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Andean Archaeology III represents a continuation in our effort to highlight the finest of current archaeological scholarship conducted in the Central Andean culture area. Each paper contributes in a significant way to understanding prehistoric processes in the Central Andean culture tradition, adding importantly to the rich base provided by Andean Archaeology I and II. As in those former volumes we do not seek a balanced presentation of the entirety of the Andean past, but instead showcase what is new, what is innovative, and what is controversial in thinking about and investigating the great sweep of Andean cultural development.

We wholeheartedly agree with Pauketat (2001:xiii) that it is “more satisfying to compare how cultural phenomena happened,” than for researchers to hasten to answer “why questions” that tend more to “reify their initial assumptions” than to inform us about prehistoric people and their embodied, cultural practices. We support the revitalized study of sociocultural evolution, especially that championed by Bruce Trigger (e.g., 1998, 2003), which has benefited by several decades of valuable critique.

On the other hand, explanations of the past not based on comparisons of historical processes carefully argued from well-studied archaeological records sacrifice the rigor that was such an important part of the first processual archaeology advocated by Lewis Binford (1962, 1964, 1972; Sabloff 1998; see also Yoffee 2005 inter alia). In some recent and current Andean archaeology we find explanatory conclusions, especially processual evolutionary transformations, and climate change-based rise or collapse accounts, to have been reached too hastily, constituting more of a reading of material remains in terms of theoretical expectations than a rigorous interrogation of the archaeological record.

Elucidation of historical process in Central Andean archaeology has been the primary criterion for selecting contributions for this volume. But we also have found that as we move toward a 21st-century approach and paradigm for the Andean past, there is significant need to re-examine the spatial and temporal range of the “Central Andean” cultural tradition. To be clear, this book is not a collection of papers commissioned to resolve that question. Rather, as we sought out the most exciting contributions for our volume we were struck by the fact that current authors are not questioning the “Central Andes” as the cultural unit they are investigating.
At the same time, much research appears to have surprising implications for the way we define, organize, and investigate that cultural unit. Consequently, we highlight this issue, providing something of the history of how the “Central Andes” has been defined. In our Introduction and Conclusion we also tease out some of our authors’ assumptions about, and implications for, the cultural tradition. An idea that emerges from our work is the suspicion that a northern Central Andean tradition can be defined as reasonably distinct from a southern Central Andean tradition. While we are not ready to redefine the Central Andes, or propose an alternative cultural/temporal unit, let us suggest from the beginning of the volume that it is time to confer a symposium to discuss these issues. We must at least make explicit the implications of contradictory trends in current thinking and practice, from alternative chronologies to independent evolutionary trajectories.

Our selection of papers draws from investigators of diverse nationalities and approaches. In deference to these authors, we are permitting certain inconsistencies in the volume. For instance, Peter Kaulicke, who lives and works in Peru, follows Peruvian canon by writing Mochica whereas Edward Swenson, a North American Peruvianist, writes Moche. In an attempt to standardize usages, we do not italicize Spanish and Quechua words as these are ubiquitous in the archaeological literature. We also do not italicize Spondylus.
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Chapter 1

Regional Patterns

William H. Isbell and Helaine Silverman

A CONTINENTAL VIEW

When early anthropologists faced the bewildering diversity of peoples reported by Europeans during their age of discovery, scholars explained the behavioral differences in terms of evolutionary schemes that grouped cultures with similar principles of kinship, economic production, or political authority together into broad evolutionary stages. Subsequently, when anthropologists in the United States responded to demands to organize descriptions of hundreds of Native American cultures in some meaningful way, they formulated the “culture area,” a concept that sprang from ethnographic field experience (Kroeber 1939; Wissler 1917). It posited that peoples living in proximity to one another and inhabiting more or less similar environments tended to share many aspects of culture in common. The culture area concept benefited from the best of the ideas about cultural diffusion so popular in European geography, and at the continental level the culture area approach reapplied much earlier thinking about cultural evolution.

