INKA ARCHAEOLOGY, LIKE THAT OF THE OTHER GREAT EMPIRES OF LATE
Pre-Columbian America, suffers from the paradoxical situation that on
the one hand we possess much more data than for earlier cultures and, on
the other hand, this wealth of data has led us to neglect the study of mate-
rial culture and its interpretation. One reason is that archaeology has
become an addendum to the interpretation of the written sources. This
is problematic when dealing with nonliterate societies. In Mexico, where
some original native textual documents exist, archaeological evidence has
not only complemented, but also corrected ethnohistorical interpreta-
tions. One of the principal postulates is the strict separation of the anal-
ysis of the material remains from that of the textual material, combining
them only when comparing the results (Meyers 1998a [1976]; Smith 1992;
Pärsinnen and Siiriäinen 1997: 256).

Another misunderstanding in the treatment of the two different
source materials is the tendency to verify through archaeology the
historical data, such as the change of rulers, the conquest of the prov-
inces, or the exchange of people throughout the empire. Such events are
rarely reflected in the archaeological material and, in general, as has been
stated (Sinopoli 1994), an archaeology of empire that concentrates too
much on military conquests will run the risk of overlooking other factors
such as exchange relations. Consequently, the distribution of imperial
ceramic styles in time and space may not correlate exactly with military
or political expansion.

In this chapter, I present two different loci of power of the Inka state,
one in the northern and one in the southeastern periphery. In order to
evaluate the style of Inka power, I shall briefly refer to the archaeology
of Cusco. After a discussion of some manifestations of Inka power in the two cases, I shall draw some conclusions in terms of different superimposed religious power systems and try to interpret the evidence within the framework of an archaeological chronology for the Inka culture.

**Cusco Archaeology: The “Bottling Up” of the Inka Style**

In 1993, John Hyslop (1993: 351) posed a classic question: How did the Inka do so much in such a short time? The standard version of Inka history for more than sixty years, is that roughly in the decade between 1460 and 1470 all major provinces between Ecuador and Chile and Argentina were conquered (e.g., Rowe 1945). Here is not the place to discuss the methodological problems of this short version: the tendency of the informants to attribute the great deeds to their closest relatives; the logical, logistical, and organizational problems of such a rapid expansion and stabilization of the empire (see Meyers 1975, 1998a [1976]: 31–42). Rather, I maintain that an archaeological treatment of this phenomenon, separate from a study of colonial textual sources, can lead to different conclusions. From the perspective of art history, the supposed creation of such a sophisticated and stylistically well-balanced style as the Cusco Inka style can rarely be developed by one ruler and promoted in such a short time. This seems even more obvious if we consider the limitations of the proposed antecedents that have more in common with contemporaneous neighboring styles than with the Imperial Inka style. While I cannot agree with Hyslop’s acceptance of the short chronology, I find more value in his statement that the “Inka horizon must be viewed as the mobilization of pan-Andean resources, not just Inka ones from Cusco” (Hyslop 1993: 351).

Whereas this statement has been applied to the imperial expansion only, it can be expanded to include the initial phase of the empire, which would begin earlier than the proposed date of 1438, as well as the formative phase of the Inka style. Geographically speaking, isolated development is unlikely not only for theoretical reasons, but also because of the various parallels that can be found in surrounding areas close to Cusco (Bauer 1992a, b) and more to the south, as Max Uhle (1912) and Philip A. Means (1931: 199) suggested long ago. Possible candidates to “compete” with Killke as precedent of the Inka style are Churajón, Chiribaya, San Miguel, Gentilar, and others in the southwest, and also the altiplano style called Kolla, and the Mollo style, east of Lake Titicaca (Ponce 1957). It is this latter style that shows the closest stylistic connection between Tiwanaku and Inka. This position represents a serious alternative to the “bottling up” of the Inka style in the Cusco area.

The same argument could be made for the architecture. Despite all differences, there exist clear reasons for postulating a stylistic line from Tiwanaku to the Inka, probably via the *chullpa* (burial structures) complex
or the Mollo architecture as documented, for example, in Iskanwaya (Arel- 
lano 1985).

The Inka in the Province: The Style of Power, the Power of Style

It can be assumed that the Inka state exercised its powers in a variety of 
manifestations. What we know about the ruling principles shaping polit-
ical, economic, social, and religious reorganization is primarily based on 
written evidence from the Spanish Colonists. Also, ethnohistorically 
defined principles of state dominance such as ethnic relocations and their 
replacement by Cusco people or Inkaized groups, not to mention general 
models such as economic complementarity (e.g., Hyslop 1993: 348), have 
not been convincingly verified by the archaeological evidence. The same 
is true of the military expansion of the Cusco people, headed by certain 
kings and generals, as assumed by the “standard version.” No Inka fortress, 
civil or religious construction element, or any material object, especially 
in the provinces, can yet be convincingly attributed to a specific Inka 
emperor such as Tupac Yupanqui or Huayna Capac.

