US AND THEM:
Archaeology and Ethnicity in the Andes



Richard Martin Reycraft, editor

MONOGRAPH 53
THE COTSEN INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

MONOGRAPH 53

Us and Them:
ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNICITY IN THE ANDES



EDITED BY
RICHARD MARTIN REYCRAFT

COTSEN INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
2005

EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE COTSEN INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT UCLA
Jeanne E. Arnold, Christopher B. Donnan, John K. Papadopoulos, James R. Sackett,
Julia L. J. Sanchez, and Charles Stanish

THE COTSEN INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT UCLA
Charles Stanish, Director
Julia L. J. Sanchez, Assistant Director and Director of Publications
Shauna Mecartea, Publications Assistant

This book is set in 10-point Janson Text, with titles in 33-point Meridien.
Edited by Abby Sider
Designed by William Morosi

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Us and them : archaeology and ethnicity in the Andes / edited by Richard Martin Reycraft.
p. cm.
"This volume is a compilation of papers presented in the symposium Us and Them: Archaeology and Ethnicity in the Andes, held at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in Chicago in April 1999"--Indrod.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-931745-17-X (alk. paper) eBook ISBN: 978-1-938770-85-2
1. Indians of South America--Andes Region--Antiquities--Congresses. 2. Indians of South America--Andes Region--Ethnic identity--Congresses. 3. Indians of South America x Anthropometry--Andes Region--Congresses. 4. Desert archaeology--Andes Region--Congresses. 5. Ethnoarchaeology--Andes Region--Congresses. 6. Human remains (Archaeology)--Andes Region--Congresses. 7. Grave goods--Andes Region--Congresses. 8. Andes Region--Antiquities--Congresses. I. Reycraft, Richard Martin. II. Society for American Archaeology. Meeting (64th : 1999 : Chicago, Ill.)
F2230.1.E84U7 2004
980'.00498--dc22
2004025648

Copyright © 2005 Regents of the University of California
All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

DEDICATION

This volume is dedicated to my wife, Soledad, and my parents, Elizabeth and Donald, whose unending love and support have always inspired and sustained me.

Contents

Dedication *iii*

1. **Introduction**
Us and Them: Archaeology and Ethnicity in the Andes *1*
Richard Martin Reycraft

2. Ethnogenesis at Galindo, Peru *12*
Garth Bawden

3. Of Pots and People: Ceramic Style and Social Identity in the Tiwanaku State *34*
John Wayne Janusek

4. Style Change and Ethnogenesis among the Chiribaya of Far South Coastal Peru *54*
Richard Martin Reycraft

5. Who Were the Priests, the Warriors, and the Prisoners?
A Peculiar Problem of Identity in Moche Culture and Iconography, North Coast of Peru *73*
Steve Bourget

6. Household Approaches to Ethnicity on the South Coast of Peru:
The Domestic Architecture of Early Nasca Society *86*
Kevin J. Vaughn

7. Cultural Communication of Ethnicity through Clothing:
The Qocha-Lake Symbol in Contemporary Textiles from Ausangate, Peru *104*
Andrea M. Heckman

8. North Coast Style after Moche: Clothing and Identity at El Brujo, Chicama Valley, Peru *115*
Amy Oakland Rodman and Gioconda Arabel Fernandez Lopez

9. Ethnicity, Kinship, and Ancient DNA *134*
Sloan R. Williams

10. A Bioarchaeological Approach to Tiwanaku Group Dynamics *153*
Deborah E. Blom

11. A Bioarchaeological Assessment of Prehistoric Ethnicity
among Early Late Intermediate Period Populations of the Azapa Valley, Chile *183*
Richard C. Sutter

12. *Pescadores* and *Labradores* among the *Señorío* of Chiribaya in Southern Peru *206*
M. C. Lozada and Jane E. Buikstra

13. Migration, Colonies, and Ethnicity in the South-Central Andes *226*
Charles Stanish

14. Discussion: Ethnogenesis and Ethnicity in the Andes *233*
Jane E. Buikstra

Index *239*

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

US AND THEM: ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNICITY IN THE ANDES



RICHARD MARTIN REYCRAFT

This volume is a compilation of papers presented in the symposium *Us and Them: Archaeology and Ethnicity in the Andes*, held at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in Chicago in April 1999. All of the original symposium participants have contributed to this volume. One participant, Andrea Heckman, was recruited for the Chicago symposium, but active fieldwork prevented her attendance; she has nevertheless provided a volume chapter.

The symposium assembled a corpus of scholars whose work collectively represents a significant advancement in the study of prehistoric ethnicity in the Andean region. The research presented in the symposium, and subsequently in this volume, was assembled in order to represent a diverse collection of theoretical and methodological approaches. The subsequent chapters will thus impart recent discoveries in several subfields of prehistoric Andean anthropology, including spatial archaeology, textile and ceramic analysis, and, perhaps most notably, biological anthropology. Many of the authors in this volume apply novel research -techniques, while others wield more established approaches in original ways. Hopefully, their results will stimulate others to pursue future innovative work in the prehistoric study of ethnic identification.

Compared with many other parts of the globe, the Andean region provides some significant advantages for the researcher of prehistoric ethnic groups. Perhaps first and foremost of these advantages are its geography and environment. The spectacular Andes Mountains provide a compressed vertical geography that juxtaposes fertile coastal and mountain valleys between inhospitable deserts and mountains. Throughout Andean prehistory, these valleys were rich breeding grounds for a mosaic of distinct ethnic groups, and this diversity provides good comparative data for ethnic study. Many of these valleys, particularly the mountain variety, are still remote and secluded, which has provided some insulation against modern development, allowing traditional cultural practices and dress to persist. While less protected from modern development, the coastal valleys have extremely arid climates, which

have preserved a wide variety of prehistoric remains, including such perishables as wood and bone artifacts, textiles, and human hair and tissue. The importance of such materials to prehistoric ethnic studies is borne out in the subsequent chapters of this volume. Finally, there exists in the Andes a patchy but growing body of ethnohistoric source material that documents a variety of Andean peoples, including their ethnic practices and accoutrements, as encountered by the Spaniards in the early years of their conquest. Perhaps because of these advantages, anthropologists have attempted to examine prehistoric Andean ethnicity for at least a century.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION IN THE ANDES: A BRIEF HISTORY

In the Andean region, the archaeology of ethnicity begins with Max Uhle. In 1896, Uhle initiated the first stratigraphic excavation of grave lots in the Andes. His excavations were located in a dense cemetery situated below the northern base of the Temple of Pachacamac, near Lima, Peru (Strong and Corbett 1943; Uhle 1903). For eons, the temple had functioned as a pilgrimage center. Employing stratigraphic relationships, Uhle was able to take advantage of the diverse material culture brought to the temple by pilgrims and conquerors from various regions. By comparing decorated ceramics and textiles, he defined Inka, Chimu, Coastal Tiahuanaco (Huari), and Pachacamac Interlocking (Lima Culture) burials at Pachacamac (Menzel 1977; Strong and Corbett 1943; Uhle 1903).

Uhle was also one of the first archaeologists to examine cranial deformation practices as ethnic identifiers. At the main temple of Pachacamac, he noticed that the great majority of crania were deformed by occipital flattening, a deformation style then known as the "Chincha style," which was practiced by peoples from the central and north coast of Peru during the Late Intermediate period (Strong and Corbett 1943; Uhle 1903). However, in a cemetery located near another temple at Pachacamac—the Temple of the Sun—Uhle found crania deformed in a variety of non-coastal styles. These crania were associated with Cuzco material culture such as decorated Inka ceramics and textiles. By associating cranial deformation styles with distinctive grave goods, Uhle confirmed ethnohistoric accounts of an Inka temple at Pachacamac and placed Inka priests at the temple.