The American continents, and other parts of the world, were divided into cultural areas, each one characterized by a particular variety of spatially and historically related cultures that were considered to represent a “culture type.” Culture types could, in turn, be compared and arranged in terms of their complexity, expressing an implicit theory of cultural evolution that organized sub-continental cultural regions. In the 1960s Elman Service (1962) and Morton Fried (1967) presented explicit evolutionary schemes, classifying pre-modern human societies into four successive stages. Service proposed a sequence of stages starting with “band” organization, followed by “tribes,” then “chiefdoms,” and finally “state” government. Fried proposed a sequence from “egalitarian” society, to “rank” society, to “stratified” society, and then “state” organization. However, two decades earlier, very similar classifications already were shaping the origins of an anthropology of South America.

Working for the Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, prominent U.S. anthropologist Julian Steward (1949) divided the South American continent into “aboriginal culture types” based on a moment-of-contact stasis often referred to as the ethnographic present (Figure 1.1): Marginal and Semi-Marginal,
Tropical Forest and South Andes (combined), Circum-Caribbean, and the Central Andes. This typology was a modest revision of Steward’s earlier scheme, which he had employed to organize the previous volumes of the *Handbook of South American Indians* (Steward 1946a, b, 1948a, b, c).
The nature as well as the distribution of South America’s culture areas were poorly known before the numerous descriptive papers contained in the *Handbook* were written and assembled. So, theory and practice shaped one another in the foundation of South American anthropology, and thinking about culture areas was determined by what the authors of the constituent papers were writing. For example, Steward’s 1949 regional organization, mentioned above, incorporated new information about sociopolitical and religious patterns of the Incas, that had been prepared for the volume on Andean civilizations (see Steward 1946b).

Volume I of the *HSAI* was devoted to “Marginal Tribes,” hunters and gatherers living in mobile bands, but including fisher people as well as hunter-gatherers who practiced some cultivation and were, consequently, sedentary for at least part of the year (Steward 1946a). The “Tropical Forest Tribes” (Steward 1948a) were brought together in Volume III. These peoples were generally characterized as root crop farmers who resided in small, autonomous villages and were organized by kinship (Lowie 1948). Volume IV embraced all the cultures assigned to the “Circum-Caribbean Tribes,” who were characterized as intensive farmers residing in large villages, sometimes organized into federations by chiefs and paramount chiefs (Steward 1948b). Volume II described the “Andean Civilizations,” (Steward 1946b), whose title alone characterized an evolutionary stage of cultural development. Wendell Bennett (1946:1) was clear in his introductory paper in Volume II: “At the time of the Spanish Conquest, the three outstanding Highland cultures were those of the Chibcha, the Inca, and the Araucanians. Of these three, that of the Inca is best known and was the most advanced in cultural achievement.” “Highland” was synonymous with Andean, so in South America, only Andean cultures were “civilized,” and the most privileged were the “Central” Andeans, or the Incas and their ancestors, implicitly conceptualized as donors to simpler South American culture areas or culture types. Still today South American anthropologists follow Bennett in dividing the Andean cultures into three great regions or types: North Andes, Central Andes, and South Andes (e.g., Lumbreras 1981).

The evolutionary privilege of Central Andean cultures has translated into greater archaeological investment in the prehistory of that area, and to a dominance of South American prehistory by its practitioners. Indeed, archaeologists working in the Central Andes apparently feel so “central,” and so assured that their privileged subject cultures stood as donors to the other Andean societies, that we define ourselves without spatial qualifier: we are Andeanists. The title of this volume, and its antecedents, testify to our hubris.