What we have is a general set of elements such as fortifications, storage 
and road systems, “Imperial Inka” architecture, and transportable cultural 
remains, whose careful examination over the last decades has advanced our 
knowledge considerably and has changed our view from a rather standard-
ized to a much more differentiated one. By classifying all these features as 
manifestations of state power, however, we again run the risk of oversim-
plifying. What we can learn from the ethnohistorical record is that the 
Inka style of power was apparently a flexible one, with ruling principles 
changing from region to region. Consequently, one of the tasks of the 
archaeologist is to consider every element of the material culture sepa-
rately in terms of style, geographical distribution, and chronology before 
drawing upon generalizations mostly based on ethnohistorical concepts.

In the case of ceramic styles, I would prefer not to speak of a symbol 
of state power (Morris 1995) or even that of a single ruler (Rowe 1996), 
but reformulate the problem as one of the power of the style itself. Given 
the high mobility of all sorts of goods in the Andes (staple and wealth), 
it would not be surprising to find the expansion and imposition of the 
Imperial Inka style around the Andes unsupported by military conquest 
or other sorts of political pressure. And, from another perspective, why 
should a Cusco Coya not prefer fine Chimú pottery in her household? 
Were there official prescriptions determining the forms and decoration of 
Inka ceramics and were they controlled by the state? Does the evidence 
of the existence of state potters in some places mean that there was no 
production for the “free market”?

Given a degree of self-regulation in the field of production and 
distribution, variety of use in functional sense, availability, and prestige
and fashion of certain wares, it is difficult to distinguish between Cusco Inka pottery, state pottery, provincial pottery, and Inka pottery as Morris (1995: 426) has suggested. Drawing an analogy to Roman provincial archaeology, in an earlier article (Meyers 1975), I underlined the widespread phenomenon of a clear Inka influence on local wares, especially of domestic use. I called a second group “Inka imitation ware,” a more or less crude imitation of the most typical forms and motives. The group of “mixed styles” is the privileged field for the study of power balance between all the elements of both styles (Meyers 1975). Their existence throughout the Inka Empire, not only in Peruvian territory, is evidence of the free contact between styles and probably also potters, and an argument against state regulation.

CASE I: THE RAMP PYRAMIDS FROM COCHASQUÍ

Inka culture in Ecuador is represented by a variety of features, including the different ceramic styles (influenced, imitation, and mixed) mentioned above particularly in the Cashaloma-Inka complex in the southern highlands (Fresco 1984). The distribution map of several elements of the Imperial Inka styles shows ten geographical units of findings, with a slight decrease in intensity toward the north (fig. 1). In contrast to Hyslop’s interpretation (1993, citing Salomon and Fresco), however, the Inka frontier north of Quito clearly demonstrates a strong stylistic influence on local ceramics, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, based on an analysis of the ceramics from Cochasquí (Meyers 1989). Apart from the well-documented concentration of Inka fortresses in that area, a thin-section analysis by Tamara Bray proved that Inka-style pottery from this region is indistinguishable from the local Caranqui ware (Bray n.d.: 140, 1992: 227), suggesting that local pottery was produced along Inka lines. In the ceramics of Cochasquí’s second phase, Inka influence is evidenced by the use of black as an additional color, and by a characteristic rim treatment (Meyers 1989). Among the whole vessels found at Cochasquí, the prevailing vessel shapes are Form 1 (“aryballus”), mostly in imitation style; Form 10 (foot bowl); and cooking pots (ollas) with tripod legs instead of the common ring base. The most curious specimen is the “fern pattern” on an Inka-Form 1-imitation vessel applied using the technique of resist painting (Oberem and Wurster 1989: figs. 96, 97).
Cochasquí, in the Sierra Norte de Quito, consists of a complex of fifteen stepped earthen pyramids with up to 200 m long ramps that lead to the platforms (fig. 2). The same cultural and chronological complex includes a series of burial mounds and a habitation site. Excavations at the largest construction, Pyramid E, in 1964 and 1965, uncovered the lower section of the stepped structure, which was made up of walls constructed of big blocks of volcanic tuff (*cangahua*) with a pillow-like outside surface, resembling Cusco Inka stone walls (fig. 3). This same observation was made by Max Uhle in the 1930s, when he watched the work of grave robbers at the same building. He interpreted this huge building as an Inka sun temple (Uhle 1933).