Early attempts at ethnic identification in Andean archaeology were often obfuscated by the contrasting terms of "race" and "culture." After Uhle's (1903) Pachacamac study, Andean archaeologists focused on the definition of cultures, culture areas, and culture histories (Bennett 1934, 1936, 1939; Kidder 1943; Kroeber 1925, 1926a, 1926b, 1927, 1930; Kroeber and Strong 1924a, 1924b; Means 1917, 1931; Strong 1925; Tello 1923), while physical anthropologists examined racial diversity and racial history (Hrdlicka 1911, 1914; Hrdlicka et al. 1912; Imbelloni 1938; Newman 1943, 1947, 1948; Stewart 1943a, 1943b). In a break with earlier evolutionary anthropology, Boas (1887, 1905) had separated culture from race and concentrated on the former. Boas' most brilliant student, Alfred Kroeber, introduced this approach to Andean archaeology. In Kroeber's view, culture was a "superorganic" (Kroeber 1917), a historically particularistic entity that superseded race. Culture was also given a geographic emphasis through the work of Wissler (1914). Race, a concept of genetic relatedness that earlier evolutionary anthropologists (Morgan 1877; Tylor 1871) had explicitly associated with culture, was only sporadically addressed in the Andes. Although the interrelationships between race and culture were never adequately explored, it was generally assumed that large culture areas, sometimes defined as regional co-traditions (Bennet 1948), were based on racial distinctions defined by skull types (Kroeber 1930; Newman 1948).

During the 1920s and 1930s, the American anthropological emphasis on historical particularism and the need for regional chronologies resulted in the definition of several prehistoric Andean civilizations through culture trait lists. These lists were based primarily on burial accoutrements, and despite explicit statements that all aspects of material culture should be emphasized in the definition of archaeological cultures (Childe 1929), their foundations rested on the analysis of mortuary ceramics (Bennett 1939; Kroeber 1926b, 1930, Kroeber and Strong 1924a, 1924b; Larco-Hoyle 1941, 1944, 1945). Nevertheless, some interesting attempts were made to broaden this approach. Once again, Uhle was at the forefront of this endeavor.

In *Fundamentos etnicos y arqueología de Arica y Tacna*, Uhle (1922) attempted to define the territories of several aboriginal ethnic groups from the Tacna-Arica region. In a novel approach, different ethnic groups (which Uhle described as tribes) were first defined by language, based on ethnohistorically recorded grammar and vocabulary characteristics. Uhle's next step was to identify an ethnic geography based on local place names and their relationships to each language. Finally, after defining several ethnic territories by place name, Uhle

compared and contrasted the material culture traits of each territory. For this final analysis he described a wide variety of culture traits, such as divergent tomb shapes, differences in ritual paraphernalia (snuff trays, etc.), monumental art, textiles, and petroglyph styles. Unfortunately, by this time Uhle had abandoned the tedious stratigraphic excavations that defined his earlier work. Innovative though it was, *Fundamentos etnicos y arqueología de Arica y Tacna* was based on poor archaeological information gleaned from limited excavations and archaeological hearsay. Uhle's (1922) assertions of an Atacameña civilization have never been substantiated. Interestingly, the chapters in this volume by M. C. Lozada, Richard Martin Reycraft, and Richard C. Sutter describe different ethnic groups that Uhle grouped together as Atacameña.

Until the mid-1940s, ethnic archaeology, under the guise of culture definition, dominated Andean archaeology. The foremost works of this era, written by archaeologists considered to have been the major players in the field, all defined archaeological cultures. Bennett (1934, 1936) defined the Tiahuanaco and Gallinazo cultures, Kidder (1943) described Pucara, Rowe (1944) depicted the Inka, Tello (1942, 1943) defined the Chavín, Tschopik (1946) the Aymara, and Uhle (1903, 1922, 1924a, 1924b, 1925a, 1925b, 1926) and Kroeber (1926b, 1930) together defined a slew of prehistoric coastal cultures. Perhaps the most prolific was Rafael Larco-Hoyle, who identified the Cupisnique (1941), the Salinar (1944), the Virú (1945), and further defined the Moche (1938, 1939).

Larco-Hoyle's (1938–1939) two-volume set entitled *Los Mochicas* was a holistic attempt to describe the origins, development, and ultimate fate of the prehistoric Moche culture of north coastal Peru. Several lines of evidence were employed in this endeavor. Physical anthropological data were combined with ceramic images of Moche individuals to develop the first profile of the ethnic characteristics of prehistoric Moche people. Variations in the facial characteristics of Moche portrait vessels led Larco-Hoyle to conclude that racial diversity existed within Moche culture. These variations were then compared with the living descendents of the Moche, the Native American inhabitants of the Moche Pueblo. The social attributes of the people of Moche Pueblo, such as their vernacular architecture and household organization, were, in turn, compared with known prehistoric Moche social characteristics. Following Uhle (1922), Larco-Hoyle also utilized ethnohistorically recorded grammar and vocabulary characteristics to identify an ethnic geography based on local place names. Lacking good textile information, he examined repetitive themes of Moche individuals depicted in ceramic decoration and came to the conclusion that Moche dress was ethnically distinctive. Larco-Hoyle noticed that several portrait vessels depicting the same individual were found in different valleys in the Moche realm. Upon further analysis he discovered that the same individual wore different garb in each valley. Based on this he postulated a Moche system composed of different political groups united by a single leader.

Larco-Hoyle's views concerning the relationships between Moche dress variation and political/task groups were particularly advanced for the time. He also had access to the largest collection of Moche burial goods in Peru, the *Museo Rafael Larco Herrera* in Chiclin. However, because he exclusively excavated burials, and the vast majority of his information was based on mortuary assemblages, Larco-Hoyle could not substantiate his propositions concerning Moche social and political organization. The shortcomings of the near-exclusive reliance on mortuary assemblage data for culture definition were manifest by the late 1930s. In other regions of the world, particularly the North American Southwest, where both Kroeber and Kidder had previously worked, refuse mound excavations had provided more accurate culture-historical and social organizational information. Refuse mounds were considered important for the delineation of both culture-historical and ethnic information because, unlike graves, they did not contain consciously selected cultural materials (Ford 1949). The Institute for Andean Research (IAR) recognized this problem and set about correcting it by funding a series of excavations in refuse mounds in the Andean region (Strong, Willey, and Corbett 1943).

Several of these projects are now landmarks. Strong and Corbett (1943) revisited Pachacamac and trenched into a large midden associated with the Temple of the Sun. They encountered an enormous mass of textiles, some of which were elite Inka examples; however, the vast majority were simple striped and plain-weave pieces. Large quantities of both decorated and undecorated ceramics were also encountered. From this information, Strong and Corbett (1943) were able to identify two ethnic groups living near the temple. The first was a group of Inka elite, probably priests. The second group was composed of local people of low status, who most likely served the Inka priests. Uhle (1903) was only able to identify the first group in the grave lots he excavated at the Temple of the Sun.

During the excavation of refuse mounds, archaeologists often encountered the occasional buried house.

Although extensive horizontal excavations of domestic structures did not occur at this time, they were viewed as valuable chronological aids, for the floors of these houses often contained in-situ vessels, which confirmed the ceramic seriation sequences defined in the middens (Bennett 1939; Willey 1943). Eventually, construction technology and house shapes were added to the trait lists of defined cultures.

Rowe (1944) conducted another breakthrough study funded by the IAR. Rowe's goal was the definition of Inka culture, specifically the development of early Inka culture in the Cuzco area. To do this he needed to locate and excavate refuse mounds that contained pre-Inka material culture. He found the required mounds near the Inka fortress of Sacsahuaman. His ceramic sequences were primarily defined by decorated ceramic sherds, but because Rowe was excavating refuse mounds rather than burials, many of the sherds he classified as pre-Inka Chanapata and early Inka Killke wares were undecorated utilitarian ceramics. Rowe was also one of the first Andean archaeologists to utilize domestic architecture as an ethnic identifier. Cuzco contained portions of many standing Inka structures, and the nearby settlement of Ollantaytambo held intact Inka domestic structures. Through these remains, Rowe (1944) was able to formally define Inka construction methods and the *cancha*, or Inka residential compound.

At the same time Rowe was focusing on refuse mounds and domestic architecture, another IAR project archaeologist was examining mortuary remains from a unique perspective. For generations, Andean archaeologists had viewed burial goods as the archaeological foundation of ethnic distinction. During these early years, the vast majority of cultural distinctions were defined by examining differences in burial paraphernalia. Tschopik (1946) was the first archaeologist to look past burial goods and specifically consider tomb style as a culture definition criterion. For her study, she examined several ethnohistoric sources that described the territories of politically independent Aymara-speaking groups in the Lake Titicaca region during, and just prior to, the Inka conquest. She then attempted to link ceramic variation with differently shaped and constructed *chullpa* (Aymara burial towers) and other tomb types. With these data in hand, Tschopik tentatively associated different chullpa styles with the various Aymara subgroups.