The confidence with which we Central Andeanists call ourselves Andeanists surely contributes to the marginalization of scholarship devoted to the North Andes (Ecuador, Colombia) and South Andes (southern Bolivia, Chile, NW Argentina), while also tending to reify an image of a precocious culture nucleus (or several closely related nuclei) with discrete spatial distribution. But, is it really clear that there was an Andean cultural core complementing a less developed periphery, or, as the saying goes, is “one man’s center another’s periphery”? The vast majority of (Central) Andeanists have worked within “rise of civilization/pristine state” culture historical or processual paradigms, so other regions of South America appear secondary because their political evolution never culminated in autochthonous
complex social formations classified as states and empires. However, would we need to reverse our field of vision if we were investigating, for instance, long-distance trade, in which North Andean cultures seem to have excelled? Similarly, what if we did not focus on the Central Andean states and empires (Mochica, Chimú, Wari, Tiwanaku, Inca), but emphasized instead cultures such as Paracas, Nasca, and Recuay, or one of the less known cultures such as Chanapata, Qotacalle, or Huarpa? If these were our interest, wouldn’t we recognize strong parallels with Bahía, Jama-Coaque, and Tolita? In fact, if we consider ethnohistoric and archaeological descriptions of Chupachu and Wamali villages (Matos 1972; Murra 1967; Ortiz de Zuñiga 1967, 1972; Thompson 1967), are they significantly different from the agricultural hamlets and villages excavated in northern Chile (see, e.g., Rivera 2002)?

If we open the Central Andean culture area to question, is there more unity within, and more difference between the component cultures and those beyond the recognized boundaries? Challenging internal continuity, Silverman (2004: 3) has called attention to Stanish’s (2001) assertion that archaeologists should cease to envision a single trajectory of pristine state development in the Central Andes, and recognize three discrete regions of state-level political evolution: Mochica (north coast), Wari (south central highlands), and Tiwanaku (Titicaca Basin). This would imply significant evolutionary difference among the member cultures. Clearly, we must be aware of how the Central Andes have been conceptualized, and how much internal difference characterizes this culture area.

A REGIONAL VIEW

A Central Andean culture area was defined early in the history of South American anthropology, but from the beginning it was recognized as having important divisions and nuanced variations within. In his famous 1927 article, “Coast and highland in prehistoric Peru” Alfred Kroeber described the ceramic styles that were being identified as more or less representing the key cultures of Central Andean prehistory. Kroeber went to pains to classify them as coastal or highland, as representing mixtures, and in some cases as being extremely eclectic. Part of his presentation reported interpretations of the renowned Peruvian scholar, Julio C. Tello, whose perceptive understandings of the Andean past were little known at the time. Having just spent a good deal of time with his Peruvian colleague, Kroeber was anxious to share and explain some of their discussions, since he had become convinced of the merits of many of Tello’s insights.

Tello argued that the origins of Central Andean culture were in the highlands, from which it spread to the coast in a series of emanations, the first in the form of Chavín. Tello also believed that Chavín pottery emulated earlier vessels of wood from the tropical forest, and that tropical forest animals—especially the jaguar—played key roles in Chavín myth and religious iconography, demonstrating that highland Andean culture must have borrowed heavily from tropical forest cultures. (Unfortunately, tropical forest relations apparently were not part of the
Tello-Kroeber discussions reported in 1927, so we will have to return to this topic below, and in our Conclusion.)

Obviously, Tello’s archaeological interpretations were inspired in no small part by his Peruvian nationalism. Consciously or unconsciously, he located the most important centers of cultural influence within Peru, and treated areas beyond Peru more as receptors of Peruvian highland cultural influences. Today we can hardly help but wonder how much the boundaries of modern Peru—especially its northern and southern frontiers—really correspond with a long term Central Andean culture region (see below). Be this as it may, Kroeber (1927: 642) was certainly promoting such thinking when he wrote, “It is clear that ancient Peruvian culture was enough of a unit to make necessary its treatment broadly and as a whole.”

Kroeber, like Tello, was interested in expanding the synchronic culture area concept into something with greater time depth that would be useful to archaeologists as well as ethnologists. For the Central Andes, this goal was realized in an important symposium that brought together some of the foremost anthropological thinkers of the time, to hear and discuss a set of presentations. This conference, and its subsequent publication, bore the revealing title, “A Reappraisal of Peruvian Archaeology.” Kroeber set the agenda, but it was a young archaeologist, Wendell Bennett (1948a), who contributed the key article and edited the symposium papers.