The platform of Pyramid E as well as those of other similar excavated structures was consolidated with brick-hard burned clay. These structures contained a series of postholes that, together with small circular ditches, suggested the existence of round houses with conical roofs (fig. 4). Rectangular cavities up to 6 m long and 50 cm wide molded in clay were positioned symmetrically in relation to the central axis (fig. 5). Every cavity formed a rectangular area into which another rectangular area had been deepened in a concentric way with the sides a little bit inclined. On the platform of Pyramid E the excavators found a series of stone cones stuck in the cavities, always in groups of three, forming a triangle that could hold a cooking pot. The excavators interpreted the pyramids with the house
FIG. 3  Detail showing the blocks of cangahua, Pyramid E (photograph by Udo Oberem)

FIG. 4  Reconstruction of Pyramid E at Cochasqui (after Oberem and Wurster 1989: fig. 41)
constructions as seats of the Caranqui lords of the region, famous for their resistance to the troops of Huayna Capac. They assumed that the cavities served as domestic kitchens and did not consider a ritual function for these features, although they did not deny the possibility of other explanations (Wurster 1989: 58–60).

The documentation of an analogous cavity from the carved rock in Samaipata, eastern Bolivia, has led me to reconsider the function of this fairly rare element at Cochasqui. The feature at Samaipata has a striking similarity to those of Cochasqui, the major difference being that it is carved in the northwestern corner of the huge sandstone rock and is among hundreds of carved elements at that site (fig. 6). It lacks the stone cones, but it has the same dimensions (6 m long and 50 cm wide), running in an east-west direction. There is sufficient evidence to assume that they are the products of a common culture, while not necessarily assuming a contemporaneous origin for these features encountered across such a vast geographical distance. These have not yet been documented in other literature, so far as I know. My suggestion is that they served as recipients for liquids during libation and/or burning.

FIG. 5 Cavities on the platform of Pyramid E at Cochasqui (photograph by Udo Oberem)

FIG. 6 Rectangular cavity near feline relief on the carved rock at Samaipata
rituals. In contrast to Cochasquí, the carved rock of Samaipata can be dated to the Late Horizon. In the case of the Cochasquí cavities, my explanation would only be plausible if the house was burned and the cavities added after that event. This is technically possible. I therefore hypothesize a change at Cochasquí of the civil and perhaps ritual residence of the local lord into a place for the execution of state rituals. Practicing Inka public rituals on top of a former native elite residence not only provides a clear demonstration of power but also may have been intended as humiliation or punishment of those who resisted conquest by the Inka.

CASE II: THE CARVED ROCK FROM SAMAIPATA

The so-called Samaipata Fort (“Fuerte de Samaipata”) is situated on one of the last flanks of the eastern Bolivian Andes, at an altitude of about 1,900 m, a little more than 100 km to the southwest of the modern city of Santa Cruz de la Sierra (figs. 7, 8). The site was visited by Thadäus Haenke at the end of the eighteenth century and described by the French traveler Alcide d’Orbigny some forty years later (d’Orbigny 1835–1847). His interpretation as a “lavage d’or des Incas” was rejected at the beginning of the twentieth century by the Swedish scholar Erland Nordenskiöld, who considered it the last outpost of the Inka Empire toward the eastern lowlands. He also placed more emphasis on its ceremonial character (Nordenskiöld 1924), as did Hermann Trimborn (1967).
Toward a Reconceptualization of the Late Horizon and the Inka Period
Since then, Samaipata has been generally interpreted as one of the great fortresses that protected the eastern flanks of the empire against the continuous attacks of the savage forest peoples (“Chunchos salvajes”) of the lowlands. An examination of the ethnohistorical material reveals, however, that these writings have more to do with a projection of the various armed conflicts between the Chiriguanos and the Spaniards during the viceroyalty of Toledo (Julien 1997), than a rejection of the time of the Inka. This vision is still manifested today by the common denomination of the site as “El Fuerte de Samaipata.” Indeed, the Arabic-Andalusian style “patio-house” situated on top of the Inka ruins, almost attached to the carved rock (fig. 9), can be interpreted as the throne/headquarters of a Spanish captain from the time of these conflicts (Meyers n.d.). Furthermore, we identified at least one Inka fortress some 60 km southeast of Samaipata (Meyers and Ulbert 1998a, b), which would confirm the recent suggestions of a more eastern expansion of the Inka Empire in that region (Pärsinnen 1992; Saignes 1985).

D’Orbigny’s map indicates a “village des Incas” to the south of the famous carved rock, and during our excavations between 1992 and 1994 we documented an extended complex of terraces, structures, and buildings of various sizes at the site (fig. 10; Meyers 1993, 1998b; Meyers and Ulbert 1998a, b). 4 The great hall (kallanka), with an extension of 68 m x
16 m, that flanks the great plaza to the south is described by my colleague and codirector of the last field season, María de los Angeles Muñoz (see her chapter, this volume).