By the mid-1940s, mortuary goods, monumental architecture style, ceramic iconography, ethnohistoric information, refuse mound excavations, domestic architecture, and tomb style had all been utilized as criteria for ethnic differentiation. For the first time the opportunity was present for all of this information to be combined in a single comprehensive study aimed at differentiating change in prehistoric Andean social and political organization. Gordon Willey (1946, 1947, 1953) and his colleagues (Bennett 1950; Bird 1948; Collier 1955; Ford 1949; Ford and Willey 1949a, 1949b; Strong 1947, 1948; Strong and Evans 1952) undertook this exceptional study.

The Virú Valley Project was a monumental effort to study the settlement pattern changes throughout the culture-historical sequence of a single valley. The project methodology linked surface survey and site mapping with surface collections of ceramics and limited stratigraphic excavations of refuse mounds and domestic and monumental architecture (Willey 1953). This methodology benefited ethnic identification in two major ways.

First, Ford's (1949) stratigraphic excavations of refuse mounds and domestic architecture emphasized stylistic changes in both utilitarian and decorated ceramics. Ford (1949:32) discovered that, on average, 99% of all sherds found in Virú Valley middens were from "culinary" ceramics. By focusing on changes in the attributes of utilitarian wares over time, Ford could utilize a more robust and refined measure of culture-historical change. He could also correlate temporal changes in utilitarian versus decorated wares. He discovered that these wares changed at different times and at dissimilar rates. In the long term, utilitarian wares tended to be a stable substrate upon which more rapid shifts in decorated ceramics occurred. By contrasting changes in utilitarian ceramics and domestic architecture on the one hand, and decorated ceramics and "cult" architecture (temples, platform mounds, etc.) on the other, Ford (1949:49) was able to document the presence of different ethnic, religious, and political groups in the Virú Valley.

A second and perhaps more profound way in which the Virú Valley Project influenced the archaeology of ethnic identification was its explicit intent to define settlement patterns. The settlement pattern approach, which had never been attempted before the Virú study, identified coeval components of a society. By combining modern survey techniques, such as aerial photography, site mapping, stratigraphic test excavations of refuse middens, and surface artifact identification and collection, the Virú Valley group was able to define contemporaneous domestic, politico/religious, military, mortuary, and public works within a single coastal valley.

In studying the entire settlement system, rather than a specific temple mound or mortuary assemblage,

Willey (1953) was able to define several sociopolitical changes in the Virú Valley culture-historical sequence (1953:381, 396). He employed Ford's (1949) ceramic information and Bennett's (1950) domestic structure data in combination with the details of surveyed religious architecture, fortified complexes, and irrigation networks to identify the emergence of a unified Gallinazo political system, the conquest of the Gallinazo by the Moche, and the dramatic sociopolitical changes that took place during the "Coastal Tiahuanaco" era.

The Virú Valley study provided archaeologists with a potent set of research tools to identify the social and political organizations of different ethnic groups. Within a decade of the Virú publications, however, an ascendant processual school of archaeology would attack the very foundations of the culture-historical perspective with a critique of its concept of culture. The Virú Valley Project archaeologists, to one degree or another, all participated in an academic theoretical perspective whose ancestry extended back to Kroeber's (1917) concept of the superorganic. Ford (1949:38) described this as a view of culture as "a stream of ideas, that passes from individual to individual by means of symbolic action, verbal instruction, or imitation. . . . The present day archaeologist is primarily concerned with the histories of what can be recovered or reconstructed of these streams of ideas."

The identification of past cultures in Andean archaeology was, in one way or another, dependent on this superorganic, normative perspective. Cultures were seen as monolithic entities that represented either past ethnic groups, tribes, or races (Jones 1997:106). In contrast, the Processual School viewed archaeological material culture as representative of a variety of past activities, including but not limited to ideological norms (Jones 1997:107). Culture in the processual sense was not a monolithic entity at all, for it was differentially participated in by individuals and groups performing different tasks, frequently at different locations, with different levels of corporate inclusiveness (Binford 1965:205).

A further problem with the normative approach was the development of trait lists. Most pre-processual practitioners defined archeological cultures with extensive trait lists, which were often developed from excavations at a particular type-site. The methodological reasoning behind the trait list approach was to develop "a complex of styles, artifacts, and constructions sufficiently distinctive and isolated to be called a culture" (Bennett 1950:15). In addition to the amalgamation of cultural variation, this approach had another inherent problem: the confusion of stylistic, functional, and environmental variation (Binford 1965).

Cumbersome culture trait lists often included a wide variety of material culture, such as construction material, dietary preferences, and the presence or absence of monumental art and architecture, which resulted from functional, environmental, and social-developmental rather than ethnic variation. Processual and postprocessual archaeologists have come to realize that ethnic groups cannot simply be defined as an aggregation of all spatially and temporally related cultural traits. Rather, ethnic groups are self-conscious entities that distinguish themselves from others by both conscious and unconscious stylistic choices (Boyd and Richerson 1987; Jones 1997; Sackett 1982; Shennan 1989; Wiessner 1984; Wobst 1977). In distinguishing between cultural groups, the archaeologist must identify those cultural attributes pertinent for ethnic identification.

The normative approach to ethnic identification contained another inherent flaw. Although they seldom expressed their view, most archaeologists working during the culture-historical period saw ethnic groups as reflective of either national, tribal, and/or kin bonds, and thus categorized social identity as an innate characteristic provided through birth into the given society. Within this paradigm, ethnic change was viewed as a gradual historical process, which was driven by diffusion and innovation and interrupted by invasion or migration (Ford 1949: 39). Ethnologists working in the late 1960s and early 1970s, however, encountered situations where ethnic identification was situational and differently expressed in diverse circumstances for the negotiation for resources (Barth 1969a; Cohen 1974). This information initiated an intense and unresolved anthropological debate about the nature of ethnicity (Barth 1969b; Cohen 1974; Geertz 1963; Issacs 1974; Jones 1997). The existence of such "circumstantial" ethnicities suggests that ethnic identity may change rapidly as a result of changing social, economic, and/or environmental conditions.

VOLUME ORGANIZATION

These criticisms of the normative approach have shifted the emphasis of ethnic archaeology away from the generation of extensive culture trait lists toward a more refined focus on stylistic variation indicative of ethnic association (Sackett 1982; Wiessner 1984; Wobst 1977). In the Andes, the link between ethnically sensitive material culture and ethnic identity usually begins

with investigations of ethnohistoric source materials. Recent archaeological studies in the region have made strides in the designation of prehistoric ethnic groups by refining the study of textile design and structure (Clark, Palacios, and Juarez 1993; Oakland Rodman 1992), household archaeology (Bawden 1982; Stanish 1989), and spatial organization (Aldenderfer and Stanish 1993; Bawden 1977).

The authors presented in this volume all employ advanced methodological procedures designed to further the archaeological identification of ethnic groups. In chapter 2, Garth Bawden presents information regarding ethnogenesis in the Late Moche period town of Galindo, Peru. The urban town of Galindo was founded after the environmental and social upheavals at the onset of the Middle Horizon, which extensively reduced the southern Moche realm. Bawden describes ethnicity according to two criteria, shared group membership and group social reproduction. By examining the context of Late Moche period stylistic variation, he is able to identify novel stylistic, ideological, and community organization techniques employed by elites in the construction of a new political ideology in an attempt to mask their prior ideological failure. These new political mandates violated prior kinship land relationships and restricted and alienated the masses, who responded by manipulating their own domestic traditions and mortuary customs in the formation of a new social identity. Bawden's assertion that the manipulation of collective symbolism and the adoption of foreign motifs during periods of acute environmental and social stress may result in ethnogenesis is also the topic of Reycraft's contribution in chapter 4.

In chapter 3, John Wayne Janusek examines patterns of similarity and difference in ceramic styles as they relate to variations in craft production, spatial organization, diet, and mortuary patterns in prehistoric Tiwanaku urban society of the Lake Titicaca basin. He argues that certain classes of Tiwanaku ceramic vessels were employed for the expression and negation of status and social identity. In Janusek's view, ethnicity is a form of social identity, which represents the affiliation of groups of individuals based on common histories, cultural expressions, and social manners. Social identity is a scalar social organizational phenomenon, which begins at the level of the nuclear family and expands into extensive, often imagined, affiliations of multiple communities, regions, or districts within an encompassing political entity. By relating ceramic stylistic variation to related variations in the sociostructural fabric of urban Tiwanaku society, Janusek is able to document the presence of several social identity groups. These range from micro-level kin-based corporate groups that maintained their own traditions and residential compounds within Tiwanaku cities (which indicates that Tiwanaku urban society incorporated ethnic groups from distant geographic regions) to macro-level urban identity groups that varied between these cities. Ethnic data from this chapter are further reinforced by cranial deformation information provided by Deborah E. Blom in chapter 10 of this volume.