Following Kroeber’s lead, Bennett sought to reshape the culture area into a diachronic concept that would serve not only to classify cultures of the ethnographic present, but as a tool for archaeologists to trace culture history. With ethnographic, linguistic and archaeological descriptions prepared for the new Handbook of South American Indians swelling academic resources in the late 1940s, Bennett (1948b) could reexamine the culture area as it applied to the Central Andes, crafting a concept more sensitive to historical process, cultural origins, dispersals, and perhaps most important, long-term interrelationships. His proposal was the “area co-tradition,” and specifically the “Peruvian co-tradition” for Central Andean prehistory. The conviction underwriting Bennett’s Peruvian area co-tradition was “the over-all unit of culture history of an area within which the component cultures have been interrelated over a period of time” (1948b: 1).

The major cultural characteristics associated with the Peruvian co-tradition were intensive agriculture and herding, employing irrigation, terracing, fertilizer and crop rotation (Bennett 1948b: 2). Villages were large and generally integrated into political units marked by class distinctions. Labor was organized into large groups and included corvée that contributed to the production of a large surplus supporting leisure for administrative elites. Crafts, including metallurgy, were highly developed. However, weaving was especially prized, with clothing generally consisting of breach clout and slit-neck shirt or wrap-around skirt with belt, a shawl, a woven bag, a headdress, and ear ornaments. Buildings were made of permanent materials such as stone and adobe, and included monumental public structures. Great temples and religious shrines were erected, and these became the objectives of long-distance pilgrimages. Pilgrimages, in turn, disseminated ideas and promoted contact between diverse cultural groups.
Negative cultural traits also defined the Peruvian co-tradition (Bennett 1948b: 3). For example, no urn burial, no bow and arrow, and only weak water transportation were also considered diagnostics.

The unity of ancient Central Andean cultures was also established by a series of prehistoric horizon styles expressed particularly in ceramics, as well as long and complex sub-regional traditions. The Central Andes shared Chavín, Tiwanaku and Inca horizons, as well as less impressive ceramic dispersals, such as a negative decoration horizon, a White-on-Red horizon, and a Black-White-Red horizon. In terms of sub-regional traditions Bennett (1948b: 2–3) asserted that “Chiripa has relationships with Pucara, Early Tiahuanaco, and Chanapata; Pucara in turn is linked with Classic Tiahuanaco, Wari, the Epigonal, and the Black-White-Red horizon; these finally merge into Ica and Chimú. Another such branching relationship is Chavín, Cavernas, Necropolis, and Nazca on one side; Chavín, Salinar, Mochica and Chimú on the other.” Furthermore, Bennett argued that cultural changes were more or less universal and uniform throughout the Peruvian co-tradition area.

On his map, Bennett (1948b: fig. 2; see Figure 1.2) subdivided the region of the Peruvian co-tradition into smaller sub-areas. Following Kroeber, and confirming a pattern that would shape Central Andean archaeology through the rest of the century, he first separated coast from highlands. Next, he divided Peru into North, Central, and South, as well as more distant areas—the Far North and the Far South (that included a small part of Bolivia). On the desert coast, numerous valley oases fostered a more or less continuous distribution of peoples and cultural variations, but Bennett recognized subsets of valleys and assigned them to his respective divisions. Note that Bennett’s Rimac grouping falls partly into the Central, and partly into the North Coast, which is especially interesting in terms of the current recognition of a “norte chico” or “near north coast” valley grouping that includes Supe, a valley discussed in this volume by Ruth Shady and which may hold particular importance for the origin of the Central Andean co-tradition.

The highlands were also divided into north-south regions, for which Bennett identified the Cajamarca Valley as the Far North Highlands, the Callejón de Huaylas and Huanuco Valley as North Highlands, the Mantaro (and its Ayacucho tributary) Valley as Central Highlands, Cuzco as South Highlands, and the Titicaca Basin as Far South. The southern altiplano was omitted except for Tiwanaku and the south shore of Lake Titicaca, lying only a few kilometers from the Peru-Bolivia border. However, Bennett excluded the most southern of the Peruvian coastal valleys, beyond Arequipa, apparently considering them more similar to the cultures of coastal Chile and the South Andes. His Peruvian co-tradition, however, did include Moquegua, where recent archaeological research has revealed the fascinating face-to-face confrontation of Wari and Tiwanaku (see, e.g., Goldstein 1993; Williams and Nash 2002). Bennett also excluded the tropical lowlands east of Peru’s great mountain chains, as well as Piura and farther north, from his Peruvian co-tradition.

