
TOPICAL REVIEW

CURRENT RESEARCH AND PROSPECTS IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

John V. Murra, Cornell University

IN RECENT YEARS ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY HAS BENEFITTED FROM FOUR new developments:

First, is the greater accessibility of the classical chronicles, particularly since the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles in Madrid decided in 1956 to re-print Bernabé Cobo's *Historia del Nuevo Mundo* which had gone out of print decades before. The BAE has since reprinted at reasonable prices many other titles, among them the indispensable *Relaciones geográficas de Indias*. Anyone who had tried to study pre-European Andean institutions in the libraries at Cuzco, Cuenca or Sucre even ten years ago knows how difficult it was then to check any claim or hypothesis at the source. Students were forced to use third-hand and incomplete references; many others in the Andes were discouraged from pursuing such studies because of the unavailability of the eye-witness or other early accounts.

The publication efforts in Madrid had parallels elsewhere. The quadricentenary of the University of San Marcos in 1951 was the occasion for re-printing the three earliest Quechua dictionaries. The very first, Domingo de Santo Tomás' *Vocabulario* (1560) was accompanied by the earliest grammar. The Bolivian revolution of 1952 created the intellectual context for a photostatic reprint of Bertonio's Aymara dictionary, under the auspices of the new Ministerio de Asuntos Campesinos. Luis E. Valcárcel, author of the first book to be called *Etnohistoria del Perú antiguo*, prepared an edition of the previously almost unknown Cabello Valboa (1586). More recently and in a single year, 1967, three important titles became widely available: Guillermo Lohmann Villena's first complete version of Matienzo's *Gobierno del Perú* (1567), published by the Institut Français d'Etudes Andines; Carlos Aranibar's edition of Cieza's *Señorio de los Incas*, sponsored by the Instituto de Estudios Peru-

anos, and Pierre Duviols' success in obtaining permission in Quito to print Cristobal de Albornoz's *Instrucción para descubrir todas las guacas del Piru y sus camayos . . .*, previously known only through hearsay. All three of them will be widely quoted in years to come.

Compared to 1950, let us say, the inventory of sources available in 1970 is incomparably fuller. One need no longer be near a first-class library to study the Incas. Scholars, particularly those in the Andean republics, have now much easier access to the texts they need. While some recent editions were reprinted without rechecking the originals in the archives or omitting the search for a better copy of a lost original,¹ most of the titles mentioned above did benefit from good editing and/or facsimile reproduction.

Second, since Means' original catalog of chroniclers in *Biblioteca Andina* (1928), scholars have done considerable work on the antecedents, the personalities and the intellectual context in which the early European writers had conducted their work. Their classification by Means into "Garcilasan" and "Toledan" schools is now seen as too simple, though one should not refrain from using the Biblioteca for that reason. The debate over a slow vs. a rapid expansion of Tawantinsuyu, the Inca state, implicit in Means' polarization of sources, is not yet spent.² One should note, however, that Baudin's chronological and occupational approach in classifying the chroniclers (1928), as elaborated by Porras (1937, 1945–54, 1962) and his students, is the prevailing one.

The biographies of a few of the chroniclers have attracted the enthusiasm of historians and a great deal has been learned about the conditions in which they did their work, the amount of first-hand experience they had had in the Andes, the public they had in mind while writing, and how they copied each other.

The model for the biographies has been the revelations of the last half century about Bartolomé de Las Casas.³ In the Andean region these have been matched through the discoveries and insights about Garcilaso de la Vega, "El Inca." Porras (1946, 1955, 1962) and José Durand (1948, 1956, 1961) have concentrated on the forty years Garcilaso spent in Andalucía before the publication of the *Comentarios Reales*. They have documented his reading habits, what happened during "the lost years" in Montilla, the extent of his participation in putting down the rebellion of the Alpujarras, his sources of income, his alleged contacts with Cuzco after 1560. While no other Andean chronicler has been the subject of such systematic and devoted search by trained people, the recent efforts of Maticorena (1955) and Aranibar (1967) on behalf of Cieza de León are in the same tradition.