Reycraft investigates ethnogenesis among the prehistoric Chiribaya of far south coastal Peru in chapter 4. In the Late Intermediate period, at the apex of their cultural florescence, an extreme El Niño impact destroyed the Chiribaya *señorío* (chiefdom), resulting in political collapse and a population exodus. Life was very different for those who remained after the disaster, and their material culture changed accordingly. For this study, Reycraft examined stylistic change across several categories of material culture. He found that some of the most visible kinds of artifacts, which are those often considered the most diagnostic of ethnic identity, changed rapidly after the El Niño event. Other categories of material culture persisted in the predisaster Chiribaya tradition. Reycraft defines ethnicity as the mechanism by which groups of individuals who share a social identity use culture to symbolize their solidarity. Ethnicity as a mechanism implies an active use of culture as an apparatus of social expression and change. This perspective is similar to the positions employed by Bawden in chapter 2 and Janusek in chapter 3. Like Bawden, Reycraft finds that rapid ethnogenesis followed a period of severe environmental and social stress.

Chapter 5 presents Steve Bourget's investigation of social identity among the Moche of north coastal Peru, specifically in terms of their social, symbolic, and mythical roles. In this impressive display of scholarship, Bourget investigates the social identity and the social/mythical roles of individuals portrayed in Moche ritual iconography. He is able to link the characters depicted in ritual iconography to actual individuals by examining forensic information garnered from sacrificial victims, depictions of ritual paraphernalia portrayed in scenes of combat and sacrifice, and the material culture found in elite Moche burials. In the concluding portion of this innovative chapter, Bourget presents a new interpretation of the so-called "Revolt of the Objects" iconographic theme, in which he proposes that the ceremonial objects depicted vested Moche warriors with their ritual power.

In chapter 6, Kevin J. Vaughn provides us with an analysis of household archaeology in the southern Nasca region of Peru. Stanish (1989) and Bawden (1982) pioneered the household archaeological approaches employed in this chapter. Like Stanish (1989), Vaughn is seeking to identify the archaeological household, which he defines as the minimal coresidential domestic group. The domestic household may be the purest form of social identity, for as humans we especially identify with our kith and kin. In the southern Nasca region, Vaughn distinguishes the archaeological household in the household-patio group. The domestic function of this architectural unit is confirmed by the presence of hearths, grinding stones, and food storage features. Interestingly, the non-elite occupants of these structures utilized large quantities of decorated ceramics. This contradicts some of Stanish's (1989, 1992) earlier findings in the upper Osmore region of southern Peru and suggests that decorated wares were commonly used in the households of some prehistoric Andean societies. Thus decorated wares may well represent social identity in certain circumstances. A similar situation seems to have occurred in the predisaster Chiribaya example provided by Reycraft. Vaughn's data further suggest that domestic architecture is an accurate gauge of ethnicity in the southern Nasca region. Household archaeology is also an important element in Bawden's, Janusek's, and Reycraft's contributions to this volume.

In chapter 7, Andrea M. Heckman provides an ethnographic study of the history and function of textiles as purveyors of ethnic, status, and ideological information in Ausangate, Peru. In Ausangate and many other remote regions in the Andes, traditional textile weaving and function can be traced back to the late pre-Columbian epoch. Although some textile forms have disappeared, many others remain, and weavers and wearers continue to imbue cloth with traditional meanings. This information, however, can only be understood in terms of Andean logic. Heckman provides this with an analysis of the basic textile design elements and the cosmological and ethnic connotations that are employed by traditional weavers in Ausangate. Because ancient cultural traditions persist in many remote areas of the Andes, ethnographers have an opportunity to work with and question weavers about the significance of their designs. Undeniably, postcontact influences have filtered into the Andean cultural repertoire, but these influences can be identified through a careful analysis of form and meaning. Heckman provides this link between present and past in her chapter.

Amy Oakland Rodman and Gioconda Arabel Fernandez Lopez have contributed an excellent textile study in chapter 8. They present data concerning burial lots found at Huaca Cao Viejo burial complex in the lower Chicama Valley, Peru. Almost 500 individual burials were uncovered at the Huaca Cao Viejo complex between 1989 and 1997. The Inka required that natives of a given province wear easily distinguishable items of their native dress, such as hats and tunics, at all times so that anyone found outside their native province could be identified (Cobo 1956 [1653]). This variation in dress was noticed by the Spanish conquerors and was documented in narratives by Cobo (1956 [1653]), Cieza de León (1986 [1553]), and others. Variation in traditional Andean community clothing style has continued into the current era, and, as the authors note in this chapter, there are few technical differences between the traditional textiles worn today and many prehistoric Andean textiles. By studying different structural and design elements of the Huaca Cao Viejo textile assemblage, Oakland Rodman and Fernandez Lopez have defined four distinct textile styles. Three of these styles likely document shifting ethnic expression in the garment costume of local groups following the Moche decline (which is also discussed by Bawden in chapter 2). All of these textile styles combine elements of local and exotic design, which may reflect the shifting political and communal allegiances of each local group.

In chapter 9, Sloan R. Williams provides a biological perspective on ethnic studies by addressing the benefits and problems of two common methods for measuring genetic relatedness in populations: nuclear DNA (nDNA) and mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA). The research presented in this chapter was designed to compare the ability of each method to discriminate among closely related endogamous social groups. The ultimate goal is to find a good method of measuring genetic relatedness among prehistoric groups by using ancient DNA; hence this study was designed to reproduce constraints typically encountered in ancient DNA studies. In order to measure the capabilities of each method, however, the study had to examine genetic relatedness among communities in a living, endogamous, traditionally Amerindian society with a relatively well-known social and medical history. Thus, for this study the author has chosen the Yanomamö. While archaeologists and biological anthropologists who utilize ancient DNA in their studies will be interested in the results section, Williams also provides useful information concerning the often associated concepts of ethnicity and genetic relatedness.

Blom has contributed a bioarchaeological study of social group dynamics in prehistoric Tiwanaku society in chapter 10. Blom suggests that, because people of one culture will always use objects created by another, studies that focus only on items of material culture can provide inaccurate representations of ethnic identification. For this study, she compares material culture, cranial deformation patterns, and skeletal epigenetic traits from the Tiwanaku urban heartland and from the middle Moquegua Valley, Peru. The latter area is considered to have been a part of the Tiwanaku Empire. Epigenetic skeletal traits are variations in the teeth and bones that can be used to calculate biological distance measures between populations. Because permanent kinds of body decoration tend to denote social group membership, and because cranial deformation must be initiated during infancy, cranial deformation patterns are good indicators of social group membership at birth. Studies like Blom's are ideally suited to monitor changes in ethnic identification, such as exogamous marriage residence changes and shifting alliances. Blom does find variations in cranial deformation styles between the two study populations. She discusses these variations in terms of basic Andean concepts of duality.

The bioarchaeological approach continues with a contribution by Sutter in chapter 11. Sutter's goal is to identify variables that are related to ethnogenesis and ethnic variation. In pursuit of this goal, he employs the concept of the biocultural group. Biocultural groups are ethnically affiliated, genetically related social groups that share cultural attributes, behaviors, and economic activities. In an attempt to archaeologically define these groups, Sutter examines cranial deformation patterns, dental pathologies, skeletal and dental epigenetic traits, and material culture from several mortuary sites in the coastal Azapa Valley of Chile. Some of this study's results contradict those achieved by several other contributors to this volume, which, as the author suggests, demonstrates that the cultural traits employed as ethnic markers by a given society are arbitrary and will vary between regions.