Bennett pointed out how spatial and environmental factors contributed to the boundaries of the Peruvian co-tradition. Within the co-tradition area, major valleys and basins are never more than 200 km apart, with the exception of Cuzco, which
Figure 1.2. Wendell C. Bennett’s map of the Central Andean culture area with its subdivisions in his essay, “The Peruvian Co-Tradition” (Bennett 1948: 5).

was prominent only in late times. On the other hand, there are some 400 kms of rugged and forested mountains between Cajamarca in Peru’s Far North, to Loja, the southern-most Ecuadorian basin of substantial size. There, climate change from a single to a double rainy season significantly alters vegetation and transforms puna grasslands suitable for llamas and alpacas into wet páramo that is poor grazing.
Perhaps even more revealing is Bennett’s (1948b: 4) explanation of the southern boundary of the Peruvian co-tradition.

A desert strip cuts eastward across the Andes south of 17 degrees. The western cordillera of Bolivia is dry, without basins, and, today, virtually without population. South of Lake Titicaca, the Desaguadero River disappears in Lake Poopó, where the water evaporates into extensive salt flats. Actually, apart from the Titicaca basin, the most inhabitable regions of Bolivia are in the eastern cordillera. The closest to Peru is the Cochabamba basin, and this is separated from Titicaca by over 300 kilometers of rugged mountainous country. In spite of this, good Tiahuanaco ceramics are found in the Cochabamba region although permanent buildings, ceremonial centers, and stone carving are not. In general, the Peruvian influences in the eastern cordillera are no greater than those from the Amazon, Chaco, and Pampas. It thus seems sound on geographical and cultural grounds to fix the southern boundary of the Peruvian co-tradition on the Mollendo-Arequipa-Tiahuanaco line. Since Bennett’s writing, archaeological research has shown that several of the largest pre-Tiwanaku settlements in the Cochabamba Valley are actually huge mounds, almost tells, of adobe architecture, where large communities must have been practicing intensive agriculture based on irrigation. Do these constitute permanent buildings, ceremonial centers, presenting sufficient criteria for reevaluating the Peruvian co-tradition? We return to this issue in our Conclusion.

The long-term influence of the Peruvian co-tradition cannot be underestimated, and it underlies John Rowe’s (1960, Rowe and Menzel 1967: ii–iii) later formulation of a unified archaeological chronology for the prehistoric Central Andes. Rowe employed the major horizon styles that underlay Bennett’s premise of cultural unity as chronological tools. Three sequential pan-regional stylistic diffusions—Chavin, Tiwanaku and Inca styles—were interspersed by periods of local or sub-regional differentiation, and these time units were associated with absolute ages (radio-carbon dating, a new technique at that time, was revolutionizing prehistoric archaeology all around the world). Rowe’s chronological chart included only three coastal areas, North, Central and South, but a full complement of five highland zones, although with slightly different terminology: North (Ancash), North Central (Ayacucho), South Central (Cuzco), South (Puno), and Bolivia (southern Titicaca Basin), so it is unlikely that Rowe meant to exclude Bennett’s Far North Coast or Far South Coast from the Central Andean region. More likely, there simply was not enough information to fill in chronological columns for those sub-areas in the 1960s, and Rowe was loath to speculate.

Rowe’s relative chronology has been a vital contribution to the advancement of Central Andean archaeology. Rowe (1960) emphasized scientific rigor, the collection of data, and its strict interpretation. He was convinced that the prehistory of any culture area must be precisely synchronized, employing short time units, before more interpretative questions should be asked, otherwise archaeology would quickly descend into speculation governed by currently popular theories. Since pottery seriation could achieve a division of the past into shorter periods than radio-carbon or other absolute dating, ceramic seriations should be developed for each cultural sub-area. A master sequence should be located somewhere sufficiently
central to serve the entire area of the co-tradition, and it should be carefully attached to calendar time through radiocarbon and other absolute dates. Only this approach would provide temporal control precise enough to determine how events in neighboring sub-areas, within the region of the co-tradition—where interactions were surely multiple and complex—were related in time, and consequently, how they could have influenced one another in space. Without precise control of time across sub-area boundaries, inferences of diffusion as opposed to independent evolution were simply expressions of opinion.

