at Incallajta in 1926 and 1927, Jesús Lara (1967) wrote a detailed description of many of the site’s structures, and added additional buildings and features to Nordenskiöld’s map (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:8). He observed that the width of many of the site’s walls were narrower at the top than at their bases. He also posited that Incallajta, in association with two smaller outposts, was part of an Inka defense system connected by and utilizing signal fires to protect the Monte Puncu pass and the valley of Pocona. Unfortunately, we found no remnants of these other outposts. Lara also excavated in various unspecified locations in the site, apparently finding no cultural material.

According to Roy Querejazu (1998:162), Hugo Rene Pol made a topographic map of Incallajta that included latitude and longitude, and wrote two unpublished articles in 1956 and 1967 describing the site and the need for
conservation. He noted the defensive nature of the northeastern perimeter wall with its arrowslits.

The Argentine archaeologist and Cochabamba Museum director Dick Ibarra Grasso studied Incallajta during the 1960’s and published extensively about the site (Ibarra Grasso: 1973, 1982a, 1982b, Ibarra Grasso and Querejazu: 1988). Ibarra Grasso dedicated an entire chapter of his 1982 book Ciencia Astronómica y Sociología Incaica (1982a 137-149) (Inka Astronomy and Sociology) to El Gran Observatorio Incaico de Incallajta (The Great Inka Observatory of Incallajta). He argued that Structure 53, a tower with five crenellated faces, was designed to permit observation of the movement of the sun and thus served a calendrical function (Ibarra Grasso 1982a: 137-149, 390,396). He suggested that the tower was designed particularly to mark solstices and equinoxes. He also theorized that the twelve doors of the kallanka served a calendrical function marking the months of the year (Ibarra Grasso 1973: 397-8). Most of these theories were not analyzed or tested systematically.

Ibarra Grasso (Ibarra Grasso and Querejazu 1986:333) also suggested correctly that Structure 1 was the largest building with a single nave (room) in all of the Pre-Columbian Americas. He described Structure 1 as a temple dedicated to the creator god Viracocha and not the sun, stating that temples dedicated to the former were characterized by numerous open doors facing the plaza. Ibarra Grasso hypothesized that Structure 1 had a roof of straw or totora reeds with mud paste, and that the roof would have to be supported by at least three rows of
columns made of large tree trunks. Ibarra Grasso and Querejazu (1986:333), along with Bernardo Ellefsen (1972) also stated that Incallajta was the “Other Cusco” located in the Charcas mentioned by Guaman Poma (1980:187).

Bernardo Ellefsen (1972, 1973) also worked at and published extensively on Incallajta. He stated that gabled roofs, multiples doors on one wall and niches on the opposite wall, like Structure 1, characterized Inka temples. Like Lara, he noted that the doors of Structure 1 were rectangular and not trapezoidal (Ellefsen 1972:2). He argued that Topa Inka could not have constructed Incallajta as a fortress against the Chiriguanos, as the historical and ethnographic Chiriguanos lived a great distance from the site (Ellefsen 1972:5-6). He did observe that many chroniclers and historians called any tropical dweller bordering on this region a Chiriguano.

Ellefsen (1972:29-44) also suggested that Incallajta was not a fortress built by Topa Inka nor the “ortaleza” referred to by Sarmiento and Cobo. He stated that only the high portion (that is, the Northern Sector with the Zigzag wall) was likely a fortress, while the rest of the site had the character of a walled city. He also argued that the site was too small to be a fortress, comparing it to other “fortresses” such as Sacsayhuaman, Ollantaytambo, and unnamed large fortresses on the Peruvian coast. Ellefsen wrote that that Incallajta’s location would not suffice to protect the valley of Pocona from incursions from the north, and concluded that the site was the capital of the Inka province of Pocona.
Ellefsen (1973), based on the work of R. Tom Zuidema, compared Incallajta to the Inka capital, believing it might be the Other Cusco located in the Charcas mentioned by Guaman Poma (1980:187). He noted that the central sector of both cities lay between two rivers at the base of a fortified mountain to the north. Ellefsen argued that Incallajta, like Cusco, was divided into two halves, *hanan* and *hurin* (upper and lower). Although acknowledging that the Sun Temple in Cusco is in the southeastern section of the city center, Ellefsen suggested that at Incallajta the Sun Temple is the West Block in the Western Sector, on the other side of the western quebrada, a conclusion he based upon the building’s size, isolation, and sacred location (Ellefsen 1973:39). He also suggests that Kancha D is the *acclahuasi*.

In connection with planning of a restoration project with the support of UNESCO and the Bolivian government, Alberto Rex-Gonzalez and Antonio Cravotto assessed and mapped the site in 1975 and 1976 (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977). Their map was based primarily on that prepared by Carlos Paniagua in 1971 (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:9). The study is divided into two parts: 1) a survey by Rex-Gonzalez of past published studies at the site and a detailed description of the buildings and walls of the site, and 2) a series of recommendations regarding reconstruction, preservation and conservation by Cravotto.

Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto suggested that all of the walls of Incallajta were plastered, and in some cases painted red. They found remnants of this
plaster and paint in several structures. In the “slightly trapezoidal” niches of Structure 1, they noted two layers of plaster—an outer layer of red on top of a clearer one. They also noted that the thickness of Structure 1’s walls diminishes from bottom to top, and that the only adobe construction found on the site was Structure 1’s gable (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:15-18).

Rex-Gonzalez also suggests that the Zigzag wall represents an extremely advanced defensive structure and tactic, as it permits an approaching enemy to be fired upon from two sides. He stated that this type of defensive feature did not exist in the Old World prior to the discovery of the Americas and was exported to Europe at that time (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977: 31-33).

The authors noted that many of the prior identifications of structures and their functions were often based in “mere speculations with little or no supporting proof” (Rex-Gonzalez and Cravotto 1977:7; translation mine). They state that the Machamarca Valley, where Incallajta is located, is far from on the most important pathways between the tropical forest and the Cochabamba Valley, and thus they do not believe the site was built to defend against an invasion of tropical peoples. Rather, they believe that Incallajta was an urban center with numerous functions, one of which could have been defense.

Graziano Gasparini and Louise Margolies (1980:208) note that only the Temple of Viracocha at Raqchi surpasses the covered area of Structure 1 in area. Based on the width of Structure 1 and the slope of its gable, which they describe as “a very long distance to span with single timbers” (Gasparini and
Margolies: 210), they propose that like Raqchi, Structure 1 had four naves (3 east-west rows of columns). They propose a peaked roof each of whose slopes was over 16 m long, supported by a series of complicated frames.

Vincent Lee (1992) also proposed an architectural reconstruction of Structure 1. Lee (1992:9) first noted that the western gable “had fallen entirely intact and still lay there”. Lee calculated that the western gable was about 15 m high, topped by adobe, and progressively less steep toward its apex. Lee (1992:10) proposed that Structure 1’s roof was supported by five rows of east-west columns and a roof “similar to the Dutch or gambrel roofs common in rural America”. This type of roof, according to Lee, resembled the shape of the Cuyusmanco shown by Guaman Poma (1980: 331), and possessed several structural advantages. These benefits included less thrust on the tops of the eave walls and a lower roof pitch, which would allow for lower gable walls and less required framing materials and roof thatch. Lee also suggested that this design would permit a second floor loft in Structure 1.

Roy Querejazu (1998) published a comprehensive summary of research at the site in his book, *Incallajta y la Conquista Incaica del Collasuyu*. He reports finding an intact bowl and some fragments from a utilitarian pitcher on the banks of the Machamarca River. He advocates for increased resources for and attention to site management and preservation.

Maria de los Angeles Muñoz, co-director of our excavations, has continued to work on community development (Muñoz 2003, 2007) and
archaeological research (Montes et al 2008, Muñoz 2010) at the site. She studied a silver ring and four green beads that she excavated in Kancha 52. The beads were analyzed using energy dispersive spectroscopy and particle induced x-ray emission analyses that proved they were turquoise. These analyses also showed that the ring had a copper weld, with the highest concentration of copper at the weld’s center. The authors state that reduction welding of this type had not previously been reported for pre-Columbian metallurgy.

Muñoz (2010:209) also reports on her recent excavations in Structures 36 and 39 and Kancha 52. She interprets that Structures 36 and 39 were dedicated to domestic use, while Kancha 52 was for an elite or hierarchically higher domestic use. She reports that these excavations found no formal occupation floors, few features, and a low density of cultural material. She does not provide additional data regarding these interpretations.

Muñoz also conducted X-ray diffraction and fluorescence analysis of a limited sample of ceramic material that she excavated. This analysis revealed little difference in mineral composition, paste, or slip between Inka and pre-Inka ceramics. Muñoz reports that she excavated some storage structures in the Northern Sector, and that chemical analysis thereof revealed an absence of carbonates and phosphates.
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Chapter 8: RESEARCH, DESIGN DESIGN, STRATEGY, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Any analysis of performance at a particular location requires a focus on its built environment, which includes buildings, plazas, monuments, roads and landscapes. The built environment “provides an excellent medium for addressing issues of space, place, landscape, agency, flow, circulation, and interaction of human agents within physical structures laden with cultural, social, political, economic, and symbolic meaning” (Erickson 2009:204), all critical elements of an archaeology of performance and of Inka imperial expansion.

In order to understand the built environment, we adopted a three-pronged strategy. First, we performed preliminary reconnaissance in the Pocona region to understand better the nature and intensity of the Inka presence there, as well as to place the site of Incallajta in a broader regional context. This reconnaissance, along with a review of prior research by others in this region, was designed to elucidate the cultural landscape of the Inkas and those they conquered. The results of this reconnaissance are presented in Chapter 6’s broader discussion of the Inka presence in Pocona.

Second, in order to consider the organization, division and use of space at Incallajta we digitally mapped and virtually reconstructed the site. This process also enabled us to consider movement through, to and from the site, as well as its theatrical qualities.

Lastly, we excavated some of Incallajta’s buildings and doorways. In
addition to understanding construction techniques and sequences and the site’s chronology, our excavation strategy was designed to understand the nature and use of certain buildings and spaces that we believed could be central to spectacle and ritual performance at the site. We also hoped to understand more about diachronic changes in spaces and utilization of the site.

**Mapping and Virtual Reconstruction of Incallajta**

Utilizing a total station, we prepared a comprehensive digital map of Incallajta. We established two data points, one on Cerro Pukara above the Eastern Sector, and the other south of the Machamarca River on Cerro Maium opposite the site (Figure 8.1). These data points allowed visual coverage and data collection across the entire site. Our team shot 2,558 points, collecting 3 coordinates (two UTM coordinates and altitude) for each point. We documented all buildings and numerous other surface features, such as stairways, doors and boulders. This number of points enabled us not only to map the site and its constituent parts, but also to document the heights of surviving walls and to better digitally reconstruct the site.

We entered these coordinate points into vector-based informational software, AutoCAD Architectural Desktop, to create a two-dimensional map of the site. AutoCAD interpreted these points to create a three-dimensional plot of all the points. This plot proved problematic and inaccurate as we had collected our coordinates in a single set and the software was unable to distinguish between topographic contours and building walls and peaks. We manually
separated our data sets in order to resolve this problem. Utilizing AutoCAD, we digitally rebuilt the walls of each building based upon our coordinate points, and then added roofs and other building features consistent with our knowledge of Inka architecture. Where we were uncertain with respect to features, such as whether a roof was peaked or hipped, we prepared alternative representations of the building under study. Digital reconstructions of the entire site as well as various portions thereof were then generated (Figures 8.2-8.10).

After completing this reconstruction, we prepared a series of simulations to explore the performatic qualities of the site. We simulated walking routes from various points of the site to reach Structure 1, Structure 100 and the Central Plaza Sector. I have included simulations from three starting points: the Group G Entry Plaza, Corridor D-E, and Kancha H, representing the three of the primary pathways to the Central Sector (Figures 8.11-8.18).

We also prepared within digital Incallajta a simulation recreating ritual movements documented at other locations. While most descriptions of Inka ritual do not include movement with sufficient specificity for such an analysis, Garcilaso (1609) documents an Inka ceremony of a procession through a series of “lanes” or turns at the Temple of Viracocha (the Inka creator deity) at Raqchi, Peru (Figure 8.19). As some scholars (Ellefsen 1973, Ibarra Grasso and Querejazu 1986, Coben 2006) have suggested that Structure 1 is a Temple of Viracocha, we simulated this ceremony in that building. At Raqchi, the building has a central
interior wall with several doors that create the lanes, while in Structure 1, where no such wall exists, we hypothesized that the lanes were created by the rows of columns which support the roof (Figure 8.20). The starting point of the two simulations differed, as the temple at Raqchi has only two doors, one on each of the shorter walls of the building, while Structure 1 has 12 doors on its long southern wall.

We also combined panoramic simulations and individual building reconstructions to test hypotheses regarding Inka construction techniques and building uses. These simulations are created through the linkage and overlapping of a series of rendered images that simulate the view and experience of a particular environment from a selected vantage point. We utilized this technique within Structure 1 to examine the quantity and volume of trees required to support a possible roof, as well as to examine the lighting at various points of the day.

Excavations at Incallajta

We excavated in seven different areas of the site. Large scale excavations that uncovered significant amounts of a building or its interior were undertaken in the Central Sector’s Plaza Group in Structures 1, 100 and 101. We placed smaller units in four other places: Structures 23 and 24 in Group H of the Central Sector, and the Zigzag Entrance and Structure 65 in the Northern Sector.

We fixed a central datum point inside Structure 1 and established a grid around it for use in our Structure 1 and Structure 100 excavations (Figure 8.21).
We fixed a second point and grid for Structure 101 (Figure 8.22). I have labeled all units by the coordinates of the corner closest to the datum point. For example, the unit whose southwest corner was found at two m north and two m east of the data point is designated Unit N2E2, while the unit whose northwest corner was two m south and two m east of the data point is designated Unit S2E2. All excavations were by natural levels. We did not screen excavated soil.