In chapter 12, Lozada and Jane E. Buikstra examine some of the implications of Rostworowski's (1970, 1977, 1989, 1993) ethnohistoric descriptions of precontact coastal señorío sociopolitical systems. Specifically, Rostworowski suggests that coastal señoríos consisted of *parcialidades*, semiautonomous political and economic groups that displayed many of the characteristics of ethnic groups, each having their own language, economic specialization, and lords. The lords of these semiautonomous groups were in turn subject to a supreme lord who ruled the señorío. To test these implications, the authors have chosen to sample the material culture, cranial deformation patterns, and skeletal epigenetic traits from three distinct mortuary sites pertaining to the Late Intermediate period/Classic phase Chiribaya señorío of far south coastal Peru. The three sites were chosen because their burial accoutrements indicate precisely the different economic and status occupations that are described by Rostworowski's model. The results of this study reinforce many of Rostworowski's assertions and refine our knowledge of prehistoric coastal señorío sociopolitics.

In Chapters 13 and 14, respectively, Stanish and Buikstra analyze and discuss the contributions in this volume. Both authors are widely recognized for their groundbreaking efforts in the definition of archaeological ethnic groups in the Andean region. Stanish was an early, vocal critic of the "artifact-based" definition of prehistoric ethnic groups. As heretofore mentioned, this methodology required the development of extensive lists of artifact traits, which were often developed entirely from decorated ceramic vessels found in a wide variety of archaeological contexts. In its place, Stanish (1992:34–41) pioneered the use of structure shapes and the spatial distributions of functionally distinct rooms to identify the ethnic affiliations of archaeological settlements. This approach has subsequently been adopted by many of the authors in this volume. Buikstra has worked in multiple regions across the globe, producing innovative research in the field of bioarchaeology. In the Andean region, her emphasis on the meticulous biometric analysis of human remains, which is performed in conjunction with comprehensive examinations of any associated material culture, has helped reinvigorate the field of mortuary archaeology. Some of her primary concerns have been in the areas of mortuary ritual and the ethnic, gender, and power relationships found therein. Many of the volume contributors have been profoundly influenced by her work.

In conclusion, this volume presents new and stimulating research in the archaeology of ethnic identity. While the geographic focus of the volume is the Andean study region, the research techniques presented, with the possible exception of the textile studies, should have applications elsewhere as well. With this compilation of diverse approaches, the editor hopes that *Us and Them: Archaeology and Ethnicity in the Andes* will inspire future research and help refine the field of ethnic archaeology.

REFERENCES

Aldenderfer, M. S., and C. Stanish
1993 Domestic architecture, household archaeology, and the past in the south-central Andes. In *Domestic architecture, ethnicity, and complementarity in the south-central Andes*, edited by M. S. Aldenderfer, 1–12. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Barth, F.
1969a Introduction. In *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*, edited by F. Barth, 9–38. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
1969b Pathan identity and its maintenance. In *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*, edited by F. Barth, 117–134. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Bawden, G. L.
1977 Galindo and the nature of the Middle Horizon in northern coastal Peru. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Harvard University.
1982 Community organization reflected by the household: A study of pre-Columbian social dynamics. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 9:165–183.

Bennett, W. C.
1934 *Excavations at Tiahuanaco*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 34 (3). New York.
1936 *Excavations in Bolivia*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 35 (4). New York.
1939 *Archaeology of the north coast of Peru*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 39 (1). New York.
1950 *The Gallinazo group, Virú Valley, Peru*. Yale University Publications in Anthropology 49. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bennett, W. C., ed.
1948 *A reappraisal of Peruvian archaeology*. Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology 4. Washington, D.C.

Binford, L. R.
1965 Archaeological systematics and the study of the culture process. *American Antiquity* 31:203–210.

Bird, J. B.
1948 Preceramic cultures in Chicama and Virú. *American Antiquity* 13 (4): 21–28.

Boas, F.
1887 Museums of ethnicity and their classifications. *Science* 9:485–486.
1905 The mythologies of the Indians. *International Quarterly* 12:157–173.

Boyd, R., and P. J. Richerson
1987 The evolution of ethnic markers. *Cultural Anthropology* 2:65–79.

Childe, V. G.
1929 *The Danube in prehistory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cieza de León, P. de
1986 [1553] *La crónica del Perú*. 3 vols. Lima: Pontifica Universidad Católica del Perú y Academia Nacional de la Historia.

Clark, N. R., P. Palacios, and N. Juarez
1993 *Proyecto textil III, Chiribaya Baja: Cementerio 1 fardos y textiles*. Internal report of Proyecto Contisuyu. Moquegua, Peru: Museo Contisuyu.

Cobo, B.
1956 [1653] *Historia del nuevo mundo*. Edited by P. F. Mateos. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles 91–92. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas.

Cohen, A.
1974 Introduction: The lesson of ethnicity. In *Urban ethnicity*, edited by A. Cohen, ix–xxiii. London: Tavistock Publications.

Collier, D.
1955 *Cultural chronology and change as reflected in the ceramics of the Virú Valley, Peru*. Fieldiana: Anthropology 43. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.

Ford, J. A.
1949 Cultural dating of prehistoric sites in Virú Valley, Peru. In *Surface survey of the Virú Valley, Peru*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 43 (1): 30–94. New York.

Ford, J. A., and G. R. Willey
1949a Virú Valley: background and problems. In *Surface survey of the Virú Valley, Peru*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 43 (1): 1–30. New York.
1949b *Surface survey of the Virú Valley, Peru*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 43 (1). New York.

Geertz, C.
1963 The integrative revolution: Primordial sentiments and civil politics in the new states. In *Old societies and new states*, edited by C. Geertz, 105–157. New York: The Free Press.

Hrdlicka, A.
1911 *Some results of recent anthropological exploration in Peru*. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections 56 (16). Washington, D.C.
1914 *Anthropological work in Peru in 1913, with notes on the pathology of the ancient Peruvians*. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections 61 (18). Washington, D.C.

Hrdlicka, A., W. H. Holmes, B. Willis, F. E. Wright, and C. N. Fenner
1912 *Early man in South America*. Bureau of American

Ethnology Bulletin 52. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Imbelloni, J.
1938 Tabla clasificatoria de los Indios, regiones biológicas y grupos raciales humanos en América. *Physis* 12 (44): 229–249.

Issacs, H.
1974 Basic group identity: Idols of the tribe. *Ethnicity* 1: 15–41.

Jones, S.
1997 *The archaeology of ethnicity, constructing identities in the past and present.* London and New York: Routledge Press.

Kidder II, A.
1943 *Some early sites in the northern Lake Titicaca basin*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 27 (1). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kroeber, A. L.
1917 The superorganic. *American Anthropologist* 19:200–207.
1925 *The Uhle pottery collections from Moche*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (5): 191–234. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1926a *Archeological explorations in Peru. Pt. 1: Ancient pottery from Trujillo*. Field Museum of Natural History Anthropology Memoirs 2:1–43. Chicago.
1926b *The Uhle pottery collections from Chancay*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (7): 265–304. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1927 Coast and highland in prehistoric Peru. *American Anthropologist* 29:625–653.
1930 *Archaeological explorations in Peru. Pt. II: The northern coast*. Field Museum of Natural History Anthropology Memoirs 2:47–116. Chicago.

Kroeber, A. L., and W. D. Strong
1924a *The Uhle collections from Chincha*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (1): 1–54. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1924b *The Uhle pottery collections from Ica*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (3): 95–133. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Larco-Hoyle, R.
1938 *Los Mochicas*. Vol. 1, *La crónica y variedades*. Lima.
1939 *Los Mochicas*. Vol. 2, *Rimac*. Lima.
1941 *Los Cupisniques*, *La crónica y variedades*. Lima.
1944 *Cultura Salinar*. Buenos Aires: Sociedad Geográfica Americana.
1945 *La Cultura Virú*. Buenos Aires: Sociedad Geográfica Americana.

Means, P. A.
1917 *A survey of ancient Peruvian art*. Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. New Haven.
1931 *Ancient civilizations in the Andes*. New York: C. Scribner's sons.

Menzel, D.
1977 *The archaeology of ancient Peru and the work of Max Uhle*. Berkeley: R. H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology, University of California.

Morgan, L. H.
1877 *Ancient society*. New York: Holt.

Newman, M. T.
1943 A metric study of undeformed Indian crania from Peru. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 1:21–45.
1947 *Indian skeletal materials from the central coast of Peru: An archaeologically orientated study in physical anthropology*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 28 (1). Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.
1948 A summary of the racial history of Peru. In *A reappraisal of Peruvian archaeology*, edited by W. C. Bennett, 16–20. Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology 4. Washington, D.C.