In four different excavation sectors, we documented two construction phases of Inka buildings, the later one evidencing two occupation floors separated by layers of destruction. This is not the place to describe the occupation sequence in detail or the diversity of the material recovered. The pottery assemblage includes at least three ceramic wares of Inka style (fig. 11) as well as local wares (fig. 12). The local wares show an affinity with a stylistic complex distributed along the eastern flank of the Andes and with wares found in the Amazonian region to the north and the Chaco.
FIG. 13 View of the carved rock outcrop at Samaipata, from the west
region to the south. Rather than focus on these artifactual remains, I want to consider the large rock-carving complex that reveals a heterogeneous combination of diverse motifs, multiple processes of carving, and stylistically different features, which could serve as a unique "quarry" of Pre-Columbian Andean and perhaps non-Andean ritual complexes (fig. 13).

The carved rock of Samaipata consists of a huge sandstone ridge with a 250 m east-west and 50 m north-south extension. It is covered by figurative representations of felines, serpents, and geometric figures such as rhombuses, meanders, triangles, rectangles, and circles (fig. 14). Several carved basins are distributed around the rock. A special unit appears to be formed by the steps and rectangular seats ordered in rows on the southern part (fig. 15). These give the whole complex the appearance of a sort of amphitheater. Other features on the top of the rock have been interpreted and named in the earlier literature, especially in the work of Leo Pucher (1945). For example, he interpreted the grooves of rhomboids paralleled by two canals (fig. 16) as the representation of a serpent (*el dorso de serpiente*). He called the complex of seats, carved in the form of a circle, "the choir of the priests" (*el coro de los sacerdotes*). Five niches were carved on the northern flank (fig. 17), part of a large temple building. Portions of the wall are still in situ (fig. 18). While not considering those elements clearly

FIG. 14 Plan of the carved rock at Samaipata; arrows indicate super positions (drawing by Peter Pahlen, Cornelius Ulbert, and Rolando Marulanda)
added in a later phase of utilization and construction, I want to point out two cases of a clear superposition of Inka elements whose interpretation could not only provide a new vision of Inka presence in the provinces, but also shed new light on Inka development in the core area.

Two Religious Systems Superimposed in Samaipata?

In this section, we are concerned with two complexes of worked sandstone walls erected on top of the rock at Samaipata. On the western side, there is a transversal wall oriented in north-south direction and still conserved to a height of 80 cm (fig. 10, S16; see also fig. 13). It contains three double-jambed niches facing west and three single-jambed niches facing east toward the two long carved canals. Along its southern part, it cuts a 40 cm deep basin into two parts. The other complex lies at the eastern end of the carved rock and consists of two walls positioned in the form of an L (fig. 10, S9; see also fig. 14, arrows). The transversal wall contains six double-jambed niches arranged in a meandering form whereby three niches face alternately to the east and the west. It is separated by a small passage from the longitudinal wall, which has seven double-jambed niches facing south and six single-jambed niches facing north. The eastern end enters into a semicircle carved into the rock, which contains several triangular and quadrangular seats. The wall ends in front of one of these seats, leaving the semicircle structure dysfunctional.
In both of the above cases, we are dealing not with buildings, but rather with niched galleries, which were superimposed on top of the rock carvings. The western gallery was probably connected to the two canals to form a ritual complex, especially considering that the canals are inclined toward the gallery. On the eastern end of the canals there is a basin positioned asymmetrically, which seems to be rendered dysfunctional in the same way as the eastern niche gallery.

What has attracted our attention at Samaipata is the apparent nonintegration of the previous system into the new ritual complex. Obviously, we have two different ritual complexes. Moreover, we interpret the two systems as opposed to each other, with the later one not respecting and perhaps even explicitly rejecting the earlier one. This impression could be extended to the majority of the other carvings, many of which have been interrupted and dismembered. For example, transversal staircases or niches are carved at the edges of the rock. These belonged to large roofed buildings built on the flank of the carved monument, whose reconstruction by computer simulation reveals that the elements of the carved rocks could no longer be seen from the adjacent platform or from the grand plaza with the kallanka down to the south. Thus, superposition of the late complex on top of the former one can be interpreted as a demonstration of power similar to that at Cochasquí at the other extreme of the empire.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the evidence. Three of them are presented here as hypotheses. Because of the methodological considerations explained above, only archaeological arguments based primarily on the traditional methods of stylistic comparison and stratigraphical superposition will be employed.

**HYPOTHESIS 1: ALL ELEMENTS ARE OF INKA ORIGIN**

All the complexes described at Samaipata are hypothesized to be of Inka origin, and the stylistic differences and superpositions related to different phases of occupation and use by the Inka. The style and technique of rock carving and of almost all the structural elements have parallels in the Cusco region. Analogues can be drawn to various carved boulders and rock outcrops, including the carved steps of Rodadero Hill at Sacsayhuaman (fig. 19) and the rock of Sahuite in Apurimac (fig. 20). These, and many other cases of such features, have until now mostly been interpreted as Inkaic in the archaeological literature. Consequently, at Samaipata, we have to define two stylistically and stratigraphically separate complexes, both created by the Inka.