**Central Sector, Plaza Group, Structure 1**

Through an excavation of approximately 132 square m of surface area in the middle of Structure 1 (Figure 8.21), we hoped to learn whether Structure 1 was roofed, and if so, how that roof was supported. We also wanted to know what techniques if any might be necessary to support the walls of such a large structure if a heavy roof was present in the past. Lastly, we sought features or artifacts that would help determine the chronology, function, and evidence of use of this important building.

**Structure 1 Postholes**

We excavated three large round postholes for columns. These postholes were found primarily in Unit N4E0 (“Posthole 40), Unit N10E0 (“Posthole 100”), and Unit N10E8 (“Posthole 108”) (collectively, the “Excavated Postholes”), though portions extended into adjacent units (Figure 8.21). We initially identified each Excavated Posthole by a granular earthen stratum that was darker and less compacted than the surrounding dirt (the “Dark Column Stratum”) (Figure 8.23). This stratum, found atop all of the postholes, was circular with diameters ranging
from approximately 1.85-2.30 m, thicknesses of 0.15-0.20 m and depths of 0.95-1.05 m. The Dark Column Stratum was filled with burnt clay, straw and carbon.

Removing the surface of the Dark Column Stratum revealed the Excavated Postholes. These postholes have diameters of approximately 2 m, and are lined with stones of varying sizes (Figures 8.24, 8.24a and 8.24b). Some of these stones appeared dressed. These stones form a cylinder about 0.5 m thick, leaving a hole of approximately one m within them. A 0.15 m wide cylinder of clay and straw lines the inside of these stones, leaving a hole of about 0.75m for the column itself. We were able to consolidate a small portion (46 cm long, 14 cm thick) of Posthole 108’s clay cylinder (Figure 8.25).

At the base (depth approximately 2.5 m) of the Excavated Postholes, we found a circle (diameter approximately 0.75 m) of darkened soil with burnt carbon within it (Figure 8.26). We interpreted this darkened soil as a wooden column of similar diameter. Beneath this darkened soil we found stone bases upon which we believed the columns rested (Figure 8.27).

We also found the Dark Column Stratum in Unit N0E0, Unit N0E6 and Unit N6E6. Removing the surface of that stratum, we observed a pattern of rocks and fill similar to that encountered in the Excavated Postholes (Figure 8.28). We concluded that there were similar postholes in these units (the “Unexcavated Postholes”, and together with the Excavated Postholes, the “Structure 1 Postholes”), though we chose not excavate them.

Just over 8 m separate the Structure 1 Postholes in the east-west
direction, while 6.3 m separate them north to south. Extrapolating from the placement of the Structure 1 Postholes and assuming constant spacing among them, we concluded that there were three east-west rows of 8 postholes. These rows are 6.3 m, 12.6 m and almost 19 m from Structure 1’s south wall. The westernmost and easternmost postholes are approximately 8 meters from Structure 1’s west and east walls respectively.

**Structure 1 North Revetment Wall**

We excavated a 2 m by 2 m unit (“Unit N16E0”) that extended to Structure 1’s north wall (Figure 8.29). We discovered at a depth of 0.93 m a two-step low revetment wall supporting Structure 1’s north wall (Figure 8.30). The lower step was roughly 42 cm wide, and atop it the upper step was approximately 28 cm wide. The lower riser was 14 cm high and the second about 25 cm high. The higher step was better constructed than the lower, utilizing larger, better fitting stones.

**Doorway and Structure 1 South Revetment Wall**

We excavated two units (Unit S6E6 and Unit S8E6) around Structure 1’s fifth door (“Door 5”) counting from its southeastern corner (Figure 8.31). Unit S6E6 was extended approximately 1 meter to the south in order to include Door 5’s threshold in this unit. We found a two-step low revetment wall (the “Structure 1 South Revetment Wall) on the exterior of and supporting Structure 1’s south wall (Figure 8.32). The lower step was roughly 46 cm wide, and atop it the upper step was approximately 28 cm wide. Both risers were approximately 25 cm high.
The upper step is at the same level as Door 5’s threshold and Structure 1’s floor.

In front of Door 5, the Structure 1 South Revetment Wall consists only of its lower step (Figure 8.33). Someone entering Structure 1 here would step up on the lower step, which continued to the doorway, and then step up into the building. The lower step of the Structure 1 South Revetment Wall thus appears to double as an entry step into Structure 1. This portion of the lower step did not appear more worn than the portion not directly in front of Door 5 (Figure 8.33).

**Possible Floor**

We found only one potential original floor at a depth of 1.08 m in UnitS4E6 and UnitS6E6, just inside and adjacent to the western portion of Door 5. This floor measured 43 cm north to south, 25 cm east to west and was approximately 4 cm thick. The floor did not extend beyond these dimensions in any direction. This floor was made of compacted clay mixed with ocher. Its southeastern corner showed evidence of burning. Under this clay floor, we encountered a layer of compacted clay mixed with small stones, which served to level the floor surface.

We encountered no other floors in Structure 1, and only 10 fragments of non-diagnostic plain ware pottery. We collected carbon samples for dating from various contexts that are described below. We found evidence of prior excavations, either by looters or perhaps Nordenskiöld or Lara, in several of Structure 1’s units. Modern cultural material encountered in this building includes a brass bullet casing, a sardine can, and modern ceramics.
Central Sector, Plaza Group, Structure 100

We excavated Structure 100, a mound in front of Door 6, to investigate possible buried structures under this mound. We also hoped to find evidence of the use and function of this structure and its relationship to Structure 1 immediately to its north.

We excavated an area of approximately 60 square m (Figure 8.21), uncovering all of Structure 100 and excavating to a sterile level on its sides. We found a low platform, approximately 6.5 m by 6.3 m in the form of a chakana, or Andean cross surrounding a large boulder (Figure 8.34). The rear of the platform overlaps and is build atop the Structure 1 South Revetment Wall, suggesting that the platform was constructed later than Structure 1. On the east and west sides of the rock were small rectangular stone shafts that ended at the ground surface. We excavated the fill in these shafts and found no cultural material.

The platform abuts the sixth door from the east of Structure 1 and one may mount the platform through this door. A large hole in front of Door 6, likely a looter’s pit, prevented us from determining the nature of this access to the platform. A large rock at the base of the east side of this doorway juts into and a portion of the doorway, which would have made passing through the doorway to Structure 1 more difficult. We were unable to determine if this rock were part of the original construction or placed there at or after the time of looting to prevent the collapse of a portion of the Structure 1’s southern wall.

We encountered little pre-Columbian cultural material in Structure 100
(fewer than 5 fragments of non-diagnostic plain ware pottery). We collected a few carbon samples for dating, the locations of which are set forth below.

**Central Sector, Plaza Group, Structure 101**

We excavated Structure 101, a low mound with several large boulders protruding from it. This mound is located at the center of the base of the Upper Plaza Retaining Wall. We sought to learn whether or not there was a stone structure in this mound and the use and function of Structure 101.

We excavated an area of approximately 36 square m (Figure 8.22). While we encountered no walls, we found a rectangular earth and rock platform, upon which sat several large boulders. The largest stone, on the eastern side of the platform, is 1.67 m at its highest point, 1.24 m wide and 0.92 m thick. This stone is placed on compacted soil and surrounded by small rocks. The second largest stone sits on the south central side of the platform, and measures 1.69 m long, 1.45 m wide and 0.9 m high. This latter stone is similarly placed on compacted soil and surrounded by small rocks. We found 7 undecorated potsherds in Structure 101.

**Central Sector, Group H, Structure 23**

We sought to determine the nature and use of building 23, and its potential relationship to the two doorways in the Perimeter Wall immediately to its north and south, as well as to the nearby buildings posited to be part of a Sun Temple.

We excavated to sterile (depth of 1.30 m) a 2 m (north-south) by 2.5 m (east-west) unit that spanned the entire width of Structure 23 at its northern end.
(Figure 8.35). The east wall of this structure, which doubles as the Perimeter Wall, has a banquette measuring 26 cm wide and 40 cm high. Two rows of dressed stones constitute the face of the banquette, with the stones of the lower row being larger than those of the upper (Figure 8.36).

We found one occupation layer at depths ranging from 0.79 m to 0.97 m with about two dozen potsherd fragments, a grinding stone, and a significant quantity of burnt carbon. Most of the potsherds were found within 0.50 m of the banquette, and three were decorated (Figure 8.37). Unfortunately, due to a robbery in our depository, we were unable to analyze any of our excavated potsherds.

*Central Sector, Group H, Structure 24*

We sought to determine the use and function of Structure 24, and to confirm that it was a multi-story building. We selected the location of our excavation here in part in response to a report from a local informant that Ramon Sanzetenea and Bernardo Ellefsen of the Cochabamba Museum had in the 1970’s excavated in the center of this structure, in order to avoid their prior unit. We could find no documentation of this excavation.

We excavated a 2 m by 2 m unit in the southeast corner of one of the only two two-story structures on the site (Figure 8.38). We encountered two occupation floors in our excavations. The lower occupation floor (depth of 2.22 m) was red color and associated with a few undecorated potsherds, while the upper occupation floor (depth of 2.05 m) was a creamy yellow color (Figure 150).
Both occupation floors were made of compacted clay 4-5 cm thick, and laid on thin compacted layers of gravel. The upper occupation floor had approximately 12 fragments from undecorated domestic wares. We also encountered burnt carbon and straw. We reach sterile at a depth of 2.35 m.

Our excavations revealed that the interior walls and niches of this building were plastered and covered with red pigment of a similar color to the floor. Immediately above the level of the yellow upper occupation floor on both the east and south walls of the building we encountered a row of small (approximately 25 cm high by 15 cm wide) trapezoidal niches that were not visible prior to our excavations.

**Northern Sector, Zigzag Entrance**

We sought to understand the design of one of the principal accesses to the site, and the process by which someone would have entered the site’s Northern Sector. We excavated a 3 m north-south by 4 m east-west unit between the walls that form the Zigzag Entrance (Figure 8.40). Unlike our other excavations, this unit was not excavated to sterile due to concern about the stability of the surrounding walls and lack of time at the end of our excavation season. We did reach a depth of 5.38 m.

Unfortunately, this area showed significant evidence of prior undocumented excavation and significant removal of stones from what may have been a stone-paved entrance. We found two well worked stones, similar to those found in the Zigzag Wall itself, on the same level in a fan-like shape. These may
have served as a step in a more formal entryway. We encountered a few other well-worked stones with smooth faces, though these were not arranged in any discernible way. We found evidence of carbon and clay, although no cultural material.

**Northern Sector, Structure 65**

We excavated Structure 65 immediately inside the Zigzag Entrance. We wanted to know if Structure 65 might serve as a guardhouse, a buttress for the abutting zigzag wall and/or some other function. Also, as Structure 65 does not appear on the maps of Nordenskiöld or Rex-Gonzalez, we wished to ascertain whether it was pre-Columbian or a later construction.

We excavated to sterile (depth of 2.62 m) a 2-m (east-west) by 3.1-m (north-south) unit across the entire width of Structure 65 at its western end (Figure 8.41). We found several layers of fill with little cultural material but significant quantities of ash and carbon as well as the remnants of a burned beam (depth 1.11 m), suggesting a fire in the building. We also encountered a hearth (depth 1.02 m) and remnants of a *boleadora* (throwing stone). We found no potsherds anywhere in the structure.
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Chapter 9: INCALLAJTA: SACRAL THEATER OF THE INKA EMPIRE

In this chapter, I consider Incallajta from the performatic framework described in earlier chapters. I begin by considering the results of our field research, and then incorporate those results into a broader consideration of Incallajta as a performance center and its role in the Inka empire and its expansion.

Chronology

We sent eight carbon samples from our excavations to the Beta Analytics Laboratory for radiocarbon dating and all produced dates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beta No.</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>C13/C12 Ratio</th>
<th>Conventional Radiocarbon Date</th>
<th>2 Sigma Calibration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162097</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-21.2</td>
<td>440 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>AD 1332 to 1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162100</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-22.8</td>
<td>680 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>AD 1226 to 1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162104</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-25.3</td>
<td>310 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>AD 1448 to 1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162099</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-25.1</td>
<td>400 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>AD 1426 to 1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162105</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-24.1</td>
<td>390 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>AD 1433 to 1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162101</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-22.9</td>
<td>370 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>AD 1440 to 1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>510 +/- 70 BP</td>
<td>AD 1290 to 1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-24.5</td>
<td>500 +/- 70 BP</td>
<td>AD 1292 to 1620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1. All dates are radiometric radiocarbon dates. Dates calibrated with OxCal 4.1 INTCAL-09 (Bronk Ramsey 2010). Samples are all charred material: acid/alkali/acid
With the exception of Sample 79, all of these dates are consistent with (though do not prove) the accepted chronology of Inka expansion into this region in the mid to late 15th century. The dates are also however consistent with suggestions by other commentators that the Inka arrived and constructed settlements in this area in the early 15th century (D’Altroy 2000, Alconini 2007).

Structure 1

Columns and Roofs

We found three Excavated Postholes and three additional Unexcavated Postholes. Just over 8 m separate the Structure 1 Postholes in the east-west direction, while 6.3 m separate them north-south. Extrapolating from the placement of the Structure 1 Postholes and assuming constant spacing among them, we concluded that there were three east-west rows of 8 postholes, for a total of 24 columns. These rows are 6.3 m, 12.6 m and almost 19 m from Structure 1’s south wall. The westernmost and easternmost postholes are approximately 8 meters from Structure 1’s west and east walls respectively.

We used the results of our excavations, our digital mapping, and our observations of Structure 1’s remaining gable to reconstruct Structure 1 (Figure 9.1). We estimated the pitch and height of the roof at approximately 60 degrees and 19.5 m respectively. The architect Paul Boulifard then designed a roof framing system that would support the massive thatched roof required to cover Structure 1. In addition to several over 10 m high and almost 1 m in diameter tree trunks that would have been served as columns, this framing would have
contained at least 16 6.5 m long purlins, or horizontal members, as well as a large number of smaller interlocking wooden supports. This wooden framing could have been brought from the yungas, a tropical forest roughly 40-50 km to the northeast of the site.