Oakland Rodman, A.
1992 Textiles and ethnicity: Tiwanaku in San Pedro de Atacama, North Chile. *Latin American Antiquity* 3 (4): 316–341.

Rowe, J.
1944 *An introduction to the archaeology of Cuzco*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 28 (2). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, M.
1970 Mercaderes del Valle de Chincha en la epoca prehispánica: Un documento y unos comentarios. *Revista Española de Antropología Americana* 5:135–177.
1977 *Etnía y sociedad: Costa peruana prehispánica*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
1989 *Costa peruana prehispánica*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
1993 La voz parcialidad en su contexto en los Siglos XVI y XVII. In *Ensayos de historia Andina*, 231–240. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Sackett, J. R.
1982 Approaches to style in lithic archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1:59–112.

Shennan, S. J.
1989 Introduction. In *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*, edited by S. J. Shennan, 1–32. London: Unwin Hyman.

Stanish, C.
1989 Household archaeology: Testing models of zonal complementarity in the south central Andes. *American Anthropologist* 91 (1): 7–24.

1992 *Ancient Andean political economy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Stewart, T. D.

1943a Skeletal remains with cultural associations from the Chicama, Moche, and Virú Valleys. *Proceedings of the U. S. National Museum* 93:153–185.

1943b Skeletal remains from Paracas, Peru. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 1:47–63.

Strong, W. D.

1925 *The Uhle pottery collections from Ancon*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnography 21 (4): 135–190. Berkeley: University of California Press.

1947 Finding the tomb of the warrior god. *National Geographic Magazine* 91:453–482.

1948 Cultural epochs and refuse stratigraphy in Peruvian archaeology. In *A reappraisal of Peruvian archaeology*, edited by W. C. Bennett, 93–102. Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology 4. Washington, D.C.

Strong, W. D., and J. M. Corbett

1943 A ceramic sequence at Pachacamac. In *Archaeological studies in Peru 1941–1942*. Columbia Studies in Archaeology and Ethnology 1 (2). New York: Columbia University Press.

Strong, W. D., and C. Evans

1952 *Cultural stratigraphy in the Virú Valley, northern Peru*. Columbia Studies in Archaeology and Ethnology 4. New York: Columbia University Press.

Strong, W. D., G. R. Willey, and J. M. Corbett

1943 Preface. In *Archaeological studies in Peru 1941–1942*. Columbia Studies in Archaeology and Ethnology 1. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tello, J. C.

1923 Wira-Kocha. *Inca* 1:93–320.

1942 Orígen y desarrollo de las civilizaciones prehistóricas. *Actas del XXVII Congreso de Americanistas* (1939). Lima: Libería e Imprenta Gil.

1943 Discovery of the Chavín culture in Peru. *American Antiquity* 9:135–160.

Tschopik, M.

1946 *Some notes on the archaeology of the Department of Puno, Peru*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 27 (3). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tylor, E. B.

1871 *Primitive culture*. London: John Murray.

Uhle, M.

1903 *Pachacamac: A report of the William Pepper, M.D., LL.D, Peruvian expedition of 1896*. Translated by C. Grosse. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Archaeology.

1922 *Fundamentos etnicos y arqueología de Arica y Tacna*. 2nd edition. Quito, Equador: Imprenta de la Universidad Central.

1924a Three appendices in *The Uhle pottery collections from Ica*, by A. L. Kroeber and W. D. Strong. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (3). Berkeley: University of California Press.

1924b *Explorations at Chincha*. Edited by A. L. Kroeber. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (2). Berkeley: University of California Press.

1925a *The Uhle pottery collections from Moche and the Uhle pottery collections from Supe*, by A. L. Kroeber. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (5 and 6). Berkeley: University of California Press.

1925b *The Uhle pottery collections from Ancon*, by W. D. Strong. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (4). Berkeley: University of California Press.

1926 Appendix in *The Uhle pottery collections from Chancay*, by A. L. Kroeber. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 21 (7). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wiessner, P.

1984 Reconsidering the behavioral basis for style: A case study among the Kalahari San. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 3:190–234.

Willey, G. R.

1943 *Excavations in the Chancay Valley*. Columbia Studies in Archaeology and Ethnology 1:123–196.

1946 The Virú Valley program in northern Peru. *Acta Americana* 4 (4): 224–238.

1947 A Middle Period cemetery in the Virú Valley, northern Peru. *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 37 (2).

1953 *Prehistoric settlement patterns in the Virú Valley, Peru*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 155. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Wissler, C.

1914 The material cultures of the North American Indians. *American Anthropologist* 16:447–505.

Wobst, M.

1977 Stylistic behavior and information exchange. In *For the director: Research essays in honor of the Late James B. Griffin*, edited by C. E. Cleland, 317–342. Anthropological Papers 6, Museum of Anthropology. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

CHAPTER 2

Ethnogenesis at Galindo, Peru



GARTH BAWDEN

ETHNICITY AND ETHNOGENESIS

Ethnicity

Because of the sometimes-negative connotations associated with such traditional labels as "race," "tribe," and "culture," anthropology has over the past few years tended to replace them with the term "ethnicity," but there is at present little consensus as to its precise meaning or applicability to the study of human groups. In fact, the growing body of literature devoted to ethnicity largely underscores the fact that the challenges of an archaeological study of group identity have not decreased with the shift in nomenclature. On one hand ethnicity in archaeology has been associated with biological variation. On the other hand anthropologists and archaeologists often understand social groupings through interpretations ranging from the old culture-historical categories to intragroup social distinctions and persistent economic classes. None of these various approaches is convincing. Thus, it is clear that ethnic groups often incorporate a wide range of physical morphology. Conversely, a group of people apparently sharing a well-defined cluster of physical characteristics may well embrace more than one ethnic identity (i.e., Bálint 1994). In the mortuary context where the physical and cultural manifestations of ethnic identity should be best accessible to the archaeologist, again there is no tidy correlation between skeletal morphology, burial practice, and group membership (Hubert 1989; Ucko 1969).

Just as problematic are cultural and social scenarios. Most definitions of ethnicity are now generally recognized as frustrating the term's direct association with style in the old cultural sense used by Childe and Kossinna in the Old World and by the New World Culture-Historians (see Trigger 1989:148–206 for a good review of this topic and Conkey and Hastorf 1990 for the many social roles of style), although style as symbolic communication certainly plays an important role in asserting group identity and an equally important internal role in strengthening group cohesion. Finally, attempts to ascribe wider social and economic significance to ethnicity run afoul of the unassailable fact that

societies exist in a state of constant change in which circumstance and historic process conspire to modify the interests and statuses of individuals and generate new adaptations and groupings.

In my opinion this diversity of approach illustrates a most important characteristic of ethnicity—its flexibility—for it can include aspects of all of these forms of human grouping but is not confined to any one of them. Thus my usage of ethnicity encompasses only two basic requirements: first, recognition of common membership in a social group in which people consciously share the same values, interests, and goals; second, the capacity of the group to socially reproduce itself. Within this self-referential context, ethnicity not only transcends any single determinant or set of determinants, it is also historically constructed and thus changes through time according to situational circumstance and experiential history.

On the surface this self-ascriptive character of ethnicity, its particularity, and its capacity to change with new circumstances would appear to make its archaeological investigation difficult if not fruitless. After all, given the lack of correlation of ethnicity with decorative or architectural style, or burial custom, there is little justification to ascribe ethnic significance to any individual or group of material signifiers purely on the basis of their formal characteristics—the basis of archaeological analysis. The way past this dilemma is through the study of social context. Ethnicity, in common with other social phenomena, does not exist in a vacuum. Rather it is a manifestation of its location in time and space. Thus if the context of social production can be identified, it follows that the related material artifacts can also be placed within their proper domains of meaning. Such a study requires the reconstruction of the historic trajectory that created the setting for ethnic formation as well as the specific social arena within which it emerged. While by definition this enquiry must focus on the particular time-space experience of discrete societies and thus describe a unique historic circumstance, certain broader developmental forces offer a productive setting for its realization. Foremost among these are the scales of integration, measured by both structural levels and degrees of complexity, within which ethnic formation occurs.