In the phase Inka I, the rock would have been carved with canals, seats, and steps, as an aesthetic expression of Inka masonry art and for ritual use in making liquid and/or burnt offerings or other ceremonies. In the phase Inka II, the rock would have been cut at the edges to add...
the niched temples. The niched galleries were likely constructed at the same time, along with other elements such as the two canals. Cult activities would have been concentrated on the niches, which are carved on a smaller, more human scale. The result is a fundamental change in the orientation of the two complexes. The first is directed against the rock or toward the earth. This change is reflected at the level of action as well as at the site of contemplation. In the first phase, as seen from above, the rock appears as a giant sculpture of the earth, a sort of “sculptarchitecture” (Paternosto 1996: 60–61 and passim), so the whole rock looks like a single great temple reminiscent of other architectonic examples such as Malinalco in Mexico or Petra in Jordan.

The second ritual complex is oriented in another direction, no longer toward the earth but rather toward the horizon or even the sky. In some sense, it cuts off the vision to the earth, which is now covered by temples and galleries. Within these galleries, figurines, mummies, or other venerable things might have been displayed. Like the stones of the galleries, they represent transportable elements. The whole cult in the later phase appears to be one of portable things. Even the ancestors are transportable in the form of mummies and the Sun in the form of statues. Of course, mythology is transferable and can be symbolized in the form of the various groups of four double-jambed niches or little “windows,” which appear on several parts of the rock. These appear to have symbolized the Inka origin myth of the four Ayar brothers and sisters.

The ritual system underlying these architectural elements does not seem to be concerned with, or respectful of, the static earth elements. On the contrary, it appears as a system of power, of subordination, and even of disdain. Some of the symbols of the previous ritual system can be imagined not just as ceasing to function, but as having disappeared. Several of the basins, for example, had been filled with sand so as not to disturb the new religious system in its symmetry and presentation to the subjugated people. This ritual perspective, cut off from the earth and directed to the horizon and to the peaks of the mountains, was reinforced, transforming the former platform steps into pillars that could serve as visual lines (ceques) that delineate the landscape to the horizon and even the sky, as a way of establishing possession. This is the view of a conquest society. It transforms the religious symbols and places of the conquered society into transportable state-owned goods applicable and redistributable to dissimilar conquered societies throughout the Andes.

My interpretation of this conjunction of elements is not that of an integration, as has been commonly suggested by those relying on written sources, but that of a clear superposition, with demonstrable public effects like the introduction of new transportable symbols to replace the existing chthonic elements. In the same way, the increasingly studied artificial
altars (ushnus), sometimes built around or on top of a natural rock outcrop, can be seen not only as symbols of power and conquest but also as the incorporation of military and ritual elements into the complex of state religion. They can be observed especially on the periphery of the entire empire from Ruminico to the north of Quito (Almeida 1984) through La Fortaleza, some 60 km east of Samaipata (Meyers and Ulbert 1998a), through El Shincal in Argentina (Raffino et al. 1998), and south of modern Santiago de Chile (Stehberg 1995).

Several consequences result from these considerations. Assuming that the two systems are manifestations of the same Inkaic culture, we calculate that a considerable amount of time would be necessary for the change from the one to the other. The history of religion tells us that in archaic societies, no religious system changes from one day to another. Myths, like the dream of a founder of a religion who claims to have received his orders from god (“sunturwasi legend”), can be interpreted as phenomena of etiology, that is to say, an explanation “ex post facto.” Generally, they serve to legitimize a new cult created by the new state elite or its leader.

A search for archaeological explanations of these changes will hardly find local or closely related comparative elements, even in the eastern Bolivian Andes. One has to extend the area of research past Lake Titicaca to the Cusco Valley, as did other students of the carved rock of Samaipata, such as Nordenskiöld and Uhle (1910) early in the twentieth century. There is no doubt that the biggest concentration of elements of both religious systems exists in Cusco and its neighboring regions (Hemming and Ranney 1990). Considering this as the core region for the development of the Inka style, one should also assume a more or less “organic transition” from one system to the other. Again, here we are concerned with methodological problems and those of the presentation and interpretation of concrete and comparable data from Cusco.

Beginning with the most important transportable material, ceramics, we have to deal with the old and well-known “Killke problem,” which has been treated in a rather dogmatic way since its first definition more than sixty years ago (Rowe 1944). This problem can only be resolved by more concrete archaeological work. It has been stated repeatedly that Killke ceramic production persisted through the Inka period (e.g., Lunt 1988: 494, 498) and there seems to be evidence of various contemporaneous “Killke-related” styles in the same region (Bauer 1992b; Rivera Dorado 1977). However, the problem in considering these new archaeological data is that the authors’ interpretations are guided too much by historical preconception. Sometimes, a separate archaeological argument is promised and in the final discussion questionable historic data again are taken into consideration. However, one of the results in the field of chronology
is the modification of the “master-sequence” expanding the Inka to a period starting from 1400 AD (Bauer 1992a).