Rowe and his students selected the Ica Valley on the South Coast for the Central Andean master sequence. Over the following decades major efforts determined relevant temporal units, the periods of regional diversification punctuated by periods of pan-regional interaction. Ceramic seriations were worked out for many of the periods as well as sub-areas adjacent to the Ica Valley. Radiocarbon dates were correlated with relatively short phases and epochs. As the system grew, accurate cross dating became increasingly precise with progressively more distant and earlier cultures. However, as we will see among the papers included in this volume, Rowe’s chronological approach is being discarded by some Andeanists, as alternative and regionally unique chronologies are gaining popularity in several sub-areas. This is an issue to which we will return in our Conclusion.

REGIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY

The definition and location of the Peruvian co-tradition, as well as more or less agreed-upon divisions into cultural sub-areas were well established by Bennett, and subsequently by Rowe. Throughout the second half of the 20th century there have been few disagreements among archaeologists investigating the region, except for some differences regarding the margins.

Edward Lanning’s (1967; Figure 1.3) archaeological Peru ran the length of the contemporary Peruvian coast, thereby extending farther north than Bennett’s (1948) delimitation, and from Cajamarca to the Titicaca Basin in the south, like Bennett. In his review of Peru Before the Incas, Donald W. Lathrap (1969) criticized Lanning, among other things, for excluding the “tropical lowlands to the east of the Andes,” which Lathrap saw as fundamentally implicated in the Andean cultural trajectory, and for minimizing the role of trade and interareal contact as far back as the Initial Period. As we pointed out above, Tello (1923) was the first proponent of this argument, which Lathrap championed and expanded throughout his career. Indeed, it was Lathrap (1969, 1970, 1971, 1985) and his students who carried out the first archaeological excavations in the eastern tropical forest, providing evidence that supported Tello’s position. Their discovery of dense middens full of different pottery styles documented a succession of sedentary farmer groups, whose villages lay on the fertile banks of the great Amazonian tributaries as early as the first half of the second millennium BC. (The distinguished Peruvian historian, Pablo Macera, and the Seminario de Historia Rural Andina that he directed, inspired and assisted archaeologists such as Daniel Morales, Ruth
Figure 1.3. Edward P. Lanning’s map of the Central Andean culture area with its subdivisions in his book, *Peru Before the Incas* (Lanning 1967: 31).
Shady, and Peter Kaulicke to carry out excavations in the northern and eastern margins of the Central Andean area as well, and they also contributed important new understandings about cultural relations between the Central Andes, Tropical Forest, and North Andean peoples.)

The delimitation of the northern end of the highlands by Lanning, and earlier by Bennett, reflected the lack of archaeological exploration beyond Cajamarca at the time they wrote. Of course, lack of information has plagued South American anthropology from its beginning. All formulations have been shaped by the information available at a particular moment, making it essential for periodic re-evaluations of traditional systems of organization.

Gordon Willey’s (1971: 76–90) “Peruvian Culture Area” (characterized by a “Peruvian Cultural Tradition”) built on Bennett’s (1948) proposal, but recognized some of Lathrap’s criticisms. Note the exclusion of Tumbes but inclusion of the eastern Andean slopes, and the use of the actual political border between Peru and Chile on his map (Figure 1.4).

Lumbreras’ (1974: fig. 11a–e) “Chronological correlation between regional sequences in the Central Andes” has columns (the spatial dimension) that begin in the north with Lambayeque-Jequetepeque and end in the south with Chuquibamba, Arequipa, Tacna-Arica, Puno, Tiahuanaco, and Oruro. These latter columns do not have a comprehensive geographic title; “S. Highlands” is reserved for the Cuzco column. The eastern slopes are excluded, as is Piura north to Tumbes.