Scales of Social Integration

At the broadest scale are the effectively unconscious deep structures that characterize the *longue durée* of the world's great human traditions (Western, Native American, East Asian, etc.). Although this elemental structural unity provides the most general determinants of social affinity, it transcends the assertive local and regional cultural boundaries within which ethnicity has meaning. At the active level of human social construction with which I am concerned in this study lies a complex and reflexive interaction between distinct but overlapping cognitive structures, one relatively innate and persistent, the other assertive, contingent, yet relatively transitory. At the deepest level of social awareness all individuals share with their cultural group strong yet vaguely defined conceptions of self and group, shaped by their common experience in time and space. This level of structural cognition that approximates to Giddens's (1990 [1979]) well-known "practical consciousness" and Bordieu's (1977) "habitus" constitutes a given mental language that allows all members of a society to communicate on both intellectual and emotional levels while providing the broad limits within which they dynamically interact in the arenas of daily life. This conceptual language represents the unique pool of knowledge and belief accumulated by a group through time. Moreover, it is this shared cognitive stratum that provides the foundation upon which societies build their specific organizational strategies, whether characterized by principles of kinship or class in evolutionary parlance.

However, it is at the level of daily interaction that individuals actively assess their social situation and question its utility for their needs. It is also at this level that the forces that drive ethnogenesis are located. Through political, social, economic, and ideological contestation people confront their ideas and policies and strive to negotiate new outcomes that further their own discrete goals. Yet such arguments can only be formulated within the conceptual and experiential milieu provided by the collective belief structure discussed in the previous section. In this regard it is important to note that repeated negotiation of principles drawn from this shared structure will inevitably lead to its reflexive modification, although at a much more gradual rate than that associated with active social decision making.

While it is true that those corporate alliances within society that control the institutions and economy of authority are at a distinct advantage in this negotiation process, subordinate groups are by no means without recourse. Although frequently separated from the institutional arena of social negotiation, such politically secondary groups have access to informal settings of

community life—household, unofficial or group religion, market—to affirm their interests and needs. In the final analysis dominant and subordinate interests exist in a state of complementary tension in stable societies. By contrast, in extreme circumstances of internal stress, the former exerts its power to protect and, where necessary, to impose the prevailing social order, while the latter actively resists. If resolved, group opposition of this form merely represents a dynamic for social change and need not lead to the creation of new social identities. However, an extended period of unresolved internal conflict may create a profound degree of social disruption that becomes the catalyst for such transformation.

I turn now to the role of social complexity in generating ethnic awareness. There is clear divergence of opinion regarding the level of internal social complexity that must be present for ethnicity to emerge. It has been proposed that self-ascribed identity groupings only arose in the context of evolving social complexity and the pressure that this exerts (Bentley 1987). Indeed, some theorists take this notion so far as to see ethnicity as a by-product of the modern industrial state (Gellner 1983). From this viewpoint ethnic construction is understood as a shift in the conception of personal identity in response to the emergence of new institutions of political, social, and economic domination in the modern age.

I am very uneasy with the inference that people are able to purposefully identify and articulate their particular group affinities only within a context of extreme social complexity. After all, this leads to the conclusion that most members of the world's human population through history were oblivious to the social dynamics that impacted their lives, a stance that few scholars would seriously hold. Consequently, while I accept that the organizational setting of the parent society influences the strategies that are available for ethnic formation, I believe that traditional cultural evolutionary categories like "state" and "prestate" or "industrial" versus "pre-industrial" are of minor relevance in understanding its motivation. Rather than focusing on overly general and, to my mind, questionable determinants to explain ethnic identity, I think it far more meaningful to identify the precise set of forces that impacts social life in each particular situation. These factors may include the rise of urbanism, internal social conflict, changing systems of production and commodity exchange, emergence of intersocietal warfare, political reconstitution, and major climatic disruption. In various configurations such forces can initiate the profound degree of social disturbance that accompanies assertive realignment of social affinity.

Thus, the crucial element in ethnic construction is not whether society is grounded in principles of kinship or class, or within a chiefly or state structure. Rather, it is the effect of changing situations of social life on individual and group stability. It follows that I do not restrict ethnic identity to the recent period. Instead, I assume that it has existed since at least the earliest civilizations and has played a role in defining intergroup relationships in all such subsequent instances.

In this study, I view the effects on social identity of major disruption in a society that most scholars would regard as "prestate" in universal evolutionary parlance, where principles of kinship affinity and links to ancestral land, underpinned by rituals of community and mythic origin, composed the chief strategies of social integration. Specifically, I examine how an abrupt move from traditional rural existence to pre-industrial urban life was the crucial factor that generated ethnic construction within this persisting organizational setting. I will show how this process of change with its accompanying instability caused people to reassess their social circumstances. By deliberately and autonomously manipulating prevailing structural mechanisms, they realigned their social affinities and created new and powerful foundations of personal and group identity.

Ideology and Social Construction

There is one specific mechanism of ethnic formation that is of special importance to this study. As I noted in the previous discussion, all social negotiation occurs in active daily discourse where human agents reflexively utilize their common cultural consciousness to assert individual interests. During periods of stability members of different social networks and values live in a state of complementary tension. Their respective principles are contested within the public sphere as the agendas of political, corporate, or religious movements and do not significantly affect the wider communal identity, which their adherents all share. However, in extended periods of instability and discord these beliefs become the embedded ideological weapons of group conflict.

In internal social conflict the distinct values and principles of each contesting group become the assertive ideologies around which its members consolidate. I here define ideology as the specialized formulation of social statement that promotes the aspirations of its advocates in the wider social arena. As such, ideology

is the possession of all interest groups within a society, whether defined by corporate, status, or class membership. However, dominant ideology (Abercrombie, Hill, and Turner 1980)—the condensed discourse of ruling authority and established social order—has access to the institutions of political power. Through such participatory mechanisms as pervasive symbolic communication and ceremonial ritual, the adherents of dominant ideology seek to co-opt all members of the community into accepting the beneficial social order that it proclaims. Indeed, during periods of widespread advantage it may well be accepted as the unitary belief system of a successful way of life and thereby be social reality for all.

In fact, history makes clear that this situation does not usually persist unchallenged for long. In stable conditions, negotiation and adjustment are contained within the conceptual boundaries set by dominant ideological dogma. However, in times of deprivation the perceived contradiction between political discourse and individual lived reality can lead to fundamental challenge to the ruling order by the subordinated groups who are most vulnerable. If their lived circumstances remain unchanged they will inevitably confront the existing order with their own moral and practical agendas. The ensuing contest may lead to irreparable division between the conflicting social segments, which differentially manipulate their previously shared cultural heritage to generate new, distinct, and ultimately irreconcilable ideological constructs. Over time these originally political concepts consolidate into exclusive conceptual bases of group identity—the process of ethnogenesis.

The Symbolism of Social Action

While symbols have been studied from various viewpoints (for examples see Firth 1973; Leach 1976; Mach 1993; Ricoeur 1974), most scholars would agree that they include a wide range of conceptual, behavioral, and material forms, whose meanings are rooted in the cognitive world models of their related cultures. Given the archaeological nature of my topic, I shall confine my discussion of symbolism to its material aspect. Symbols codify people's experience; assert their particular values, ideologies, and stereotypes; and direct their relations with others. Moreover they carry an emotional force that stimulates involvement and mobilizes people to act on behalf of the communicated message (Turner 1967: 30). These qualities make symbols potent players in the affirmation of power at all levels of the social ladder and in the negotiation and construction of group identity. It is, then, not surprising that they are essential forces in the central arenas of social control, where they assert the prestige of the dominant ideology.

However, control of symbolic discourse is not confined to the dominant political sector. While common cognitive origin ensures that symbols are understood throughout their community, their potential for flexible interpretation allows subordinate groups to manipulate symbolic communication in their own interests. This property becomes important in societies caught in a state of deep political and social turmoil. As contesting subgroups strive to assert their precedence, and new allegiances coalesce in response to social stress, symbolism becomes a powerful vehicle for reinforcing common awareness among their members and asserting their specific character and interests in the face of wider social pressures.

I have to this point emphasized the culture-specific nature of symbols. However, cultures do not develop in isolation, but in varying degrees are influenced by their neighbors, incorporating foreign elements into their symbolic systems. Often, intercultural affinity fosters absorption of such elements so that they are no longer distinguishable as foreign. That said, it is not unusual for elite groups to intentionally embrace foreign symbols in order to enhance their authority and to elevate them above other sectors of the population. These adoptions may carry the prestige of admired exotic images or, more significantly, of religious or political meaning that transcends local belief. By their very nature such symbols resist incorporation into the broader symbolic structure of society. This tends to introduce intrasocietal division, which, at a time of broad disruption, heightens the potential for internal conflict and rejection of the foreign symbols together with their discredited proponents.