We also have various hints of the superposition of construction phases and probably construction styles, as has been argued even for Machu Picchu (Kendall 1988: 474). A very serious problem, however, is represented by the mass of carved rocks and their association with standing architecture. It is difficult to establish a method to identify sequences or even modifications in these cases. But if we depart from the stark vision of a single, short phase of construction and distribution of Inka elements in the Cusco region, we become aware of the sequential processes that can be presumed for sites like Sacahuaman, Ollantaytambo, Vilcashuaman, and, of course, Machu Picchu. For the Andean flanks east of Cusco, we have documented several examples of boulders enclosed by walls, which are comparable to Samaipata (Fejos 1944).

HYPOTHESIS 2: MANIFESTATIONS OF TWO CULTURE COMPLEXES: INKA AND PRE-INKA
A second and alternative explanation would ascribe the rock carvings to two cultures: 1) the Inka and 2) pre-Inkaic cultures, whose origin could be the local Andean culture or even that of the eastern lowlands. Evidence of cult stones from the latter regions exists, especially in or near the rivers (Riester 1981). The presence of lowland ceramics at Samaipata (figs. 12, 21) demonstrates that the site might have been attractive to people from the “Oriente” or eastern lowlands. Among the authors who postulate a pre-Inkaic origin for Samaipata (Rivera Sundt 1979: 108), however, aside from the mention of the mythic importance of animals such as the jaguar and the boa constrictor (e.g., Pucher 1945), there have been no concrete elements to confirm such views. Nevertheless, the region of Moxos will have to be taken into account in future studies of this kind. The eastern Bolivian valley region was also a considerable source of the late ceramics recovered at Samaipata, but these have been too little studied to make serious comparisons.

So again we return to the nuclear region of the development of the Inka style. The stepped stones of Rodadero Hill in Cusco, the so-called Throne of the Inka from Intincala, Copacabana, Lake Titicaca (Paternosto 1996: 98, 99), and the stepped structures of the carved rock of Samaipata have a common stylistic and probably a common religious background. However, there seems to exist a closer relationship to the stepped stone carvings of the Pumapunku complex in Tiwanaku than to what has been specified as Inka architecture until now. Also, similar structures in Cusco,
Sacsahuaman, Ollantaytambo, and even the stepped stone of Machu Picchu and other elements in that area show this same pattern. To draw the conclusion that we have to concern ourselves with the Tiwanaku complex would not only be premature, but also inadequate. In the more or less 3000 m² excavated in Samaipata, we did not find a single ceramic sherd of the classic Tiwanaku style.

In any case, our understanding of the Tiwanaku culture complex in terms of the architecture as well as the ceramics suffers from the same general problems as in the Inka case. For example, we still do not have a convincing subdivision of the Tiwanaku style, which is supposed to have lasted more than a millennium in the altiplano, nor a definition of its patterns of expansion. What we can assume is that in the Cusco to Titicaca region there was a “creative climate” to forge a mixture of Wari and Tiwanaku styles that resulted in a new stylistic concept. It is my opinion that future studies of Inka origin that concentrate on the stylistic lines from these cultural complexes to the Imperial Inka style, via possible mediator styles, such as Churajón (Szykulski n.d.) and Mollo (fig. 22), will be very promising.

HYPOTHESIS 3: THREE OR MORE PHASES OF ROCK CARVINGS
A third explanation derives from the evidence of at least three phases of origin and use of the sacred complex of Samaipata. Given the fact that the veneration of rocks and working of stones is an old phenomenon in South America, beginning with Chavín, including San Agustín in Colombia, and ending with various cultural manifestations even in the lowland areas, one could conclude that the huge boulder of Samaipata could have played a role as a sacred hill (loma santa) since remote times (Riester 1976). However, at this moment we lack specific evidence for early rock carving, although we have found Formative-period ceramics, probably of lowland origin, in the excavations at Samaipata.

The second phase would be represented by the steps, seats, and similar carvings. Its most important characteristic would be the conversion of the rock into a giant “archisculpture.” Whether we call it early Inka or pre-Inka is a question of definition of what is Inka in the core area. The third phase would include the niched elements, especially the niched temples and galleries, the libation canals, and probably also the cavity similar to those of Cochasquí. The Inka use of the rock seems to correspond to the two construction phases defined for the standing stone architecture in the excavations. Finally, we could add a fourth phase, which consists of the reutilization of the Inka houses after their destruction by the Chiriguanos.

FIG. 22 Mollo-style ceramic vessel combining late Andean and eastern elements (Museo de Metales Preciosos, Colección Fritz Buck, La Paz)
and/or the Spaniards, and also the offerings of ceramics and seeds found in the niched galleries that date from the time of the Spanish Viceroyalty.