Revetment Walls

Both the north and south walls of Structure 1 are supported by low, two-step revetment walls (the Structure 1 North Revetment Wall and the Structure 1 South Revetment Wall) described above. These revetments walls are adjacent to the southern side of the respective walls they are supporting, and enable Structure 1 to bear the weight of its large roof. As the Central Sector slopes downward from north to south, the weight of the roof might otherwise cause Structure 1’s north or south wall to deflect to the south.

Water Management

While preparing our simulations that explore the movement through the site, we initially considered a modeling a pathway from the Group G Entry Plaza to the west side of Structure 1 that included walking through the area just north of Structure 1 (the Canal), which we and others had believed to be a corridor. However, when we began to prepare a virtual reality reconstruction for this simulation, we realized that a 1.5 m tall person could not pass through the Canal without hitting his/her head on Structure 1’s roof, which protrudes into this area (Figure 9.2-9.3). We also realized that during rainy season, which is 5-6 months per year, enormous amounts of water would run off the roof into the Canal,
making passage impossible and dangerous. We thus interpreted this area as a
drainage canal for this runoff, running from Structure 1’s northeast corner
downhill past the northwest corner to an enclosed area to the west.

This reconstruction also revealed why we had never been able to locate a
doorway in the walled area to the west of Structure 1. Prior to our reconstruction,
we had hypothesized that this area was a room accessed by the canal. We now
interpret this area as a pool, into which water from the Canal flowed and
gathered. We did not identify any canals or other means for water to exit the
Pool, although we did not excavate in this area.

*Structures 100 and 101*

The chroniclers agree that in the center of Haukaypata in Cuzco was a
large stone atop a basin or font (Betanzos 1996[1551]:47; Pizarro 1978[1571]:89-
91; see Monteverde 2011:13 for all descriptions of the Cuzco ushnu). Betanzos
describes the font as a “medio estado” (about 0.85 m) high, and notes that the
stone was covered with a band of gold. Neither Betanzos nor Pedro Pizarro, two
of the earliest chroniclers to enter Cuzco, utilizes the term ushnu (or any of its
variants) to describe this font/stone complex. Only later chroniclers writing in
1570 and after, such as Cristobal de Molina, el Anonimo, Bernabe Cobe and
Cristobal de Albornoz, apply the term to the Cuzco font/stone complex.

Numerous uses are suggested for this complex, including a place to worship the
sun, leave offerings, pour libations and venerate ancestors, perform or begin
rituals and ceremonies and a locus of astronomical or calendrical observations.
The Cuzco font/stone complex described by the chroniclers differs dramatically from what are considered prototypical ushnus by archaeologists, the stepped platform structures of sites located in the northern Chinchasuyu quadrant of the Inka empire such as Pumpu (Matos 1994), Huánuco Pampa (Morris and Thompson 1985, Morris et al 2011), Vilcashuaman (Cieza 1864 [1552]) and possibly Cajamarca (Guaman Poma 1980 [1603] (Figures 9.4-9.5). Guaman Poma erroneously draws the Cuzco ushnu as a stepped pyramid, almost identical in form to his drawing of the Cajamarca ushnu, and not matching any of the other chroniclers’ accounts. A few others of these stepped archaeological structures are reported in highland Argentina and Chile (Hyslop 1990:91-95). Numerous platforms, some with ramps or stairs, are also described in Inka literature as ushnus (Hyslop 1990).

While most chroniclers place ushnus in plazas, Albornoz places ushnus not only in plazas but also on royal roads. His physical description of ushnus matches the pyramidal stepped platforms described above, not surprisingly as he spent much of his time in Peru in the Chinchasuyu region. Frank Meddens and
colleagues (2010) have identified near modern day Ayacucho, Peru a series of stepped platform structures on not in plazas that they describe as ushnus.

Structure 100

Based on the original descriptions of the Cuzco ushnu in the chronicles, I interpret Structure 100 as the ushnu of Incallajta. The low platform with rock, located on a large central plaza, matches closely the chronicled features of the ushnu of Cuzco, far more than other structures interpreted as ushnus (Coben in press). The two shafts on either side of Structure 100’s rock could have served for either offerings or libations (e.g. Meddens et al 2011). While we not excavate under the ushnu or surrounding plaza for canals or evidence of a basin, an extensive water system, including the Canal, the Pool, the Structure 1 Conduit and possibly the depression in front of the ushnu suggest an extensive water system at the site. In addition, the theatrical and viewshed characteristics of the site, discussed more fully below, support this interpretation.

Structure 101

My interpretation of Structure 101 as an ushnu is more tentative. While meeting a broad definition of ushnu as a “sacred platform” (Coben in press) and resembling more closely the Cuzco ushnu than many of the other so-called ushnus in the Inka empire, Structure 101 has multiple rocks, not one like the Cuzco ushnu, upon it and an absence of stonework in its structure. We also identified no potential water conveyance features in this area. Nonetheless, in light of its superb theatrical location, at the highest and most visible point of the
Lower Plaza, I identify it as an ushnu as that term is commonly used in Inka studies

*Virtual Reality Simulations*

*Plaza Access*

We prepared a series of digital three-dimensional virtual reality simulations to explore the experience of movement through the site. We modeled potential ritual performance routes from various points of the site to reach Structure 1, Structure 100 and the Central Plaza Sector. I will discuss three possible routes: the Group G Entry Plaza through Group G to the Upper Plaza (the “Northeast Route”), Corridor D-E through the Sacerdotes Plaza to the Upper Plaza (the “West Route”), and Kancha H to the Lower Plaza (the “Southeast Route”), representing the three of the primary pathways to the Central Sector (Figures 8.11-8.18).

Both the Northeast and West Routes present overly convoluted and restricted routes to and from the Central Plaza Sector, requiring passage through narrow corridors and several turns. The high walls and extended overhanging roofs of the site’s many large buildings contribute to the sense that the passageways are narrow and restricted, as well as blocking sunlight or moonlight from many points of the route. People on the Northeast and West move frequently from shadow to light, finally emerging from tight corridors into more open, brighter plaza areas.

By contrast, the Southeast Route is far more direct. Upon emerging from
Kancha H through a narrow passageway, one can quickly see most of the Lower Plaza and in the distance Structure 1. This route is open and bright, with few of the turns or changes in light that characterize the Northeast and West Routes.

The Southeast Route is similar to the ways of accessing the Central Plaza Sector from outside the site through the four doors in the eastern Perimeter Wall. These doors were likely accessed through a footpath from the Quebrada Fuerte Huayco, and also potentially from the Northern Sector by walking outside the Zigzag and Perimeter Walls.

*Ritual Movement Simulation*

We also prepared within digital Incallajta a digital simulation recreating ritual movements described by the chronicler Garcilaso de la Vega (1966 [1607]:70) as taking place at the Inka temple dedicated to the Creator God Viracocha at Raqchi, Peru. The Temple of Raqchi is the largest in the Inka empire, measuring 92 m long by 25.25 m wide (Gasparini and Margolies 1980:238). This building has four naves, with a large central wall on its longer north-south axis flanked by two north-south rows of eleven columns (Figure 8.19). This central wall has ten doors. The Temple of Raqchi is accessed through two doors in its shorter southern side. According to Garcilaso (1966 [1607]:70), the Inkas upon entering by the door of the temple, they turned down the first lane to the right until the wall on the right hand side of the temple was reached. Then they turned down the second lane until they reached the other wall. Then they turned down the third lane, and so on...
(according to the spaces on the plan) until they came to the twelfth lane at the other end, where there was a staircase leading to the upper story of the temple. At the end of each lane there was a small window which gave sufficient light.

The columns and the doors in the central wall apparently form these lanes (Figure 8.19).

We sought to recreate these movements virtually within Structure 1 (Figure 8.20). As Structure 1 has no doors in either of its shorter end walls, we commenced the movement at the easternmost doorway. This simulation utilized the eight north-south rows of columns (with imaginary lines connecting the columns of each north-south row) to form the lanes (See Figure 8.20 to see the “lanes” of movement). We were able to recreate this movement, including the sensation of moving toward and away from light described by Garcilaso, although Structure 1 has only 10 or 11 lanes as opposed to the 11 or 12 for Raqchi (Figure 9.6).

Garcilaso’s descriptions must be viewed critically, as his description of the size and door location of the Temple of Raqchi does not coincide well with the remains of the temple (Gasparini and Margolies 1980:243). Nonetheless, the similarity in size, movement and light of the two structures provides strong support for Structure 1’s previously suggested identification as a Temple of Viracocha (Ellefsen 1972, Nordenkskiöld [1957[1915], Coben 2006).

Panoramic Viewsheds

To consider what a ritual participant might see from a particular vantage
point, we created two digital panoramic viewsheds, one from the center of Structure 1 (Figure 9.7) and the other from Structure 100 (Figure 9.8). A viewer in Structure 1 is impressed and awed by the height, vast interior space and massive amount of wood and thatch required to build and support the roof of this structure, as well as its red painted walls. We added artificial light to this viewshed, as Structure 1 was probably quite dark, particularly on its north side, other than intermittent plays of sunlight from its doors and windows on its south side and windows on its gables. As a result of this darkness, we created a simulation showing the changes in lighting in the building as the sun moves through the sky during the course of the day (Figure 9.9).

Structure 100 provides a participant with an outstanding view of a significant portion of the site and much of its surrounding hills (Simulation 9.8). Someone standing at this point can see the entire Upper Plaza, Group H, and portions of Groups A, C, and D and the Sacerdotes Plaza Group, as well as parts of Cerro Pucara to the east of the site and Cerro Mujuloma and Cerro Maium to the south. Conversely, someone or something placed on Structure 100 would have been visible from many of these points, marking it as a likely center of dramatic action at the site. While we did not conduct a GIS viewshed analysis, I believe that this location would be one of the most visible points inside Incallajta from both inside and outside the site.
**Inka Performance**

Ceremonial and ritual performance was ubiquitous throughout the Inka Empire and the Andean region (Moore 1996b, Sillar 2002). The Inkas celebrated a regular monthly calendar of major festivals and sacrifices in and around Cusco, as well as unscheduled ceremonies that commemorated or were associated with particular events (Betanzos 1996, Cobo 1990, Molina 2011). Numerous performances, both calendar-scheduled and not, also occurred at Inka administrative centers such as Huanuco Pampa and Pumpu and royal palaces such as Quispiguanca and Machu Picchu (Morris et al 2011; Matos 1994; Niles 1999:171-173; Burger and Salazar-Burger 1993). Pilgrims followed routes through sacred geographies to state-sponsored huacas such as the Temple of Raqchi or the sacred Islands of the Sun and the Moon in Lake Titicaca (Sillar 2002; Bauer and Stanish 2001; Stanish and Bauer 2004). In numerous settlements and based on another ritual calendar, kin groups made daily offerings to huacas located on a series of radiating lines called ceques (Zuidema 1964, 2010).

Ceremonial and ritual performance was an integral part of Inka governance and statecraft, helping to manage and administer internal rivalry and politics and relationships with the local lords of conquered and allied groups (Morris et. al 2011, Bauer 1996; Coben 2006). Maria de Rostworowski (1999:43-46) suggests that participation in public rituals was a necessary and critical element of establishing social and political relations, and Gordon McEwen
(2010:78,121) notes that the primary method of Inka administration was festive ceremonial exchanges in provincial centers intended primarily for that purpose.

Many Inka performances took place in locations designed and prescribed by the state. These “theaters” are the focus of this dissertation.

*Cuzco: The Main Stage*

Any analysis of Inka performance must begin at the capital and most important Inka “theater”, their capital, Cuzco. Cuzco was the capital of the Inka Empire and its political and cosmological center (Hyslop 1990; Rowe 1946; Bauer 1998, 2004; Zuidema 2010; Betanzos 1996[1551]). One of the many definitions of the word Cuzco is “the navel of the world” (Garcilaso 1987[1609]:93). The chroniclers report a variety of Inka origin myths, almost all of which conclude with the founding of Cuzco by the mythical first Inka ruler, Manco Capac (Cobo 1996:103-8). In many of these tales, Manco Capac strikes a gold staff into the ground to fix the capital’s location.

Pachacuti, the ninth and likely the first historic Inka ruler (Rowe 1945) is said to have redesigned and rebuilt Cuzco during his reign (Betanzos 1996[1551]). According to Inka narratives, Pachacuti laid out Cuzco, its streets, plazas, roads and buildings (Betanzos 1996[1551])(Figure 9.10). He designed and constructed the Temple of the Sun (Coricancha), near the southeast corner of the city’s central district (Figure 9.11). The Coricancha also included terraced gardens and a round wall reportedly covered in gold. He canalized the
Tullumayo and Huatenay Rivers, which bound the central precinct of Cuzco and intersect near and to the southeast of the Temple of the Sun.

The chronicles suggest that Pachacuti ruled from approximately 1438-1471 (Rowe 1945), though recently some scholars have suggested his rule began more than 50 years prior to that date (Covey 2006b). In these documents, Pachacuti’s reign marks the beginnings of Inka imperial expansion, as he defeats with the help of mythical warriors the neighboring Chancas when they threatened Cuzco and becomes the first Inka ruler to conquer territory outside of the Cuzco Valley. According to many of the chronicles, the Inka state or empire thus began during his rule.

Ancient states frequently attribute their origin to transformative conquest events, like those of Pachacuti in the Inka narratives, though these claims cannot be taken at face value (Arkush 2011:206; Bauer 1991; Urton 1990). Brian Bauer and Alan Covey, on the basis of archaeological survey in the Cusco Valley, suggest that indicia of state-level political organization may be present as early as AD 1200 and that significant imperial expansion occurs by 1400 or earlier, and thus the chronology based on historical documents (the chronicles) is unreliable (Bauer and Covey 2002, Covey 2006a). Bauer’s (2010) survey of the Andahuaylas region, the Chanca homeland, reveals not a powerful foe but a fragmented region of small settlements and polities.