More broadly historical is the approach of Lohmann Villena in a long essay printed as a prologue to the already mentioned edition of Matienzo.⁴ It

introduces us not only to the life of the senior *oidor* of the Audiencia de los Charcas and his influential work, but it also celebrates the importance in Andean historiography of the fourth decade since the European invasion, the 1560's. According to Lohmann this was a period of self-searching and debate both in the Andes and in the peninsula about the emerging colonial institutions as well as the nature of the pre-Pizarro past. By the 1560's the early churchmen and *encomenderos* were growing old. Las Casas was in his nineties and would soon be dead; *criollos* and *mestizos* were no longer individual cases but new social and cultural categories; even the viceroys and governors sent temporarily from Valladolid would soon discover that the new world ruled by the Audiencia de los Reyes was no longer Indian country, nor was it like Spain. But what was it and what should it be? In the 1560's many tried to answer.

Superficially the debate dealt with such matters as the *perpetuidad* of the *encomienda* system, but Lohmann shows that much more was at stake. His essay on Matienzo gives us the best account available so far of the European view of and anxieties about what was happening in the 1560's and 1570's in the Andes. Read in conjunction with the viceroys' correspondence published by Levillier in *Gobernantes del Perú*, it sets a model of what can someday be done to recapture the opposite, the Andean reaction to and perception of events during the same period.⁵

Another characteristic of recent work by historians is the necessary job of systematically tracing who copied what and from whom. "Correspondences" and *concordancias* have long been noted between the chroniclers, but only in recent years has it become important to verify how much Cobo had borrowed from Polo or Pedro Pizarro; we are urged to stop quoting Román or Murúa as if they were primary sources.⁶ The most revealing and ethnologically profitable of these comparisons involves four shorter texts frequently cited as independent sources: the 1557 report from Huamanga by Damián de la Bandera; the 1558 description of Chíncha, one of the very few accounts of coastal settlements available to us; Santillán's *Relación* of 1563, and the anonymous *Relación del origen e gobierno que los Ingas tuvieron . . . declaradas por señores que sirvieron al Inga Yupangui. . .* Several historians, apparently independently, have shown that the parallels between these documents make it highly unlikely that they were written without some of them consulting the others.⁷ Here again a new standard for confrontation between our sources has been set in recent years. As Aranibar has indicated:

Es necesario convertir la trivial lectura de los relatos cronísticos en pesquisa severa y rigurosa; y sólo por el análisis pertinaz de las fuentes primarias, cabrá reemplazar aquellos anacrónicos modos de la elección arbitraria de las "citas" y de la acumulación indiscriminada de testimonios de valor discutible . . . Una jerarquía de fuentes,

siquiera por líneas importantes, facilitaría la consulta de las crónicas por los demás estudiosos y evitaría que tan morosa tarea tuviese que hacerla cada uno cada vez. . . (1963: 135, 129).

Third, while the first two of these new developments have been due primarily to contributions by historians, the latter two are more likely to be made by ethnologists.

No matter how widely the classic sources become available or how carefully the chroniclers' aims, biases or borrowings are ascertained, early in one's study of Andean ethnohistory one notes that in recent decades we have made few discoveries of important new or unknown historical sources. One would have to go back to 1936, to the Paris facsimile edition of Huaman Poma's 1,200-page "letter" to the king of Spain, to obtain some basic information about Andean institutions available nowhere else.

While we ought not abandon the hope that somewhere, somehow a lost chronicle may still turn up, we need to introduce a new set of questions and a new point of view to supplement and expand the available sources.⁸ A great deal can be learned by turning our inquiry away from what the XVI century considered printable and away, at least temporarily, from "Inca history" toward sources reflecting those enduring Andean institutions which long preceded the Inca conquest and which not even the European invasion could dislodge. Andean ecology, Andean crops, Andean ways of handling altitude or water, Andean recognition of what could be a resource: all these durably Andean things need ethnohistoric study. Given the anthropologists' local community and cross-cultural interests, their approach to ethnohistory has a distinct focus and starts from different premises.