Toward a Reconceptualization of the Late Horizon and Inka Periods

The problems with the so-called “master-sequence” established for the Ica Valley by John Howland Rowe, when applied in the broader context of Peruvian archaeology, have already been alluded to in this chapter. But, given the lack of a convincing alternative to this chronological framework, it seems reasonable to modify the existing model rather than to reject it. In the south central Andes, especially in northern Chile and in Bolivia, there has been a tendency to adopt this framework, at least when referring to the Late Intermediate period and the Late Horizon.

The most important criterion for its application in these regions seems to be the existence of a Middle Horizon, here represented by the Tiwanaku style. As Tiwanaku is believed to have lasted longer than Wari, the period between the Middle and Late Horizon would be reduced considerably. The situation becomes more complicated if we consider two other horizon styles mentioned in the literature, the Horizonte Tricolor del Sur (Ibarra and Querejazu 1986) and the so-called Black-on-Red Horizon (e.g., Pärssinen and Siiriäinen 1997: 265). The first of these styles developed earlier than Tiwanaku and points to an independent formative cultural development in the southeastern Bolivian and the northwestern Argentinian Andes. The second style is a post-Tiwanaku phenomenon, which belongs to the complex out of which the Imperial Inka style must have originated. However, it must be clear that the application of the “master-sequence” in Bolivia only makes sense in terms of a mere periodization scheme that subsumes the different stages and periods of development in that geographical area. The start of the Late Horizon (LH) is understood not as the beginning of the military expansion, but as the spread of Inka cultural material throughout the later empire.

The problem of defining the Late Horizon in the core area is that we are still ignoring the origin of the Inka style—in cultural, temporal, and geographical terms. Until now, as has been stated, almost all scholars have searched for the origin of Inka culture in the Cusco region. Even though we have two Inka origin myths, archaeologists as well as ethnohistorians take into consideration only the “Paqaritambo version.” No archaeologist until now has seriously examined the “Titicaca version” and considered possible Inka precursor styles in that area. Stylistically, in the same way Killke or Killke-related styles are called Early Inka, one could postulate that the late circum-Titicaca styles belonged to an early Inka ceramic complex. The “advantage” of Killke, of course, is its geographical closeness to the later Inka capital. But no clear transition from Killke to Cusco Inka and its expansion from Cusco to the Lake Titicaca area has been proven.
So there is still room for arguments for the development of Inka style in the Lake Titicaca area and its expansion to the Cusco Valley. Similarly, one could look for other foci in the “Inka core area.”

My conclusions based on these considerations imply a two-phase vision of the development of Inka culture:

1) As discussed, I refer to the last two Pre-Hispanic cultural manifestations as Inka I and Inka II. Inka I is a cultural complex distributed throughout the core area and characterized by common cultural patterns inherited from the preceding Wari/Tiwanaku culture horizon. While there may not have been political unification, the cultural expressions demonstrate great similarity as exemplified by the stepped rock carvings, pottery with similar shapes and decorative patterns, and probably also a common domestic architecture. Inka II is a highly standardized cultural pattern that, up to now, is evidenced mainly in the public sphere, particularly in architecture, and in the other fancy art styles subsumed under the denomination of Imperial Inka.

While the appearance of Inka I is rather rural and noncentralized, devoting attention to the protection of the agricultural fields against bellicose neighbors, the Inka II complex is that of an organization with a highly developed public culture and technology and perhaps a stronger degree of political unity. Judging by the lack of Imperial Inka fortresses in the core area, one can assume that the process of state formation had been finished.

2) This leads us to the temporal question. I calculated a time span of 200 years for the Inka I period beginning in 1100 AD, the estimated date of the collapse of the center of Tiwanaku. As the Wari influence in Cusco is thought to have ceased about 200 years earlier, a middle date of 1000 AD for the beginning of the Late Intermediate period for the whole area could be acceptable (table 1). In the absence of reliable historical data for the military expansion of the empire during the Late Horizon, I correlate its beginning with the expansion of Inka Imperial style through military expansion, trade, or other exchanges. The problem lies in the definition of the area from which the expansion begins. In our case, where we assume a very large core area, we have to estimate a considerable time for the distribution of the style from one or multiple manufacturing centers and for the consolidation of the Horizon style in the entire area. This process would

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Chronology of the Late Horizon (LH), the Late Intermediate period (LIP) and the Inka periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1550 AD–1600 AD:</td>
<td>Inka IIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 AD–1550 AD:</td>
<td>Inka IIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 AD–1400 AD:</td>
<td>Inka IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 AD–1300 AD:</td>
<td>Inka I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
represent the first phase of Late Horizon (LH 1) for which I calculate 100 years. Recent radiocarbon dates from sites at the periphery of the core area, that is to say, northern Chile, northwest Argentina, and Bolivia (altiplano and eastern slopes) (Adamska and Michczynski 1996) suggest that by about 1400 AD the Imperial Inka style had already spread beyond the frontiers of the core area. We accept this date for the beginning of LH 2, which does not end with the conquest by the Spanish but, depending on the remoteness of the area, probably some decades later. In some areas, as is well known and documented, the Imperial Inka style survived for a considerable time after the Spanish Conquest, integrating some Inka forms and decorative elements with certain techniques of the conquest culture. Consequently, it seems suitable to define a third phase (LH 3), which would last from approximately 1550 to 1600 AD.