Places carry powerful symbolic meaning, for places and the people who use them are part of the complex of physical, behavioral, and conceptual networks that together constitute the community. The varied experiences that individuals draw from their particular historic and social locations converge in the places where social action occurs. There they are actualized to effect stability or change. The urban built environment, the setting for this study, comprises various architectural locations, each shaped so as to promote the activities of its principal patrons and to symbolically communicate their social values. Elite architecture asserts symbolic force on behalf of dominant interests and includes forms associated with administrative,

economic, and religious institutions together with the residences and burial places of the rulers. By contrast architecture that falls largely under the control of commoners is almost entirely confined to their homes and, to a lesser degree, their burials. At the broadest level residential space actualizes socially appropriate domestic modes of behavior (Bordieu 1977; Rapoport 1982, 1990:12ff.). However, within these limits household members, through daily practice, may reflexively manipulate ideas embedded in residential structure to effect change. By adjusting the symbolic content of their houses, people manipulate basic residential principles to strengthen their collective identity and assert social solidarity—the essence of ethnicity.

The Archaeological Search for Ethnicity

Where then does this discussion leave us in the search for ethnicity in archaeology? I believe that we can circumvent the obvious problems associated with trying to correlate ethnic identity with material style and form by exploring the dynamics through which it comes into existence. Examination of the material remains of human groups in their spatial and temporal contexts can offer us insight into the social contexts that encourage the construction of collective identity and the strategies employed to consolidate it. From this starting point the physical (and archaeological) symbols of ethnogenesis find their logical place as players in the mechanisms of social production. This archeological strategy has three important requirements:

1. It must identify the full archaeological context of change within which ethnic formation occurred in a society. This requires knowledge of the particular history of the subject society, including both its internal development and external connections. It also requires knowledge of the circumstances that may have stimulated a section of society to reassess its relationship with the wider community at the time of ethnic formation.

2. It is necessary to determine that social change visible in the archaeological record was indeed caused by ethnogenesis. The archaeological record includes two components that are frequently confused by the researcher. These include the well-defined symbolism of dominant political ideology and the wider set of material expressions of communal identity. While these usually share a common cultural heritage, and usually overlap in their symbolic content and perceived meaning within the wider community, they represent ultimately distinct forms of social integration.

3. In order to be sure that the archaeological changes do in fact represent a bounded social group, the wider extracultural archaeological record must be known.

For the remainder of this chapter I apply this approach to a specific case study—the Late Moche (ca. AD 600–750) town of Galindo in the Moche Valley of northern Peru. Here rulers and commoners alike manipulated communal identity, together with its related visual symbolism and places of social interaction, to consolidate their threatened social positions at a time of disruption and transformation. In a context of abrupt urban formation, economic deprivation, social tension, and political change, the ultimately conflicting interests of these two different segments of the population caused each to seek new principles of social cohesion within the wider community, a process that eroded the existing structure of Moche group identity.

ETHNOGENESIS IN THE LATE MOCHE PERIOD

Foundations of Traditional Moche Social Cohesion

Archaeologically, the structure of traditional Moche social cohesion is most apparent in its great centers of political control. The tall platform mounds that still dominate the coastal Peruvian valleys attest to the ability of rulers to both control the labor of local communities and affirm the dominant ideology of power through awesome architectural symbols (Moore 1996; Moseley 1975). Leaders used these artificial re-creations of the rain-giving sacred mountains to fashion an ideological discourse, by officiating at familiar mythic rituals that identified the rulers with these sacred places and with their embodied meaning (Alva and Donnan 1993; Bawden 1996; Topic and Topic 1997). Those in power thereby assumed the responsibility to mediate with the supernatural to ensure communal health. At the same time they acquired potent spiritual force to support and enhance their political status.

In addition to being expressed in architectural forms, Moche traditional dominant ideology was proclaimed through portable symbolism. Fine painted ceramic, metal, and textile objects all carried depictions of the rituals of power. Themes were usually drawn from historic local antecedents (Cordy-Collins 1990) but occasionally they incorporated potent foreign images into the Moche symbolic system (Menzel 1977:62–63). Striking portrait vessels proclaimed the power of individual members of the ruling elite. While the most elaborate items were reserved for contexts of central authority, simpler examples of this symbolism circulated

in all arenas of daily life, including the residential. Thus these symbols endowed the Moche ideological message with the powerful legitimacy of familiar traditional cultural meaning shared by all strata of society.

Burial practice is especially susceptible to manipulation by intracommunal groups and is an important vehicle for ideological discourse, as we shall see in this study. Practices that surround death are in a real sense conditioned by the social and political needs of the living, who may manipulate funerary ritual to embellish or actually to construct their social positions and relationships. The Moche used burial practice to sanction the dominant social order, to maintain communal traditions and origins, and to reinforce group integrity by reference to ancestral lands and the sacred places associated with them. The traditional Moche mortuary style was a brick-lined chamber tomb capped by wood and cane roofing, often located in a formal cemetery (see Donnan 1995; Donnan and Mackey 1978 for summaries of Moche funerary practices). However, even when located in a residential area, burials were placed outside houses (Chapdelaine 1997; Donnan and Mackey 1978; Topic 1982). People were usually laid on their backs with small pieces of copper placed at feet, hands, and mouth, a practice that links Moche ritual to earlier practice (Fogel 1993:281). Burial offerings often bore the distinctive symbolism of dominant ideology. Exceptionally, the tombs of rulers were incorporated into special burial platforms accompanied by huge quantities of fine objects. Important aspects of these traditional practices changed dramatically in Late Moche times at Galindo.

The character and pervasive social context of traditional Moche symbolism conformed to a situation where a related belief system enjoys broad community support. To a large degree the success of this inclusive ideology appears to have stemmed from its grounding in long-term cultural belief in a rural society organized by principles of communal solidarity. This structural conception, actualized through ritual and symbolism, linked people to the essence of their social beings. Here dominant ideology represented the social reality of the entire population during a time of political and economic florescence.

What can we say about Moche ethnic identity in this earlier period? It is true that a ruling group produced the ideological symbolism that archaeology terms "Moche culture." But there is no indication that rulers regarded themselves as ethnically separate from the wider population with whom they shared the cultural heritage that inspired this imagery. Indeed, the accessibility of all members of society to the symbols of north coast cultural heritage during this period archaeologically supports the presence of an undifferentiated social awareness in which kinship relations provided the milieu for unitary social identification.

Crisis on the North Coast

Late in the sixth century AD, north coast Moche polities experienced profound disruptions that have variously been ascribed to climatic disaster, external invasion, and internal tension (see Bawden 1996 for summary). The impact on the Moche Valley was particularly severe, with reduction in territorial hegemony (figure 1), economic decline, and major dune inundation of prime agricultural land. In response, the focus of settlement and subsistence shifted inland to the still-irrigable valley neck where the new town of Galindo was established, replacing the previous rural pattern of settlement (figure 2; Billman 1996:292). Inevitably, this change threatened the integrity of all social groups, discrediting the long-successful political order of the rulers while separating commoners from their ancestral locations, placing them in an alien urban setting, and disrupting their existing kin-based community organization. With traditional strategies of social integration rejected, both rulers and ruled strove to re-create social stability in the new setting. Ironically, while both groups manipulated ideological structure in their endeavors, they did this in very different ways that led to social division, ethnic formation, and ultimate collapse of the Late Moche system.

Two vital practical requirements for successful dominant ideology are the perception by the populace of its benefits and, in times of stress, the rulers' ability to successfully explain and contain threats posed by historic circumstance. There can be little doubt that the long-lasting earlier Moche system met these needs. However, it is equally clear that in the conceptual domain, the seventh-century failure caused rejection of the traditional dominant political ideology together with its ideological base and the rituals and symbols that were the active agents of its authority. Rulers reaffirmed their shaken position by introducing a coercive system of control at Galindo and adopting new pan-Andean ideological concepts in an attempt to free themselves from identification with the failures of their predecessors. Unavoidably this foreign ideology was oriented to the restrictive use of the elite and excluded the wider population from participation in the new social order and its rituals.