Inka Cuzco was divided into two halves or moieties, the upper (hanansaya) to the north, and lower (hurinsaya) to the south (Figure 9.12). A
road near the southern end of the larger and more important of the city’s two adjacent central plazas, Haukaypata, likely marked such division (Hyslop 1990:58). The second plaza, to the west, was called Cusipata. The Inka also divided the city and valley of Cuzco, and their empire, into four quadrants, or suyus (Bauer 1998:6) (Figure 9.13). Hanansaya was divided into two parts, Chinchasuyu to the northwest and Antisuyu to the northeast. Hurinsaya was similarly divided, with the quarter of Cuntisuyu to the southwest and Collasuyu to the southeast. The Inka called their empire Tawantinsuyu, the land of the four quarters. The center point of this suyu system was the Haukaypata plaza. Four great roads emerged from this plaza, marking each of the suyus (Cieza 1959[1552]:144) (Figure 9.12).

Later Inka rulers constructed numerous other buildings and temples in the city. Most significantly, the massive Sacsayhuaman was constructed on the hill immediately to the north of the city (Figure 9.14). Three rows of zigzag walls mark the north side of this complex of several structures and other features. Interpretations of Sacsayhuaman include a fortress, Temple of the Sun, observatory and storehouse, and the complex was likely some combination of all of these features (Dean 1995). Sacsayhuaman served “more as a theater for religious ritual than as a defensive bastion” (Morris and von Hagen 2011:37). The construction of Sacsayhuaman has usually been attributed either to the end of the reign of Topa Inka, the tenth Inka ruler, or to Huayna Capac, the eleventh Inka ruler. The complex was likely begun during the reign of the former and
completed during the latter’s rule (Hyslop 1990). Although a minority view, a few chroniclers and archaeologists attribute Sacsayhuaman to the ruler Pachacuti, (Dean 1995).

Each ruler also constructed his own palace in Cuzco’s center, on or near Haukaypata. Many of these were or contained great halls, or galpones, often contained in large kanchas. Huayna Capac’s palace, the Casana, occupied most of the north side of Haukaypata (Hyslop 1990:40, Rowe 1979:22, Sarmiento de Gamboa 1947[1572], Garcilaso 1987[1609]). The Casana consisted of numerous buildings enclosed by a large wall (Niles 199:232), including the largest great hall in Cuzco, which had a large doorway at one end (Pizarro 1978[1571]). Two towers flanked the Casana’s entrance in its courtyard’s interior. Another smaller compound, the Coracora, lay immediately east of the Casana. Nothing remains today and little is known about this compound.

Two large compounds, the Amarucancha and the Acclahuasi, filled the south side of Haukaypata. Little is known about the former, the larger and westernmost of the two complexes, though most chroniclers attribute its construction to the ruler Huascar (Cabello Balboa 1951[1586], Sarmiento de Gamboa (1947[1572]). If this attribution is correct, the Amarucancha would be the last royal palace constructed in Cuzco. Across a narrow street to the east lay the Acclahuasi, the complex housing the mamaconas, young women who served the state (Bauer 2004:128). This compound contained a large number of rooms,
purportedly as “offices” for the mamaconas, storage bins for maize, and four alleyways (Garcilaso 1987[1609]).

Garcilaso (1987[1609]) states that an over 18 m high round tower called the Sunturhuasi stood in the Haukaypata in front of the Amarucancha. One of Guaman Poma’s (1980[1603]:329) drawing’s showing Inka palaces or royal houses includes a round tower labeled “suntor uaci”. No other chronicler mentions this impressive structure. Zuidema (1980;1989) suggests that the Sunturhuasi played an important role in astronomical and calendrical observations made from the ushnu.

Haukaypata’s east side contained another great hall in its center. Some commentators describe this building as a Temple to the creator gods, though others suggest that this temple was further south and not on Haukaypata (Bauer 2004:124). North of this hall sat a series of terraces, atop which was the palace of Huascar. To the south, at Haukaypata’s southeastern corner, sat a large enclosed compound called the Hatuncancha. Hatuncancha had only one entrance and contained a great hall. Garcilaso suggests this complex was the ruler Pachacuti’s palace.

South of the Hatuncancha likely lay another large enclosed compound, the Pucamarca (Bauer 2004:134-135). While the evidence is fragmentary, this complex possibly contained two temples, one dedicated to the creator god Viracocha and the other to the Thunder god. Further south, and just north of the Coricancha (Temple of the Sun), sits the Cusicancha, another large enclosed
Cusicancha may have served as a house for Inka royal mummies (Vargas 2007).

The Sun Temple of Cuzco, or Coricancha, was the center of the ceque system, a partitioning scheme of 41 or 42 (Cobo 1990[1653]; Bauer 1998:11) sight lines linking a total of 328 huacas, best glossed as sacred objects or shrines, that radiated from this temple of what? (van de Guchte 1999; Zuidema 2010). Three of the suyus contain nine ceques each, while Cuntisuyu contains fourteen or fifteen. Cobo suggests that the ceques in each of the four suyus are found in groups of three, ranked by the social status collana, payan, and cayao (Zuidema 1964: 2-5). These lines often pass through features of the built and natural environment including caves, springs, boulders, canals, palaces and houses, some of which are huacas (Hyslop 1990:66). Zuidema has suggested that the ceques were straight, but field research by Bauer (1998:11) and Susan Niles (1987: 171-206) suggests that the huacas on individual ceques are not aligned linearly (See Aveni 1996 and Zuidema 2010 for a response). Bauer (1998:11) observes:

In this model of the Cusco ceque system, it is the specific locations of the huacas that define the course of the lines and not vice versa. In other words, while the connotative model of the system by the Inka may have included the notions of ceques as straight lines, researchers cannot presume that the actual form of the system on the landscape reproduced this restrictive framework.
Cuzco-based kin groups were assigned to make offerings on specific ceques at particular huacas pursuant to a ritual calendar (Cobo 1990[1653]), establishing a schedule of performances at predetermined times and locations. The worshipped huacas included mountains, rocks, springs and other elements of the landscape (van de Guchte 1999). These ceque/huaca-based performances were linked to the social organization of the capital (Zuidema 1964, Bauer 1998), its calendar and astronomical observations (Zuidema 2010) and to the location and ownership of water resources among social groups (Sherbondy 1982).

The Cuzco ceque system was dynamic rather than static, “a flexible expression of social and spatial relations” (Bauer 1998:161). Niles (1999:52) notes that “A number of places important to his ancestors or to his neighbors were organized into a system at the behest of Pachacuti.” The ruler Huayna Capac later was said to have revised and expanded the system (Niles 1999:52, Rowe 1980, 1985). Special Inka experts could add or remove huacas from the system (van de Guchte 1999). Certain chroniclers describe a system with more than 342 huacas in the latter part of the 16th century (Bauer 1998). The system “was able to adapt to social and territorial changes, and it was capable of incorporating those changes into the continually developing ritual order of the region” (Bauer 1998:161)(emphasis added). The ceque system reflected, reaffirmed, manipulated and created power relations at the core of the Inka...
Empire, through the continued yet changing schedule and locations of performances and offerings.

Somewhere near the center or southern end of Haukaypata sat a sugarloaf-shaped stone covered with gold, either surrounded by or sitting upon a stone basin or font (Betanzos 1996[1551]:47, Pizarro 1978[1571]:89-91). The Inka concept of ushnu was derived from this stone and font complex and its integral role in Inka spectacles performed in Haukaypata (Zuidema 1980), though the term ushnu has been utilized to describe platform and other architectural complexes in many other Inka sites (Hyslop 1990:69-95). I have previously in this chapter discussed the concept of ushnu.

Betanzos (1996 [1551]:48) describes the ushnu as a place for the common people (in contrast to the lords of Cuzco) to pray and make offerings, and where libations are poured. Numerous festivals occurred in Haukaypata around the ushnu. Molina (1989[1552]:74-75) in describing the citua ritual, notes that the ushnu is the gathering and starting point for processions of soldiers marching out to the empire's four suyus, and that the next day again the ayllus and panacas (royal descent groups) constituting the Cuzco Inkas gathered in Haukaypata around the ushnu together with their ancestral mummies and the mummies of former Inka rulers and their attendants. The panacas and ayullus were placed following their genealogical order, status and moiety divisions. They danced, sang, ate and drank, and the ancestral mummies were also fed and provided drink. They gave thanks to the creator (Viracocha), sun and thunder.
The Inka drank with them, and the sun had a large golden drinking vessel placed in front of him into which the Inka ruler served him *chicha*. The principal priest took this vessel and poured the drink in the *ushnu* from where it ran via a tube or canal to the houses of the sun (*Coricancha*), creator and thunder gods. The priest consumed and drank the sacrificed foods and drink. Several days later,

all the nations that the Inka had subjugated entered, coming with their *huacas* and clothing common to their lands, the richest available; and the priests whose charge it was brought their *huacas* on litters. And arriving in the plaza, they entered in their three divisions of the four *suyus*, and went making reverence to the Creator and Sun and Thunder and to *Guanacauri, huaca* of the Inka and then to the Inka, who at that point was already in the plaza (Molina 1989[1575]:94).

After two days of feasting, the subjugated peoples were permitted to leave Cuzco, on condition that the *huacas* they brought with them be left in Cuzco for a year, while those *huacas* left the year before could be taken back to their respective homelands. The Inka recognized and honored provincial lords during this festival.

The central core of Cuzco was dedicated to a wide range of ritual performance and spectacles. The core is filled with palaces, plazas, temples and other religious, administrative and political structures, with little residential architecture other than the palaces (Rowe 1967, Niles 1992:349, Acuto 2005:214). Any residents of this were members of the most elite class of Inkas.
Rowe (1967:63) describes Cuzco as the “ceremonial center” of the empire, the sacral theater for the most important rituals and performance within the Inka empire.

Spectacle and Performance in Cuzco and Beyond: The Play’s the Thing

Ceremonial and ritual performance was ubiquitous throughout the Inka Empire and the Andean region (Moore 1996b, Sillar 2002). According to the chronicles, the ruler Pachacuti established a regular monthly calendar of major festivals and sacrifices to be performed in Cusco, each of which contained spectacular dramatic elements and presentations. Pachacuti was also said to have composed many of the prayers associated with these performance (Cobo 1990[1653]:119).

Festivals on the Ritual Calendar

Two of the most important of these spectacles were one for the investiture of boys as warriors (orejonés) centered around the December equinox, Capac Raymi, and another, centered around the June equinox, dedicated to the maize harvest (Betanzos 1996[1551], Cobo 1990[1653], Bauer 1996). During the latter festival, Inti Raymi,

those who had become orejon warriors…put on tunics woven of gold, silver and iridescent feathers. Dressed like that with this plumage, gold disks and bracelets, they would come out to the fiesta. There they would end their fasts and sacrifices, which they had made from the time they were made orejon warriors until then…. [t]hey would start to enjoy themselves and celebrate…since it was necessary to give thanks to the Sun for the crops. This fiesta…started in May and
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lasted until the end of June…. He [Pachacuti] ordered that this fiesta be celebrated in the square…in the city of Cuzco which is the exit from this city called Limapampa. For this fiesta the lords of Cuzco were to come out dressed in red tunics that reached down to their feet. He ordered great sacrifices to the idols for this fiesta. They were to burn much livestock, food, and garments…. And at these guacas [huacas] they would make many offerings of jewels of gold and silver (Betanzos 1996[1551]:66).

Cobo (1990:142) describes this festival as commencing on the nearby hill of Manturcula and finishing in the main plaza of Cuzco. A dance called cayo was performed four times a day. The participants include the Inka, the mamaconas, cloistered women dedicated to the service of the Inka gods, and “his lord and knights.” According to Cobo (1990:142) “this festival was performed only by the Inkas of royal blood, and not even their wives participated in it; instead the wives stayed away in a patio. The mamaconas …would give drink to the Inkas, and all of the vessels from which they ate or drank were made of gold”.

Cobo also provides a detailed description of Capac Raymi, the investiture ceremony, and the preparation for it.

When the first of the month came, the principal Inkas got together in the Temple of the Sun, and there they organized the festival and everything that needed to be done for it. They ordered all of the provincials to leave the city, and none of them returned until the end of the festival. Both those who were leaving and those coming to the court [Cuzco] were instructed to stay at a certain place designated for this purpose at the beginning of each road, and at each of these places the people gathered who were from the suyu to which that road went (Cobo 1990[1653]:127).
Preparations for the ceremony began well in advance of the spectacle proper. A number of richly dressed “noble maidens”, ages 12-14, went to a nearby hill called Chacaguanacauri to spin the thread for the fringe of the guaras (loincloths or britches). The boys went to the same hill to collect straw. The huaca (sacred idol) of Guanacauri accompanied the maidens while they were on the hill. The remaining items required for the ceremony, including the animals and clothing to be sacrificed, chicha (corn beer), clothing and emblems for the boys, was provided by their parents and relatives, who also wore special clothing.

All of the boys who participated in this ceremony were 12-15 years old and descendants or relatives of one of the Inka rulers, including the “crown prince” who was to succeed to the throne and his brothers. This ceremony included the piercing of the boys’ ears for earplugs and putting on of their guaras. The ceremony, which takes place over several days, began with the presentation of the boys at the Temple of the Sun by Inka nobles. Idols of the Inka gods and the mummies of Inka ancestors were placed on low benches to drink with the ceremony’s participants. Cobo notes that these gods and mummies participated in most of the ceremonies of the regular calendar. The Inka and the priest of the Sun then joined the ritual, which proceeded with animal sacrifices. Parts of the ceremony also take place on the sacred hill of Guanacauri and in the main plaza of Cuzco, Haukaypata. A dance called guari, which includes singing, is performed several times, first by the boys alone and later by all present. Later, in the presence of the Inka, the priest of the Sun gives the boys certain clothing.
The ceremony also included running to huacas on other hills, beatings of the boys by their older male relatives, and reminders of the victories of the Inkas. The rite concludes with a gift of weapons, and after being brought to the agricultural fields, the piercing of the boys’ ears. The only stated role for the maidens during this entire ceremony is the carrying and serving of chicha and encouraging the boys during their runs up and down the hills.