In summary, we have a 300-year span for the Imperial Inka style, which, in comparison with the earlier elaborate art styles prior to the Inkas, is not very long. Of course, the styles’ further development was brutally interrupted by the Conquest, but there is reason to believe that there was considerable time for the “maturing” of such a style. It was these and similar considerations that led me to reject the “short version” of Inka chronology more than thirty years ago (Meyers 1975). The recently presented C 14 measurements shed new light on the question, but have to be considered from a methodological perspective. It is my hope that future excavations in the Cusco and Titicaca areas, as well as on the periphery, will deliver stratigraphic and other evidence to provide a more differentiated picture of the development of the Inka style and its various manifestations through time and space.

Conclusions
In this essay, I have considered the methodological problems of handling the data with which Inka archaeology is concerned. It was my intention, perhaps a bit exaggerated in some places, to discuss and object to some preconceptions and scholarly traditions that have advanced our knowledge in some fields of study, but have been an obstacle to creativity and the development of alternative interpretations in others. In the case study of Cochasqui, I presented a different vision of the Inka domination in that northern periphery, one that was more intensive than generally presumed. In Samaipata, I identified two cultural-religious complexes, whose interpretation throws new light on the Inka culture in the core area. Many scholars will disagree with my denomination of the earlier phase as Inka I; this chronological framework is presented nonetheless in order to stimulate discussion and future studies. Its applicability and possible modification must be tested empirically. I am aware that the last word in this matter has not yet been spoken.
Notes

1 This essay is an attempt to combine some results of recent research projects with observations on the state of Inka archaeology dating back as far as the early seventies. Not all of the arguments are accompanied by citations from the literature, especially when there is agreement among most of the scholars. I am very grateful to Kerstin Nowack for the correction of the English text of an earlier version and for her detailed comments, although we disagreed on many of the points under discussion. I also thank the students of a seminar on Inka culture, held in 1996/97 at Bonn University, for their comments and collaboration. Finally, I would like to thank Joanne Pillsbury for her encouragement, and especially Grace Morsberger for her patience and great ability in editing the final version. Rolando Marulanda and Iken Paap kindly assisted in preparing the map of the carved rock (fig. 14) for publication. Of course, all shortcomings fall under my responsibility. Only minor changes to the original text and updates to the bibliography have been made.

2 The same has been demonstrated for Cayash, Central Peru (Krzanowski and Tunia 1986). This report is one of the best discussions of Inka influence on local ceramics written.

3 As a precondition for my doctoral dissertation on the Inka style in Ecuador in the seventies (Meyers 1976 [1998a]), I had to reconsider the existing classifications of Inka ceramics, mainly from Bingham (1915, 1930), Pardo (1938, 1939), and Rowe (1944). As I published the reasons for my new classification many years ago in Spanish (Meyers 1975), I will simply state here that I relied strictly on material coming from so-called “closed contexts,” applying form and quantity as my method of analysis. The fourteen main shapes (leitformen) were organized into seven form classes, based mainly on the Sacahuaman material (V alcárcel 1934–1935; Valencia 1970), the grave goods from Machu Picchu (Bingham 1915, 1930; Eaton 1916), and, to a minor extent, from Ollantaytambo (Llanos 1936). A similar classification of the decoration and rim profiles of materials from secure Cusco Inka contexts, excluding all possibilities of an earlier or later intrusion, is still a desideratum.

4 The “Proyecto de Investigaciones Arqueológicas en Samaipata” (PIAS) was carried out with the permission of and in coordination with the Instituto Nacional de Arqueología (INAR), La Paz. I am very grateful for the support of its directors, Oswaldo Rivera and Juan Albaracín-Jordán. I also thank Omar Claure, Willy Pantoja, Javier Gonzales, and María de los Angeles Muñoz, who acted as codirectors during the field campaigns. The project was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), Bonn and by minor grants. Thanks also to VARIG-Airlines for their assistance in resolving transportation problems.
5 Also here we have the intention of dating via historical deduction (e.g., when Machu Picchu is attributed to the epoch of Pachakuti). While I am not completely opposed to the method of identifying architectural structures as belonging to certain Inka lords at the time of the Spanish Conquest, this method can be a supplement to the main task of identifying architectural styles and differences.

6 I am convinced that Machu Picchu has a long occupation history, starting from pre-Inka times, comparable to the situation we found at Samaipata.
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