Richardson’s (1994: 11) map in Peoples of the Andes includes Tumbes and, interestingly, labels it on the Ecuadorian side of the border. Although likely a mere technical decision of his illustrator, for us the lettering raises the transcendentally important theoretical issue of what “Andean” was in the prehistoric period. Did such a concept even exist? Richardson’s map also excludes the eastern slopes and delimits the southern end of the archaeological Andes at the Ring Site and Chinchorro (northern extreme of Chile) for the early preceramic period and at Chiripa and Tiwanaku (northern extreme of Bolivia) for the three thousand years of prehispanic complex society.

Hocquenghem (1991) has presented a more nuanced and dynamic reading of regional patterns by recognizing the temporally shifting cultural boundary between the Central and North Andean cultural spheres. The theoretical premise of her important empirical documentation is that Andean productive and ideological organization were culturally produced to facilitate social reproduction.

Wilson (1999) revives the Stewardian perspective, but with an explicit, neo-evolutionary typology derived from from Johnson and Earle (1987), to generate a systems-hierarchical evolutionary description. In his scheme the Central Andes are strictly limited to that core area within which civilization (sensu lato) developed.

In addition to the perimetral definition of the Central Andes discussed above, the very geography of what today is the country of Peru creates an obvious dichotomy between coast and highland. But perhaps a trichotomy is more realistic, in view of the vast tract of riverine Amazonia that lies within the national territory (see Pulgar Vidal 1996).
A strong concept of the Peruvian triumvirate of coast-highland-jungle came to dominate the Central Andean archaeological agenda following Murra’s (1972) classic definition of the “vertical archipelago,” or zonal complementarity. This integrated economic strategy involved exploiting discontinuous and contrastive lands through east-west, or up-and-down the mountains, movement of labor, from one resource to another in accord with a carefully programmed calendar. For the last thirty years many archaeologists have championed this ethnohistoric model as an explanation for important developments in the pre columbian past (Lumbreras 1974; Stanish 1992 inter alia). Of course, episodes of conquest or cultural pre-eminence originated in highly localized parts of the highlands and affected large swathes of the Andean montane as well as its adjacent low-lying coast (i.e., Chavín, Wari/Tiwanku, Inca). Then, too, Lathrap was most persuasive about the need to extend our Andeanist geo-ecological gaze to the eastern jungles, in view of evidence for significant influence on and/or contact between tropical forest cultures and Central Andean (highland and coastal) societies. As pointed out above, Tello was the pioneer who first argued in favor of strong tropical forest roots for Andean culture. The point, however, is that the basic sightline of our academic endeavor has been latitudinal, so to speak, i.e., east-west, rather than longitudinal, i.e., north-south. Perhaps something of an exception is Izumi Shimada’s (1982) appealing formulation about suites of coastal valleys, arrayed north to south (or vice versa), whose redundant resources constituted “horizontal archipelagos” with significant resource potential and environmental heterogeneity. However, the scale was always small.

No doubt, the regional patterns of concern to most archaeologists of the recent past have been “patterns of culture”—that normative notion guiding so much of early and mid-20th century anthropology by which culture was conceived as a bounded systems of beliefs and behaviors shared by all members of society. For decades without problematization and interrogation, we have delineated archaeological cultures based on the geographic distribution of an idealized range of pottery styles (style itself being a very complex issue) and other material traits. We have bounded these named constructs as if invisible walls prevented slippage between one side and the other, and variation within was hardly imaginable. Too often archaeologists have taken style to be isomorphic with society in the most uncomplicated manner (see below).

A MICRO VIEW

Influenced by the revolution in cultural anthropology that began in the 1970s, gained strength in the 1980s, and became a tidal wave in the 1990s (see discussion in Bonnell and Hunt 1999; Ortner 1984), a growing number of archaeologists embrace what we will generalize as postmodern theory expressed in postprocessual archaeology. Characterized by a great variety of approaches, these new contributions to regional patterns imply ever greater complexity. Culture and culture area are treated less as normative and more as the practice of historically situated agents,
deploying material culture (ranging in scale from pots to palaces) in accord with contingent awareness, and at the same time, unconsciousness of its influences. In alliance with or opposition to networks of other individuals prehistoric actors made daily decisions that had enormous consequences over the long run, or longue durée.