At the conclusion of the ceremony, all of the people who had been excluded from Cuzco were permitted to reenter the city. Everyone gathered in Haukaypata to perform the cayo dance. Each person was given a cake, served on a consecrated silver or gold plate, ostensibly “given to them by the Sun so that they would be content and not say that the Sun had neglected them by paying attention only to those who had participated in the festival” (Cobo 1990[1653]:129). The participants danced and drank for several days. Four drums, belonging to the Sun, were played during the dances to set the beat. Four “important Indians”, each wearing a special costume dominated by puma skins worn such that “the head and neck of the lion came down over the head of the person wearing it and the animal’s skin came down over the back” (Cobo 1990[1653]:129), played these drums. The description implies that the drummers appeared as anthropomorphized pumas. The Inka ruler directed the sacrifice of animals in the main plaza and then at all of the huacas of the Cuzco region.

The primary Capac Raymi ceremony was staged in Cuzco, “and there the festival included more spectators and greater ostentation because the number of
boys who were knighted was large (Cobo 1990[1653]:128). Capac Raymi was also staged concurrently in those provinces whose governors were of royal blood. Such governors knighted their sons and other young nobles.

Descriptions of the entire ritual calendar of Cuzco are found in many of the chronicles (e.g., Betanzos (1996: Book 1, Ch. XV), Cobo (1990: Ch. 25-30) and will not be repeated here (See D’Altroy 2002:152-153 for a discussion of the calendars and the discrepancies among them). These descriptions reveal that in the moiety division of Cuzco between hurin and hanan and the empire division into four suyus are important organizing principles of almost all of the festivals. The participants wear distinctive and different costumes and perform different songs and dances at each festival. Every rite occurs in a designated location or locations, and movement between performance areas is common and often part of the spectacle itself. Idols and mummies were generally present and “participated” in the ceremonies, “consuming” chicha with other participants. The Inka ruler led or was present at these rites (Bauer 1996). People from the provinces were frequently required to leave or barred from entering Cuzco. The two rivers that border and define the central zone of Cuzco, the Huatenay and Tullumayo, play an important role in many of these ceremonies---ashes or goods are thrown into them, or chicha is poured into them. The intersection of these two rivers is a particularly significant location. The participants sacrifice animals in each of these major festivals. Many of the ceremonies are associated with the
agricultural cycle (Bauer 1996). Women were at times active participants, such as in the dance with the rope during the month of Camay.

**Other Important Cuzco-based Festivals**

Performance was not limited to these fixed events on the ritual calendar. Numerous other ceremonies occurred only in times of great need or stress, such as after an earthquake or during a drought, or upon an occasion of significance, such as the Inka dying or personally going to war (Cobo 1990[1653]:112). Two such ceremonies were the Capacocha and the Itu (Betanzos 1996[1551]:46, Molina 1989[1575]:121, Cobo 1990[1653]:151-157). In the Capacocha, the most beautiful children were chosen from locations throughout the empire and brought to the capital city of Cuzco, where they were dressed in fine clothing and jewelry and treated to ceremonial rites and feasts in Haukaypata, presided over by the Inka ruler, who sat with statues of the Creator, Sun, Thunder and Moon (Molina 1989[1575]:122). The children were then sent to be sacrificed at important shrines throughout the empire (Molina, 1989 [1575]:121). Some of these sacrifices were local to Cuzco. Betanzos (1996[1551]:46) describes a Capacocha at the Temple of the Sun, and Cobo (1990[1653]:72,156) reports one on the nearby hill of Chuquichanca and another southeast of Cuzco at Angostora. Gordon McEwan, Arminda Gibaja and Valerie Andrushko (Andrushko 2011) interpret an Inka burial at the site of Chokepuquio to the southeast of Cuzco as a Capacocha. Johan Reinhard and colleagues have located several likely Capacocha sacrificial burials on mountaintops throughout the empire (Reinhard
and Ceruti 2005). A small number of Capacocha burials have been identified for lower elevations or in the northern part of the empire (Bray 2005:87).

Prior to the commencement of the Itu, men abstained from women, salt, aji [chili] and chicha. All persons from the provinces were ejected from the city, as were women who had dogs and other animals. Guards were placed to ensure that no people or animals entered Cuzco. The first day of the ceremony required silence from all participants. After animal sacrifices, specially costumed young men moved in a procession around the main plaza, playing drums rhythmically and grimacing, followed by a noble spreading coca on the ground. An evening of prayer ensued, followed by two days of rejoicing, singing and dancing. If the Inka were going to war or in times of particularly great need, children might be sacrificed, and the drumming would be performed by “the most important nobles and knights of Cuzco”, followed by their wives carrying the men’s weapons in their hands (Cobo 1990[1653]: 153). The clothing and instruments for this festival were stored in a house in Cuzco designated exclusively for that purpose by the Inka ruler. While initially only the Inka elite could participate in this ceremony, later, in order to show great favor, the Inka ruler could grant permission for the Itu to be held in the lands of local lords ruled by the Inka. This permission was typically granted when the Inka ruled married one of his daughters or nieces to a provincial lord (Cobo 1990[1653]:152).

Concurrently with the Itu, outside of Cuzco and these authorized locales, “another festival Ayma was performed in all of the provinces” not granted
permission to perform the Itu (Cobo 1990[1653]153). Ayma included many of the same ceremonies as Itu, though the costumes were different.

Like the festivals on the fixed ritual calendar, participants in ceremonies such as Capacocha and Itu wear distinctive and different costumes, and perform songs and dances designated specifically for that festival. Every rite occurs in a designated location or locations, and movement between performance areas, also on a fixed path, is common and part of the spectacle itself. Idols were present and participated in these ceremonies, which the Inka ruler led or was present. Only designated people could participate in these ceremonies, and participants sacrifice both animals and people.

The Capacocha and Itu ceremonies possess a particularly pan-empire quality. Many of the major participants in these rites are from the provinces and members of ethnic groups other than the Inka, and significant elements of the performances occur outside of Cuzco or other Inka centers. The Inka administration designates the performers and locales, selecting the Capacocha participants and granting the right to perform Itu. Granting permission to be included in these ceremonies is a significant part of the performatic process, while those not included either must watch or perform a different ceremony like the Ayma.

These imperial primarily Cuzco-centric performances, whether on the ritual calendar or triggered by other events, were highly structured and regimented.
While each ceremony and its related offerings, prayers, declarations and sacrifices were different,

“[t]he form to be followed in the sacrifices was so well established, with the rites and ceremonies designated for each one, that no one was permitted to exercise his own free will in changing, adding, or eliminating anything from what was ordained, particularly with respect to the general and public ceremonies (Cobo 1990[1653]:110) (emphasis added)

General and public ceremonies refer to the most important Inka ritual performances--these were the most regimented. The primary actors in each ceremony were similarly designated. Cobo (1990[1653]:110) notes with respect to Inka sacrifices that

The priests of one guaca[huaica] did not interfere with the priests of another guaca[huaica]….At every town and guaca[huaica] attendants were assigned for each sacrifice, and it was stipulated when each sacrifice was to be made, the form and manner in which it was to be carried out, as well as the different types of things for it….They also made a distinction in the words that were used at the time of making the offering.

Cobo (1990[1653]) provides an elaborate description of Inka songs, dances and instruments, many of which were associated with a particular ritual, occupation or social class. Yet, amid the structure and regimentation, the Inka participants reveled greatly during their ceremonies and festivals. Their “prayers were accompanied by banquets and drinking bouts, where they enjoyed themselves with dances, games and songs which they had especially for each guaca[huaica] and festival” (Cobo 1990[1653]:121).
Performance in Cuzco extended beyond the imperial spectacles described above. Cuzco-based kin groups were assigned to make offerings to huacas on specific ceques pursuant to another ritual calendar (Cobo 1990[1653]), establishing a schedule of performances at predetermined times and locations (Bauer 1998). These performances included the burning of objects, animal, and at times child sacrifice. While the exact timetable of these offerings is uncertain, the number of ceques (41 in total) and the 328 huacas most frequently associated with this system suggests that this system of local kin-based performance was a frequent, if not daily part of Inka life in Cuzco. Ceque systems were said to be present in many Inka towns throughout the empire, including at least one in the Pocona region (Polo de Ondegardo 1990[1571]:47), and I suggest that so were the rituals that characterized them. These performances were likely pervasive throughout the Inka Empire.

**Performance Outside of Cuzco**

Performance in the empire was not limited to Cuzco. Perhaps the most important feature of Inka administrative centers, particularly in the highlands, was a large central plaza in which numerous performances occurred that were a key element of Inka statecraft (Covey 2008, Morris and Covey 2003). The plaza at Huánuco Pampa measures 550 m by 350m (Morris et al. 2011:30). In these provincial capitals, Inka governors oversaw some of the initiation rites and other ceremonies described for Cuzco (Molina 1989 [1575]). Festivities in these plazas included feasts of food and beer and singing and dancing (Morris et al...
Guaman Poma (1980[1603]:322) names Huánuco Pampa as the site for a festival, the dance of the Wawku, that shows both dancing and someone playing a small drum. Administrative centers serve as the loci of the performances involving Inka officials and administrators, local ethnic groups and the two together.

Areas for public ceremony are found at Inka royal palaces (Niles 1999:171-173; Burger and Salazar-Burger 1993) and other sites. At the ruler Huayna Capac’s royal estate, Quispiguancaca, the main plaza constituted two-thirds of the site’s area (Niles 1999:171).

Inka pilgrims frequently followed routes through sacred geographies, performing rites and rituals to state sponsored huacas such as the Temple of Raqchi or the sacred Islands of the Sun and Moon in Lake Titicaca (Sillar 2002; Arkush 2005; Bauer and Stanish 2001; Stanish and Bauer 2004). While a few of these processions, such as that at the sacred Islands of the Sun and Moon were state-sponsored and subject to highly restricted terms of access and regimented rites, others were local in origin and practice and open to broad classes of people (Bauer and Stanish 2001:21-22; Arkush 2005). In some strategic locations, the Inka superimposed a series of performance spaces and ritual structures such as platforms, plazas, kanchas and large stones in the center of previously existing, non-Inka settlements (Acuto et al. 2008, Arellano y Matos 2007; Gifford 2003; Matos 1997:402, Coben and Stanish 2005, Morris and Covey 2006).
Performance within the empire was not limited to state-sponsored ceremonies, although the Inka government likely influenced some of these performances to varying degrees. No spectacles were scheduled on the Cuzco ritual calendar for certain months of the year (Betanzos 1996[1551]; Cobo 1990[1653]). During the eleventh month, when no festivals were scheduled for Cuzco, the Inka ruler granted the people of certain towns or ethnic groups the right to conduct ceremonies in their towns (Betanzos 1996[1551]:68). Permission could also be granted to local lords to perform the Itu ceremony, usually when the Inka ruler married one of his daughters or nieces to a provincial lord (Cobo 1990[1653]:152). Concurrently with the Itu, outside of Cuzco and these authorized locales, “another festival Ayma was performed in all of the provinces” (Cobo 1990[1653]:153). Ayma included many of the same ceremonies as Itu, though the costumes were different. Frank Salomon (1995:327) notes “Inka ceremony insisted greatly on the replication at smaller local scales of rites performed at the sacred capital.” The Inka ruler and people exercised dominion over certain ethnic groups or polities by moving their huacas and sacred objects to Cuzco, and requiring the elite of such groups and polities to come to Cuzco to worship and celebrate such objects (Cieza (1959[1552]), Cobo 1990[1653]).

Many other performances were highly localized and not uniform across the empire. Guaman Poma’s (1980 [1603]:287-295) drawings and descriptions illustrate four distinct burial practices in each of the empire’s four quarters and a fifth for the Inka himself, including different mortuary structures or burial places.
Salomon (1991) suggests an even greater diversity and local tradition in mortuary practice than suggested by Guaman Poma. Guaman Poma (1980[1603]:321-329) also shows that each suyu has its own huacas (shrines) and distinct other ritual rites and practices. Certain rites, such as marriage, were performed differently in every place, pursuant to local norms (Cobo 1990[1653]:206).

According to Cobo (1990[1653]:244), “every province throughout the Inka Empire had its own special dances which were never exchanged”, as did the “Indians of Cuzco.”

New and Other Cuzcos in the Provinces: Regional Theater or Just Like Broadway?

The significance of Cuzco as center of the empire and its layout extended well beyond the city itself. The late 16th century chronicler Guaman Poma (1980[1603]) describes a set of Cuzco-like sites throughout the empire (Figure 9.15), stating “there is another Cuzco in Quito, and another in Tumi, and another in guanoco, and another in Hatuncolla, another in Charcas [south-central Bolivia].”

Cieza (1959[1552]), a chronicler of the mid 16th century identifies a Cuzco-like at the head of the Huarco (modern Cañete) Valley, Peru.

…he [Topa Inka] came down with the orejones [noble warriors] of Cuzco… and built a new city, to which he gave the name of New Cuzco, the same as his main seat…. They also tell that he ordered that the districts of the city and the hills should have the same names as those of Cuzco” (Cieza 1959[1552]:338).
Cieza (1959[1552]:342) reiterates that the ruler Topa Inka ordered that the “streets and hills and plazas bore the same names as those of the real one [Cuzco]”. I will refer to these Cuzco-like sites as “Other Cuzcos”.

With the exception of the one located in the Charcas, scholars generally agree on the identity of the Other Cuzcos. “Tumi” refers to Tomebamba, Ecuador (Idrovo 2000), “guanuco” refers to Huánuco Pampa in north central Peru (Morris and Thompson 1985, Morris et al 2011), “Hatuncolla” refers to the eponymous site west of Lake Titicaca (Julien 1983) and the Huarco Valley site refers to Inkawasi in the Cañete Valley, Peru (Hyslop 1985) (Figure 9.15). Quito has not been identified archaeologically, but likely lies under the modern city of that name in Ecuador (Salomon 1986).