The most significant step taken in this direction was the discovery and publication by Hermann Trimborn, in 1939, of the first book-length Andean document, written in an Andean language.⁹ Some thirty tales and legends, collected between 1598 and 1608, in Huarochirí, in the highlands above Lima, were saved from oblivion through the missionary zeal of Francisco de Avila, a Cuzco-born priest, stationed in the region just before the *extirpación de idolatrías* campaign of 1610. Trimborn's discovery was not only a major new title but a new kind of source which was not a chronicle. In 1939 it had no precedent in Andean bibliography and it still has no peer today as a linguistic, literary and ethnological document. For the first time we have access to Andean oral tradition, expressing Andean values and priorities, in an Andean idiom.¹⁰

Although thirty years have passed since Trimborn first offered us this text and it has since been translated into German, Latin and recently into Spanish,¹¹ this major source did not receive the attention it deserved from the scholarly community. One can speculate about the many reasons why this is so, but one of them is unmistakable: the unavailability of the book in Andean centers

of learning where many could read the original and appreciate its novelty in both language and ethnographic content. One should mention that the original Trimborn edition was mostly destroyed during the war. The second edition, by Galante (1942), although providing us with a facsimile of the manuscript, was accompanied only by a Latin translation and is very rare in the libraries of the Andean republics. The third and fourth editions, which made the tales widely readable, had to wait until 1967.

The Huarochirí stories reach deep into the Andean cultural substratum. Even the Inca are marginal and ephemeral to its basic themes: the origins of and the battles between the local gods, the supernatural excavation of an irrigation system, the competitions between lineages in ceremonial contexts, the meanings of mountain and valley in Andean ethno-ecology. While these tales and their ethnographic substance cannot be made to stand for the Andes as a whole, by reaching a deeper vein in this one locality they show us what can still be learned if we ask new questions and look for new kinds of sources. The recent flurry of interest in these legends should expand, hopefully, to include a systematic search for further and different XVI century folkloric and literary materials in the Andean languages.¹²

Fourth, similar to the Huarochirí texts in their local orientation and ethnologic importance, but very different in substance, are the *visitas*, painstaking accounts of administrative inspections conducted by the colonial authorities in the first forty to fifty years of European rule.¹³ In the opening paragraph I mentioned the new availability of Jiménez de la Espada's *Relaciones geográficas de Indias*, a compilation of such responses, usually 8 to 10 pages in length, most of them dating from the 1580's. While some deal with regions on which we have no other information, many of the answers are perfunctory.

Inquiring about earlier *visitas* when the information would be fresher and the societies described still functioning, one discovers that some questionnaires were circulated as early as the first decade of European rule and were ordered by Francisco Pizarro as part of the initial settlement, if not reconnaissance, of the country.¹⁴ At a somewhat later stage, after the end of the civil wars led by Gonzalo Pizarro but still only 17 years from the disaster at Caxamarca, Governor La Gasca organized the first *visita general* of the whole Andean area. Seventy-two inspectors or *visitadores*, co-ordinated by the first *quechúlogo*, Domingo de Santo Tomás, fanned out across the country to find out who had survived to 1549. They were instructed to ascertain how many ethnic groups there were in each valley, the size of the population, what crops were grown, what the inhabitants had "owed" to the state in Inca times and what they were "paying" now to their encomenderos. The inquiry was not to stop at interviews with the local ethnic lords but was supposed to include a census and a survey in the field, village-by-village.

We owe the first publication of a fragment of this survey to Mlle Marie

Helmer (1955–56).¹⁵ Besides providing very early demographic data,¹⁶ the text gives excellent information about the “vertical” control of diverse ecologies by a relatively small ethnic group, the distribution of crafts, the decimal system, and our first, if not necessarily accurate, list of what one local group, the Chupaychu, were expected to do as part of their obligations to the Inca state. Amazingly, this discovery that not all the 72 potential reports were lost has not encouraged researchers to hunt for traces of the other 71.