Deconstructing the above statement into its constituent elements we highlight the approach we have previously referred to as PAM (practice-agency-materiality) (Isbell and Silverman 2002: 377), which is complementary to Pauketat’s (2001) history-focused emphasis on the constraints and practice implicated in the process of tradition-making—those patterns we can see in the archaeological record that have, in Pauketat’s sense, a high social significance: the construction of culture/building of traditions through practice as daily action in social settings, with these actions being contingent on historical context (Pauketat 2001: 4–5).

Thus, as we look at the classic subdivisions of the Central Andes (in whatever iteration) we should be conscious that our intellectual classifications are not the same as the multiple overlapping and oppositional boundaries that members of prehistoric ancient societies (and smaller groups thereof) reproduced through their tangible and intangible daily and extraordinary embodied decisions.

REGIONAL PATTERNS

Archaeologists have different models of what the Central Andes are—from a quasi-monolithic entity of pristine civilization to intra-societally oscillating patterns of engagement. And this returns us to the topic of this volume. We have chosen “North and South” as our focus to begin to unpack the “thick culture” (referring to Geertz’s sense of culture as internally consistent webs of significance, the texts of society enacted by cosmology, symbols, rituals, material culture, social arrangements: see Geertz 2000: 5; internal consistency has subsequently been challenged) of the ancient societies that flourished in the Central Andes, understood geographically as the coast and highlands of contemporary Peru. We are interested both in the historic specificities of each case study, as well as the comparative dimensions in temporal and spatial (local, regional, and supra-regional) terms. In our concluding chapter we build upon the discussion presented in this introduction and suggest that the cultural constellations that distinguish northern and southern Andean cultures were as important and significant as coast-highland differences in Central Andean prehistory, and likely so from quite early in prehistory. Indeed, the concept of “Central Andean culture” requires a thorough and new examination.
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Part II

The North
The dramatic increase in archaeological research on the north coast (here, the coast north of Lima) is well represented in the six chapters comprising this section of the volume. Included are revolutionary new data pertaining to the rise of civilization in the norte chico region (Shady; see also Haas and Creamer 2004; Haas et al. 2004); a fascinating new interpretation of Chankillo, a formerly enigmatic site now firmly dated to the late Early Horizon and interpreted as a fortified seat of religious power (Ghezzi); a critical analysis of the complex ethnic mosaic of competing and interacting coastal societies of the Early Intermediate Period (Kaulicke); new theoretical perspectives on the role of particular spatialities of Late Moche ritual activity in localized strategies of political empowerment in the northern zone of Mochica society and culture (Swenson); long overdue attention to the brilliant north highland societies of the Early Intermediate Period (Lau); and fresh insight into the Chimú political economy in terms of provincial utilitarian craft specialization (Tschauner).

Several themes or research directions can be extrapolated from this diverse set of papers. First is the growing attention of archaeologists to particular north coast areas, archaeological social formations, sites, and/or problems that have traditionally received less attention. Thus, the norte chico (Shady) now is clearly recognized as the extraordinary hearth within which major patterns of Andean culture were first elaborated, not the least of which was monumental architecture including sunken circular plazas, specifically in the “late Archaic” (or Preceramic VI as it is more commonly known among North American Peruvianists) and Initial Period. Indeed, Shady sees the origin of the state in Supe in the late Archaic Period. The Casma Valley, whose early (i.e., Initial Period and Early Horizon) sites were already well known and recognized as exceptionally diverse and complex in architectural form and societal context (e.g., S. Pozorski and T. Pozorski 1991, 1994a, b; T. Pozorski and S. Pozorski 1993; Tello 1956), continues to generate data of immense significance for interpreting larger nexi of engagements among multiple territorial units. Within this universe the oft-mentioned site of Chankillo is at last systematically studied (Ghezzi). The Vicús-Mochica relationship in the upper Piura Valley is a key venue for understanding both the empirical and theoretical significance of areal delimitation of the Central Andes (Kaulicke), as well as long-term intercultural