Archaeologists have conducted surveys, mapping and excavations at most of the named Other Cuzcos, including Hatuncolla (Julien 1983), Huánuco Pampa (Morris and Thompson 1985, Morris et al 2011), Inkawasi (Hyslop 1985), and Tomebamba (Uhle 1923; Idrovo 2000). Most of these studies have identified strong similarities and connections between the design of Cuzco and the sites under study, predicated upon the presence of structural principles such as dual organization or moiety, quadripartition and the ceque system, and similarities in layout, building materials, structures, spaces and directional orientation. Replication may also have been linguistic—as discussed above these sites are referred to by the chroniclers as new or Other Cuzcos, and Cieza states that the districts, streets, hills and plazas of the site of Inkawasi carried the same names
as their counterparts in the capital. Many of Tomebamba’s toponyms similarly replicate those of Cuzco (Idrovo 2000). Yet, while varying degrees of iconicity exist at multiple scales and across numerous features, none of these Other Cuzcos is a precise physical copy of each other nor the capital itself. The importance of both similarity and difference in scale and features between an Other Cuzco and the capital requires analysis.

Many scholars have identified Incallajta as the Other Cuzco in the Charcas region referred to by Guaman Poma, based primarily on similarities between the site and the capital Cuzco as well as the monumental nature of its plazas, buildings and related performance spaces (Ellefsen 1973, Ibarra Grasso 1982a, Coben 2006, Muñoz 2007). Martti Pärssinen and colleagues (2010) however imply that the site of Paria, located about 20 km northeast of the modern city of Oruro, Bolivia and 150 km west of Incallajta, serves as the Other Cuzco of the Charcas. They describe Paria as the “capital of the Charcas” and an important point for the transfer of maize to Cuzco and for the gathering of Charcas federation troops for Inka military campaigns, and that Topa Inka directed that numerous storehouses, lodgings and a temple of the Sun be constructed there (Pärssinen et al 2010:236). They do not compare the site’s appearance or layout to Cuzco, as their work consists of reconnaissance and preliminary mapping. Cieza de Leon (1864[1553]:381-384), whom they cite as a primary source for their description of the site, places Paria in the province of Paria and not Charcas, whose capital was La Plata (modern day Sucre, Bolivia), and whose
territory includes the Cochabamba and Pocona regions. Nor was Paria the
capital of the royal audiencia of Charcas formed in 1559 after Cieza had written
his chronicle.

Hyslop (1990:304) and Pärssinen and colleagues (2010:236) also suggest
that the list of Other Cuzcos provided by Guaman Poma is not exhaustive, and
Cieza’s identification of Inkawasi supports this idea. Hylsop (1990:304) notes that
“at Cuzco one finds planning concepts employed in many other settlements.”
Inka settlement planning principles are often manifested in sites not designated
as new or Other Cuzcos. Polo de Ondegardo (1990[1571]:47-50) documented
ceque systems across the empire in a large number of towns including at least
one in the Pocona region, and describes their ubiquity as “universal.” His
description suggests that the complexity of these systems varied with the size
and importance of the individual communities (Bauer 1998:17). Moiety and
quadripartitioning have been observed at numerous sites, and numerous
buildings, platforms, waterworks and site axes associated with Cuzco have been
found at other locations (Hyslop 1990:304, Christie 2007). Some level of
replication of Cuzco appears to be manifested at most larger Inka sites. notes
Cobo (1990:190, 1979:194) distinguishes larger towns, characterized by planning
of streets and central squares, from other smaller settlements, described as
housing one hundred inhabitants with houses that were “jumbled together with no
order or coherent relation between them.” Even smaller settlements may contain

**What is an Other Cuzco?**

While many or all Inka sites may incorporate some aspects of Cuzco’s design and architecture, the chroniclers make clear that only some sites are formally designated Other Cuzcos. Even in the absence of this historical information, analyses based on archaeological data can reveal similarities and differences among various sites around the empire and Cuzco, define what might constitute an Other Cuzco, distinguish Other Cuzcos from sites that merely incorporate aspects of Cuzco, and determine what sites meet the definition of Other Cuzco.

I develop a three-part framework for analysis. First, looking at the physical layout of Cusco and the description of performances within it, I identify eight features or groups of features present at Cuzco that would be prominent as part of the performatic setting and experience. All are features described by the chroniclers at the time of the arrival of the Spanish and years afterwards and archaeological remains. The presence of a majority of these features at an Inka site other than Cuzco would reflect a degree of iconicity demonstrating Peircean replication. Second, I examine three of the more securely identified Other Cuzcos, Huánuco Pampa, Tomebamba and Inkawasi, for the presence of these features. I will not examine Quito or Hatuncolla, as the ruins of the former are under the modern city of that name and modern development has destroyed too
much of the latter to permit an analysis. Catherine Julien (1988:256), while not considering whether Hatuncolla was an Other Cuzco, suggests “some kind of identity between Hatuncolla and Cuzco”, noting the presence of kanchas, a large central plaza, a hill with storage structures to the north of the site’s center, an Inka-style site plan and the presence of significant quantities of Cuzco-Inka style ceramics. Last, I compare Incallajta to Cuzco and the Other Cuzcos for the presence of these features. I will then analyze the results of this comparison from a Peircean perspective.

I selected the following known features of Cuzco to test:

(i) A structure with a zigzag wall (Sacsayhuaman) to the north of the site’s core that is atop a hill containing storage structures (Colcapampa)
(ii) the zigzag structure is above and looks down upon a large double plaza (Haukaypata and Cusipata),
(iv) access via a road or roads to the central core
(v) a stone/platform/font complex (ushnu) in the central plaza
(vi) kallanka(s) or great halls bordering the central plaza
(vii) a central core or sector defined by two streams or rivers with their confluence occurring near the southeast corner of the core, where the site appears to come to a point
Huánuco Pampa was the capital of a newly constituted Inka province in north central Peru (Morris and Thompson 1985, Morris et al 2011). Constructed after the conquest of the region by the ruler Topa Inka, which may have occurred while his father Pachacuti was still in power, Huánuco Pampa was built on a previously uninhabited high plain (puna) along the royal highway (Morris et al 2011:9). The city includes an administrative palace and served as a storage location for staple goods, as well as a place where local populations assembled in its large central plaza to observe imperial ritual ceremonies. The Inka “annexation and administration [of this province] seems to have been achieved more easily than some other highland regions” (Morris et al. 2011:9).

I observe that at least five ((ii), (iv), (v), (vi), and (vii)) of the eight Cuzco characteristics are present at Huánuco Pampa (Figure 9.16). While Huánuco Pampa contains has a hill with storage structures to its north (ii), nothing resembling a structure with a zigzag wall (i) has been found at the site. Several kallankas border its massive central plaza (vi), which contains a stepped ushnu platform in its center (v). This plaza is not divided (iii), though it could be considered as such by the roads that enter and pass through it from its corners (iv). A confluence of a river and a small stream or canal occurs about 200 m
southeast of the central plaza (vii). While large kanchas can be found to the
south and east of the main plaza, none have a round wall nor have been
identified as a Temple of the Sun. Morris and Thompson (1985:63,69) note a
large kancha at the eastern edge of Huanuco Pampa’s southern sector (viii), but
identify it a residential complex based on the presence of cooking hearths, jars,
plates and cooking vessels. None of the kanchas are associated with a round
wall or terraces.

_Tomebamba_

According to the chronicles, the ruler Huayna Capac designed and rebuilt
Tomebamba (in present day Cuenca Ecuador) atop a settlement originally
constructed by his father, the ruler Topa Inka. (Idrovo 2000:83; Cabello Balboa
1951[1586], Sarmiento de Gamboa (1947[1572]). Tomebamba was Huayna
Capac’s birthplace, and was frequently identified as the second capital of the
Inka empire. Much of the site was destroyed in the late 1520’s during a major
battle of the Inka civil war between the competing rulers Atahualpa and Huascar
and due to urban development during the Colonial period through the present

I observe at least six ((ii),(iv), (v), (vi), (vii) and (viii)) of the eight Cuzco
characteristics are associated with Tomebamba (Figure 9.17). Much the
northern part of the site lies under the colonial and modern city of Cuenca.
Although the northern area is higher in elevation than the better preserved
southern area of the site, I am unable to determine whether or not a zigzag wall
or storage structures are present in the north (i). Idrovo identifies a neighborhood known today as Qollca on a hill to the north of Tomebamba’s core which he identifies as a region of storage of grains in Inka times (ii). The plaza is not divided (iii), except perhaps by a large Inka road that passes through it (iv) (Idrovo 2000:80-88, Uhle 1923). Uhle identified an ushnu in the plaza, a platform 28 m long by 26 m wide and 1.2 m high, although no evidence of this structure remains today. A single kallanka (70m by 11 m), interpreted by Idrovo and Uhle as a Temple of the Creator God Viracocha, dominates the north side of the plaza (vi). Two rivers defined the site’s central core and reached their confluence at the southeast end of the central sector (vii). Near and above that confluence sits a kancha, in which one of the structures has a round wall (viii) (Figure 9.17a). This structure sits on the edge of a steep hill, which is terraced.

Inkawasi

Cieza de Leon (1959[1553]:342-343) writes when that Topa Inka decided to conquer the people of the Huarco valley, “he ordered a city to be founded, to which he gave the name of Cuzco….The streets, and hills, and open square received the same names as those of the real city.” Four years later, after the conquest of the valley, this city is abandoned, and the Inka ruler and army built a new fort at the mouth of the Huarco Valley. Hyslop identifies Inkawasi as the abandoned site and the new fortress as the site of Cerro Azul at the mouth of the Cañete Valley (1985:10).
I observe only two ((iv) and (v)) of the eight Cuzco characteristics at Inkawasi (Figure 9.18). According to Hyslop (1985), Inka roads (iv) pass through the central ushnu (v) in the site’s main plaza, and a possible ushnu is found in the site’s westernmost plaza. While one large and two smaller plazas are present at Inkawasi, they are not contiguous, and are located at some distance from one and other. (iii). A few structures are located on a small hill at the northern end of the site, but no zigzag wall is present (i) and these structures do not appear to be associated with storage (ii). Indeed, Duccio Bonavia (1972:84) notes little similarity in the plans of Cuzco and Inkawasi, though he and Hyslop (1985) find numerous similarities such as quadripartioning, roads and plazas common at numerous Inka sites.

While Huánuco Pampa and Tomebamba, containing at least five and six respectively of the eight Cuzco characteristics, can be said to be Peircean replicas of Cuzco, a similar conclusion cannot be drawn for Inkawasi. The archaeological evidence does not support this designation, and in the absence of the historical evidence and archaeologist would never suggest Inkawasi is an Other Cuzco.

*Incallajta*

Incallajta has seven of the eight Cuzco characteristics (but is missing (iv)) (Figures 9.19 and 9.20). The Zigzag Wall (i) is present on Cerro Colque Huayrachina in the Northern Sector, associated with numerous round foundations (Structure 67) that I and others interpret as
storage structures (ii). The Upper Plaza and Lower Plaza constitute a central double plaza (iii), and the Upper Plaza contains Structure 101, a stone platform with a large stone (v), which I interpret as an ushnu.

Structure 1, a large kallanka, dominates the north side of the Upper Plaza (vi). Below the southeastern extreme of the Central Sector, the Quebrada Fuerte Huayco river flows into the Machamarca River (vii). Kancha H and the Semicircular Patio lie in the southeast portion of the Central Sector, with a series of terraces (Figure 9.21) built into the hills below the Semicircular Patio (viii). While only one road leads to the Zigzag Entrance, access to the Upper Plaza and the Lower Plaza was highly restricted and convoluted (iv), as shown in our digital reconstructions.

I note three additional points of iconicity between Incallajta and Tomebamba, not present at the other Other Cuzcos or the capital itself. The northern side of both of their main plazas (the Upper Plaza in Incallajta) are bordered and dominated by kallankas over 70 m long (Uhle 1923, Idrovo 2000). No other kallankas or great halls are found on these plazas. By contrast, both Cuzco and Huánuco Pampa have multiple kallankas or great halls on their primary plaza. Second, significant portions of the main sector of both Incallajta and Tomebamba are surrounded by perimeter walls described by commentators as defensive in nature (Nordenskiöld 1957[1915], Uhle 1923, Idrovo 2000). Last, the round wall of the kancha/round wall/terrace complex in the southeastern
portion of both sites is at the southern end of the building, while on the
Coricancha in Cuzco that wall is at the building’s northern end.

The Review: Theaters of Power and Community on Tour

Paul Wheatley (1971), in his classic comparative study The Pivot of the
Four Quarters: A Preliminary Enquiry into the Origins and Character of the
Ancient Chinese City, describes Shang dynasty cities as material expressions of
cosmological order and religious symbolism. These cities served as axis mundi,
the sacred center of a conceptualized space and world that embody religion,
ideology and worldview. Such centers were frequently associated with the origin
of a particular civilization, and were designed pursuant to certain urban planning
principles that incorporated and represented Shang cosmology and placed these
cities at its core. Urban centers were thus an earthly depiction of an otherworldly
ideal or archetype; or, in a Peircean framework, they were iconic instantiations
(sinsigns/tokens), of the idealized cosmological type (legisign), that existed at the
time of their construction---Peircean replicas of the axis mundi and its
surrounding space.

Kings and rulers maintain a close association with such cities and their
layouts in order to embody the power and sacrality that emanate from them.
Upon the founding of a Chinese city, the king was to "assume responsibility for
the work of God on High and himself serve . . . at the center of the land . . . and
from there govern as the central pivot" (Wheatley 1971:430).
Cuzco, the Inka capital and cosmological center, was the empire’s most important and precise physical manifestation of a model conceptualized city. Designed by Pachacuti, modified and augmented by later rulers, the city was the center of the Inka universe, and represented and embodied their religion, ideology and worldview. Cuzco was the physical and earthly depiction of an otherworldly Inka archetype—a representation of the cosmological ideal. Such ideal is a Cuzco type or legisign, of which the actual city is a Peircean replica, the most important and iconic instantiation of this type/legisign.

The idealized type Cuzco and its instantiated replica at the capital incorporated more than the architectural features, topography and layout of the idealized city and cosmos. Cuzco was the sacral theater of the Inka cosmos, the setting for an elaborate calendar of ritual ceremonies and the stage on which many of the most important performances occurred. These performances replicate the idealized social actions and rituals undertaken in the idealized Cuzco’s designated spaces, and the various calendars that govern such performances. Replication also includes theatrical properties of any production, such as dance, utterances, movement, lighting, set and sound transmission. Many of such properties are integrally related to physical orientation, solar and lunar movement and prevailing wind conditions.

The physical Cuzco and its idealized cosmological equivalent were not fixed or static, but changed over time. New buildings were constructed, new spaces and zones created and new shrines named or dedicated, while others
were rebuilt or ceased to be loci of ceremonies. Accompanying such physical modifications were changes in cosmology, ideology, religion and ritual performance. The Inka “elite of Cusco reinstated and redefined their right to rule through their control of rituals and their dominant position in the state cosmology…in most, if not all, state-sponsored celebrations of the imperial city” (Bauer 1996:333). The ceque system was frequently modified, and Urton (1990) describes how the Inka origin myth was modified and manipulated for ideological purposes. Cobo (1990[1653]:5) observed:

... from the beginning of their empire the Inkas were not always steadfast in their religion, nor did they maintain the same opinions and worship the same gods… They were prompted to make such changes because they realized that this way they improved their control over the kingdom and kept it more subservient.

While a change in ideology or belief need not be accompanied by a corresponding change in material culture (e.g., the “we the people” example above, or the continued use of such structures as the Houses of Parliament, the White House or St. Peter’s Basilica), architectural and spatial modifications necessarily alter the performances within and about them, and in a cosmological center likely parallel developments in religious belief and ritual practice.

While various Cuzco-like features were present in all towns, cities and provincial capitals, the chroniclers name only a few places in the empire as replicas of the idealized cosmological legisign: the Other Cuzcos. These instantiations of Cuzco are not identical copies of each other, but are icons of a
Certain structures, spaces, layout and landscape features may be absent, rearranged or present at different scales. Nor should replication be considered on a single feature by single feature basis. Rather, both the co-occurrence and ordering of these features are equally if not more critical to an analysis of Peircean replication. A Peircean replica suggests identity of meaning when experienced by a person. Just as a type-sentence in whose instantiation a word is out of order or missing might carry a vastly different meaning or be incomprehensible, so might the mere recurrence of features without regard to their location, relationship to one another, and order of encounter; that is, the features must be considered both as co-occurring tokens and as a chain of signs in which sequence is critical.

Thus a site’s layout, topography, ingress, egress, orientation and surrounding landscape must all be analyzed in any examination of replication. The nature and degree of iconicity may vary over time within a given replica, as well over time and space from Other Cuzco to Other Cuzco. I will analyze these changes and innovations, and their tension and dialectic with replication, to provide insight into Inka imperial expansion. Such dialectic exists not only in architectural form, but also in landscape, site design, ritual and social action.

I suggest that the Other Cuzcos replicated the capital’s role as a sacred theater, the venue for the calendar of state-sponsored performances. At Huánuco Pampa, which was a provincial capital as well as an Other Cuzco, elements of ceremonial architecture and layout predominate over administrative ones (Morris
and Thompson 1985). A large platform (ushnu) with fine Cuzco-style masonry rests in the center of the site’s enormous main plaza. Plazas were the focal points of Inka spectacles (Moore 1996b). Additional evidence of feasting and ceremonial activity is found to the east in a subsidiary complex consisting of two additional plazas and a compound of elaborate architecture and waterworks also containing such masonry. Ceramic vessels found in this area are characterized by a predominance of jars of larger size than average for the site, especially wide-mouthed ones. These materials have been interpreted as evidence for large-scale food and chicha (maize beer) preparation and serving (Morris and Thompson 1985:90, Morris et al 2011:104). The city was clearly designed for large gatherings as part of a system of governance in which ritual and spectacle played the leading role (Morris and Thompson 1985, Morris et al 2011).

Tomebamba was the sacral theater of the northern portion of the empire. Idrovo (2000: 81-100) states that Tomebamba replicates Cuzco not only in an administrative sense, but also in physical and religious appearance. He focuses on the placement of sacred spaces and describes a site that “produces a miniature sacred geography, transmitting well the religious symbols of the capital” (Idrovo 2000:83) (translation by author). This sacred geography includes a large central plaza bordered on the north by a large kallanka, identified by Uhle as a temple dedicated to the creator god Viracocha, and at the southeast portion of the core, a Sun Temple. Idrovo also note similarities in toponyms between Cuzco and Tomebamba. Finely made stones from Cuzco of the type used in
imperial structures were likely transported over long distances to Tomebamba and utilized in its construction (Ogburn 2004).

Incallajta incorporates all of this sacred geography and more, as it physically replicates Cuzco more closely than either Huánuco Pampa or Tomebamba (Figure 9.20). Incallajta also possesses numerous theatrical properties. As noted, both the Upper Plaza and the Lower Plaza contain low ushnu platforms (Structure 100 and Structure 101 respectively), at their highest points. A person standing on either platform can be seen from anywhere within its respective plaza and beyond. A dramatic entrance can be made directly through Door 6 onto Structure 100 (Figure 9.22). Structure 100 matches the description of the ushnu in Cuzco better than any other Inka central platform with which I am familiar, and thus I interpret it as Incallajta’s ushnu. The site of Incallajta replicates the sacred core of Cuzco, and its location and landscape features evoke the memory and ritual power of those of the Inka capital (Coben 2006).

Peircean Analysis

The Inka’s intensive replication of their theaters and performances enhances the latter’s power by calling attention to their highly structured nature. Parmentier (1994:129-30) observes that

…[R]ituals are not just structured; they are ‘hyperstructured’ in that these cultural forms literally call out: behold the structure! …[R]itual can be interpreted as hypersturctured social action, in which segmentation, hierarchy, and stereotypy are not just
contingent aspects of performance but are the means of calling attention to the structuredness of action.

Hyperstructured performances are highly indexical and self-referential—in other words, they call attention to themselves and the structures that they represent and embody. They are “so conventionalized that they highlight or call attention to the rules, that is the pattern [or] model or … which the ritual action instantiates” (Parmentier 1994:133). These performances invoke and powerfully ground themselves in a society’s cosmology, worldview and ideology, the sources of such rules and structures and of existing societal order.

The power of a ritual is not maximized by a highly patterned setting alone, or from the mere decontextualized performance of a ceremony (Parmentier 1994:133), but rather when a regimented performance takes place within a replicated theater according to a fixed ceremonial calendar, thereby maximizing the hyperstructured nature of the performatic action and the invocation of the cosmology from which it emanates. Such performance

... is a token which is an instance of a general regularity, that is, a Peircean replica that brings into context the legitimized authority, divine precedent or mythological charter behind ritual action. ... Ritual performance signals not just cultural conventions but conventionality itself (Parmentier 1994:133)

These hyperstructured performances call attention to and emphasize their culturally derived cosmological, religious and ideological underpinnings, highlighting and institutionalizing the existing order. They are “the contextual anchoring of hyper conventional…forms which have regimenting power due to
their association with original or transcendent cultural types” (Parmentier 1994:134).

The original and Other Cuzcos and their ceque systems, layouts, features and certainly serve as ideal theaters for hyperstructured performances. While all ritual performance is to some degree hyperstructured, it reaches its apogee at the Cuzcos. From the beginning of a performance’s preparation through the event itself, the idealized cosmological type Cuzco and all of the power, history, religion and ideology associated with it are constantly evoked. The Other Cuzcos provide the contextual and physical anchoring for the hyper conventional and scripted ceremonial performances of the ritual calendar, many of which are associated with Inka origins, the highest gods of their pantheons and the rulers themselves. Outside of the capital itself, no sites so strongly exemplify and project the structure of Inka society. And in their role as settings of and integral elements in Inka ritual, they, together with the performance themselves, replicate, contextualize and bring to life most forcefully the live performance event, that, when combined with structure, maximizes the power of Inka religion and ideology.

*Other Cuzcos, War and Rebellion*

While the Inka built numerous provincial capitals and other cities, only a few were designated as Other Cuzcos. They are generally associated with war and conflict, and I suggest they were constructed as a response thereto. Quito, Tomebamba, and Incallajta are located near border regions characterized by
numerous fortified sites, both Inka and those of other ethnic groups they were seeking to conquer (Hyslop 1990; Pärssinen and Siiriäinen 1998, 2003; Querejazu 1998, Alconini 2004, Alconini 2008, Connell et al 2003, Nordenskiöld 2001). The high wall surrounding much of Incallajta and portions of Tomebamba may have served a defensive function (Nordenskiold 1957[1915]; Idrovo 2000). Hatuncolla was built upon the site of the Colla capital. The Colla rebelled against the Inka unsuccessfully on numerous occasions, and were treated harshly in return (Stanish 2000; D’Altroy 2002:71; Cobo 1979[1653]:143, 153). The ruler Topa Inka constructed Inkawasi during his successful conquest of the Huarco Valley, perhaps to house his army. Inkawasi was likely the last valley in this region incorporated into the empire, and the warfare in this valley was intense (Hyslop 1985, Cieza 1959[1552]). Hyslop argues that one reason for this intensity and difficult conquest was the lords of Huarco’s fortress of Ungarà. This fortress protected the valley’s irrigation intakes, and prevented the Inka armies from utilizing a common military tactic of seizing these intakes (Hyslop 1985:41-43) The Inka abandoned Inkawasi after such valley was conquered and incorporated into the empire (Hyslop 1985, Cieza 1959[1552]), and was no longer an area of intense warfare. Huánuco Pampa has no known association with a particular war, rebellion, or conquest (Morris et al 2011).

Other Cuzcos were founded by and closely associated with the Inka ruler, often while on a military campaign. Tomebamba, also described as a “second capital” of the empire, was the birthplace of ruler Huayna Capac, and designed
and built by him upon a settlement constructed by ruler Topa Inka (Idrovo 2000:83, Cabello Balboa 1951: Cap.XXI). Similarly, Huayna Capac reconstructed Incallajta at a site originally built by his father (Ellefsen 1973, Ibarra Grasso 1982, Coben 2006, Querejazu 1998, Sarmiento de Gamboa 1947) while visiting that region. Topa Inka directed the construction of Inkawasi while personally directing a military campaign there (Cieza 1959:338, 342). Indeed, I speculate that one reason these Other Cuzcos were constructed was to provide the Inka ruler with a sacral theater to perform important ceremonies when he was going to be absent from Cuzco leading his troops for an extended period of time.

Much of the capital’s ritual calendar, which I suggest would have been performed in the Other Cuzcos, is closely associated with warfare. The Inka invested new warriors during Capac Raymi, and at Inti Raymi these new warriors broke their fast and celebrated the harvest. During the annual ritual planting of maize, the Inka sang haylli, a song linked with both war and agriculture, and “this ritual was codified in the language of warfare” (Bauer 1996:328,331). The Inka closely associated agriculture, the theme of many of the ceremonies of their ritual calendar, with warfare (Bauer 1996:328, van de Guchte 1990:335-8; Zuidema 1977:230). Special ceremonies, such as the Itu festival described above, were performed in Cuzco when the Inka went to war personally.

Other Cuzcos and Internal Inka Politics

According to the chronicles, the ruler Huayna Capac designed and rebuilt Tomebamba in present day Ecuador, (Idrovo 2000:83; Cabello Balboa
and likely reconstructed Incallajta while visiting the Pocona region in present-day central Bolivia (Querejazu 1998; Sarmiento de Gamboa 1947[1572]). Cabello Balboa (1951[1586]), Sarmiento de Gamboa (1947[1572]) and other chroniclers specifically state that these two sites were erected upon settlements originally constructed by Huayna Capac’s father Topa Inka. The inclusion of this “fact” in the oral histories told by Inka descendants (or perhaps in a few cases, those who had actually witnessed the events in question) to Spanish scribes at least forty years later at first blush seems unusual and is not characteristic of these tales. I suggest such inclusion represents an effort by Huayna Capac to parallel and invoke the legendary triumph at and reconstruction of Cuzco by Pachacuti that marked the beginning of the expansive Inka Empire.

The chronicles relate that Pachacuti remains behind to defend Cuzco after his father, the ruler Viracocha Inka, abandons the city and offers to submit to the ruler of the neighboring Chancas, a local ethnic group threatening the capital and the Inkas. Against all odds and with mythical assistance, Pachacuti triumphs over the Chancas. His father abdicates in his favor. Pachacuti then redesigns and rebuilds the city of Cuzco, his father’s abandoned capital, including the canalization of the Huatenay and Tullumayo rivers, the creation of the plazas Haukaypata and Cusipata, and the construction of the Coricancha Sun Temple. According to these stories, he also creates a warrior class and the ceremonial and ritual calendar of Cuzco described above (See Betanzos 1996[1551]:21-75 for a more detailed telling of this story and the establishment of the calendar).
During his own successful military campaigns, Huayna Capac reconstructed other Cuzcos atop sites built by his father. I speculate that Huayna Capac was thereby equating himself with his legendary grandfather and the founding of the Inka Empire while diminishing the legacy of his father by associating him with Viracocha Inka. His designation of Tomebamba as the second capital of the Inka Empire further supports this hypothesis, as Huayna Capac is reconstructing a capital and creating a cosmological center like Pachacuti.

The diminution of Topa Inka may have its root in the politics and fierce rivalries of the Inka civil war. Every ruler upon taking office became the head of a panaca (royal house) and his descendants (other than those descended from future rulers) become members of that panaca (Niles 1999:2). Atahualpa, the head of the Ecuador-based faction during the civil war, was a member of Pachacuti’s panaca, Hatun Ayullu, while Huascar, head of the Cuzco-based faction, was a member of Topa Inka’s panaca, Capac Ayullu (Rostworowski 1999:33-34). Huayna Capac was also a member of Hatun Ayullu prior to taking office, and the members of Capac Ayullu had nearly thwarted his accession (Rostworowski 1999: 104-105). Also, most of the sources for the chronicles were members of Hatun Ayullu and supporters of Atahualpa, as Atahualpa’s forces had killed Huascar and massacred most if not all the members of Capac Ayullu during the civil war.

According to Maria de Rostworowski (1999:34), “ignoring and altering events was a frequent practice in Andean historiography.” Susan Niles (1999:11-250
24) similarly describes numerous incidents of conflicting claims and of events and people who are wiped from the historical record. Rostworowski notes that the chronicler Betanzos, married to a relative of Atahualpa, omits Huascar from his list of Inka rulers, while Niles describes his account as “purely partisan”. Rostworowski notes that the chronicler Garcilaso, who belonged on his mother’s side to Topa Inka’s lineage, frequently distorts facts to diminish the achievements of Pachacuti and Atahualpa. I suggest that a similar process resulted in the descriptions of the rebuilding of Tomebamba and Incallajta described above, whether or not this rebuilding actually occurred.

Our mapping, excavations and carbon dating at Incallajta do not reveal such a rebuilding, nor do Idrovo’s (2000) at Tomebamba. With the exception of Structure 24, where we found two floors, we encountered only one occupation layer in all of our buildings. Other than Group A and the Eastern Sector, all of the buildings at Incallajta are constructed in a similar style, and we have no reason to believe that either Group A or the Eastern Sector were constructed earlier than the rest of the site. Idrovo’s excavations to the south of Tomebamba’s plaza also found only one level of occupation. While Huayna Capac may have incorporated prior structures built by his father into these sites, neither Idrovo nor I can identify them. Carbon dating is insufficiently exact for this type of temporal distinction, and there are not observable stylistic distinctions among structures at either site. The Inka generally did not destroy the constructions of their predecessors, but modified, improved and built around them (Niles 1999:265). Susan Niles
(1999:253), who proposed a distinctive Huayna Capac building style that included large halls and plazas, component structures built using precise right angles, buildings constructed on low terraces and waterworks, is unable to determine whether Topa Inka constructed any part of Tomebamba. Of course, we have no archaeological evidence for the reconstruction of the core of Cuzco by Pachacuti (Niles 1999:268), and all three sites might simply have apocryphal stories of rebuilding and rededication not verifiable by archaeological evidence.

As discussed above, the ritual order of Cuzco was dynamic and flexible, adapting by various leaders and others for their own strategic purposes (Bauer 1998:161; Niles 1999:52; Rowe 1980, 1985; van de Guchte 1999). Both the ceque system and the ceremonial calendar are closely related to Inka mythology and history (Bauer 1996; van de Guchte 1999). Through the manipulation of architecture, such system and such calendar, an Inka ruler (Huayna Capac if the historical attribution is correct) likely utilized Other Cuzcos not simply as a response to war and rebellion, but as part of a powerful strategy to change Inka ritual and mythic history in order to elevate his own power and that of certain of his followers, particularly those in regions distant from the capital, at the expense of Cuzco-based elites.

Benefits of Other Cuzcos

Whether related to war, rebellion, internal Inka politics or all three, the strategy of constructing Other Cuzcos is directed strongly at the Inka themselves. Neither hyperstructured state-sponsored performance nor the Peircean replicated
theaters in which they took place would have been as meaningful to a newly
conquered subject or a current foe. Non-Inkas were banned from the capital
during many of the Cuzco-based ceremonies, a practice presumably followed in
large measure at the Other Cuzcos. The primary audience for and target of ritual
in Other Cuzcos were the Inkas, and perhaps those accompanying them who
were familiar with Cuzco and its ritual calendar. This was performance of the
Inka, by the Inka and for the Inka. These repeated performances served to
legitimize, reinforce, redefine and reformulate Inka hegemony and ideology
(Bauer and Stanish 2001; Bauer 1996). They also served to reinforce an Inka’s
identification with and status and identity within their empire (Coben and Stanish,
2005). Reassurance of Inka dominance, superiority and destiny to rule would
have been a particularly important and necessary practice during difficult military
campaigns, when doubts about Inka victory in the field could undermine Inka
confidence in their rulers. Huayna Capac’s campaigns in both Ecuador and
Bolivia were hard fought, with the Inka being defeated on certain occasions
(Betanzos 1996[1551]; Sarmiento de Gamboa 1947[1572]). Inka troops in
Ecuador at one point mutinied against their ruler and began to return to Peru,
only to be lured back by various gifts, sacrifices and ceremonies. Under these
circumstances, the construction of and performance in Other Cuzcos would have
played an important role in reaffirming Huayna Capac’s leadership and the loyalty
of his subjects.

253
While the replication and hyperstructure of the Other Cuzcos might only be recognized by the Inkas and others familiar with Cuzco, I suggest that the Other Cuzcos may also have played an important strategic role with respect to the newly or sought to be incorporated ethnic groups within or across the borders of the empire. The huacas of newly conquered provinces and peoples were frequently transported to Cuzco. Local elites and persons were required to worship such huacas in the Inka capital (Cobo 1990[1653]). Originally, they were housed in the Temple of the Sun (Betanzos 1996[1551]; Cobo 1990[1653]), though as they grew more numerous the Inka constructed separate shrines for them elsewhere in the city and allowed their local priests and attendants to maintain them (Rowe 1982:109). In addition, the citua festival described above required the transport and holding hostage of huacas in Cuzco, as well as the honoring of local lords. Huaca capture and manipulation, as well as honoring local lords in their most sacred plaza, was a critical strategy by which the Inka controlled conquered people and their resources and established and reinforced their at times uneasy relationships with local elites.

This strategy also served to demonstrate the superiority of, and inculcate the newly incorporated into, Inka religion. New groups could be indoctrinated into Inka ideology, of which Cuzco, its plan and its component structures and spaces were a critical part. And the conspicuous consumption of animals, cloth, food and chicha inherent in Inka ceremonial performance at these locations would have attracted elites and followers to the Inka to the detriment of other rulers who
were unable to match such consumption due to Inka tribute requirements, and whose performances would have been less powerful due to their removal and distance from their original, contextualizing local setting to an Inka theater. Like the better-known and closely related tactic of competitive feasting, superior “competitive performance” would have drawn followers to the Inka banner by winning the hearts, minds and bellies of those coming to Cuzco to worship their own huacas.

The construction of Other Cuzcos in conflict regions would have facilitated this process greatly, as the geographic proximity of both rulers and huacas would have allowed for their manipulation and use in ongoing conflicts. Other Cuzcos provided the opportunity to perform ceremonies like the situa (described above) in proximity to newly conquered peoples. If the historical attributions were correct, in the case of Tomebamba, Quito and Incallajta such proximity would also have provided control over these rulers and huacas, and the resources that accompany them, to Huayna Capac and his followers rather than competing Inka elite kin groups in Cuzco. While evidence of huaca capture at Other Cuzcos is lacking, the presence of several large structures with courtyards and multiple plazas at Incallajta is suggestive that other ethnic groups were worshipping their huacas there. In any event, the construction of massive ceremonial centers would also have served as a statement of Inka presence, political authority and permanence within a region.
Other Cuzcos and Huayna Capac

I suggest that Other Cuzcos took on a new role during the reign of Huayna Capac, based on the additional degree of iconicity shared by Tomebamba and Incallajta described above. The external face of the round wall of the Coricancha in Cuzco faces north, while the external face of the round wall of Tomebamba’s Temple of the Sun, as identified by Idrovo (2000), faces south. Based on its round wall, kancha form, and the terraces below it, and their location in the southeastern portion of the site, I identify the Kancha H, Semicircular Wall and terraces below them complex as the Temple of the Sun, or Coricancha of Incallajta. The external face of the Semicircular Wall faces south as well. The Inkas in creating these two Other Cuzcos reoriented a portion of one of their most significant structures, one that perhaps incorporated astronomical and calendrical alignments and orientations (Aveni 1981, Zuidema 1982) that could have been altered by this change.

I have not identified other major Inka sites with a single enormous (over 70 m long) kallanka on the north side of the central plaza. By contrast, numerous kallankas and great halls surround the main plazas of Cuzco and Huánuco Pampa. Both the Tomebamba and the Incallajta kallanka have been interpreted as temples dedicated to the creator god Viracocha, based primarily on their similarity to the temple of Raqchi, Peru dedicated to that deity (Uhle 1923, Idrovo 2000, Ellefsen 1972, Nordenkskiöld [1957][1915], Coben 2006), the largest and perhaps most famous building in the empire. Both Raqchi and based upon our
excavations, Structure 1, have four naves, though the Tomebamba kallanka, only 11 m wide, likely had only two. While chroniclers disagree in their attribution of the Temple of Raqchi, Huayna Capac likely constructed this structure (Niles1999:236-239). Alternatively, I suggest that this single kallanka might represent the Casana, Huayna Capac's place in Cuzco, which dominated the north side of Haukaypata and which contained the largest great hall in Cuzco (Bauer 2004:117-119, Garcilaso 1966[1609]:321, Pizarro 1978[1571]:353). Both the Raqchi and the Casana comparisons are slightly problematic, based on the location of their doors. Unlike the multiple doors on the long wall of the kallankas, Raqchi has only two small doors in one of its shorter walls, although it is possible that it had multiple doors in its missing east wall. Pedro Pizzaro (1978[1571]:353-354) describes the Casana’s great hall as entirely open on one end and with no columns, similar to the Cuyusmanco house shown by Guaman Poma (1980[1603]:303), though it is possible that this hall was within a larger kancha that showed a multi-doored face to Haukaypata. From a performatic perspective, Raqchi and Incallajta’s Structure 1 each have four naves and are 25 m wide, enabling the creation of similar “lanes” of movement as described by Garcilaso for the former and digitally recreated by us for the latter, and are 25 m wide. The narrower (11 m wide) Tomebamba kallanka does not share these qualities.

Whether Temple of Viracocha or Casana, Huayna Capac’s other Cuzcos prominently feature a structure associated with that ruler. Unlike Cuzco, this
structure does not share the plaza with other great halls of similar scale associated with other rulers. Tomebamba and Incallajta reflect subtle yet significant changes to the Inka’s most sacral theater, perhaps creating a new type or legisign Tomebamba that replicates many of Cuzco’s characteristics while modifying others.
Figure 9.1 Digital Reconstruction of Structure 1
Figure 9.2 Digital reconstruction of the Canal area, showing that a person walking there could not pass under the roof of Structure 1
Figure 9.3 Digital Simulation: Person trying to walk through the Canal.

*All digital simulations are attached
Figure 9.4 Ushnu of Huánuco Pampa.
Photo courtesy of Diana Bradshaw
Figure 9.5 Ushnu of Vilcashuaman
Figure 9.6 Digital Simulation: Raqchi ceremony described by Garcilaso recreated in Structure 1
Figure 9.7 Digital Viewshed: Interior of Structure 1.
*All digital viewsheds are attached.
**Figure 9.8 Digital Viewshed: Structure 100**

*All digital viewsheds are attached.*
Figure 9.9 Digital Simulation: Light moving through Structure 1
*All digital simulations are attached.
Figure 9.10 Map of Cuzco
Figure 9.11 The Coricancha
Photo Courtesy of Alina Levy
Figure 9.12 Map of Cuzco showing two moieties, hanan and hurin, and the location of several major buildings, plazas and roads.
Figure 9.13 Map of the four quadrants, or suyus of the Inka empire
Figure 9.14 Sacsayhuaman
Figure 9.15 Map showing the location of the Other Cuzcos
Figure 9.16 Map of Huánuco Pampa from Morris et al (2011:29)
Figure 9.17 Map of Tomebamba from Uhle (1923)
Figure 9.17a Map of southern portion of Tomebamba, redrawn from Idrovo (2000)
Figure 9.18 Map of Inkawasi, redrawn from Hyslop (1985)
Figure 9.19 Map of Incallajta.
Figure 9.20 Comparison of Incallajta and Cuzco, with Cuzco names on Incallajta map
Figure 9.21 Terraces below the Semicircular Patio
Figure 9.22 The ushnu of Incallajta
Chapter 10: BRING DOWN THE CURTAIN: ALL THE WORLD’S A COSMOLOGICAL STAGE

This dissertation highlights the prominent and important role of replicated state-sponsored performances and their settings in the Inka Empire, and how such performances reinforced, extended, modified and transformed it. Performance was ubiquitous in the Inka Empire. The Inka constructed numerous cities, settlements, provincial capitals and pilgrimage routes in which state-sponsored or encouraged performance occurred. All of these theaters incorporated certain physical, structural, design and religious elements associated with the Inka capital of Cuzco, the empire’s cosmological, religious and political center.

Cuzco was the site of a complex series of Inka ceremonies carried out according to a fixed ritual calendar, as well as other rare and varied rites and festivals. The Inka constructed a small number of Peircean replicas of this city in troubled and war related areas of their empire, in order to reproduce powerfully their most sacred theater and the performances within it. After the capital itself, these new and Other Cuzcos would have been among the most important locales in the empire, incorporating much of the power of idealized type Cuzco and its ritual calendar while serving as the theaters for similar spectacles and ceremonies. The hyperstructure and replication of the theater itself would likely
have militated the effect of the absence of the Inka ruler himself, or alternatively, provided him an appropriate venue from which to lead when he was present.

Many of these Other Cuzcos are associated with the ruler Huayna Capac, who utilized them not just to reinforce Inka hegemony but to remold it, finally creating a second capital and sacral theater at Tomebamba. Performance of the Inka, by the Inka and for the Inka was a leading element of Inka imperial strategy, and played a critical role in the negotiation and resolution of both internal and external strife and conflict.
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