Many other *visitas* were undertaken after 1549. When the Marqués de Cañete was viceroy, several such inquiries were encouraged: two of them, which are very useful, have been mentioned above.¹⁷ In 1559 while in Ghent, Phillip II approved still another questionnaire which was meant to be used not only in the Andes but throughout the Americas. It contained a new feature: in addition to the interviews with the ethnic leaders and the town-by-town survey, the *visitador* was now instructed to undertake an even more detailed house-to-house inquiry. The partial results of one such inspection, that of the Chupaychu and Yacha in what today is Huánuco, are available to us.¹⁸ Since some of this area, inspected in 1562 by Iñigo Ortiz de Zúñiga, corresponds to one already surveyed in the *visita general* of 1549 and since some of the informants were the same in both *visitas*, we can learn a good deal about Andean culture in one small, provincial corner of the territory.¹⁹ While some of this material only confirms or clarifies what we knew already from the chroniclers, a lot of it is completely new, reflecting the regional, peasant perspective of the respondents. A similar house-to-house survey in the coca-leaf growing country around Songo, in Bolivia, remains unpublished.²⁰

Virtually all students of Andean ethnohistory agree that Francisco de Toledo’s term as viceroy (1569–81) marks a major break in the region’s historiography. The best informants, those who had functioned as adults in Tawantinsuyu society before the European invasion in 1532, were old men when Toledo arrived. By the time he left most of them were dead. The same applies to the Europeans who knew the country and its people best: those who had to understand the Andean systems at the local level well enough to survive and recruit adherents during the civil wars of the 1540’s, those who took seriously their job as catechists and thus learned the language to hear confessions, those who had married women from a royal Cuzco lineage soon enough after 1532 for such a marriage to still count as upward mobility, those who had figured out the lineage principle well enough to track down hidden royal mummies, and those who put together the first dictionaries. The best of these, Domingo de Santo Tomás and Juan Polo de Ondegardo, were both dead by 1576.

The *visita general* ordered by Toledo in 1571²¹ is in this sense a bridge between two epochs. On the one hand it was the closing chapter, the balance sheet of what Andean ethnic groups survived after forty years of European

rule. On the other, the *visita general* was the starting point of new and drastic tampering with Andean reality. Earlier viceroys may have talked about abolishing prevailing settlement patterns and concentrating the population where it would be easier to control and convert, but Toledo was the first to do something about it. He used the *visita* as the first step in a violent campaign of *reducciones*. Despite the resistance of many Andean groups and their efforts to bribe royal officials in an effort to prevent deportation, thousands of villages were uprooted and brought down into the valleys. Ethnic borders were ignored, Andean political units split, and the authority of ethnic lords and of regional deities eroded²² and eventually destroyed. Even more important, the patterns of vertical ecologic control were ignored, thus reducing the resources available and permanently impoverishing the Andean economy. The starting point and validating document of this cataclysm, the *visita general*, so far is known to us only from fragments and summaries.²³

One of these fragments²⁴ assumes greater importance because it deals with the Lupaqa, an Aymara-speaking kingdom on Lake Titicaca, whose social organization had already been surveyed in some detail seven years earlier, in 1567. As in the Chupaychu case, the Lupaqa data can be verified and supplemented by comparing the two reports.²⁵ As a result we find out more about the functions of lineages, moieties and dual authority in the Andes than from any chronicle. The moiety had political functions: two kings, one for the upper and another for the lower moiety ruled all the Lupaqa. Each of the seven subdivisions also had two lords. Moieties controlled lands, "granted" retainers, and held llama and alpaca herds. No other source gives us such quantitative or functional data about the *yana* retainers.²⁶ The *visitador* spent time inquiring how many *yana* there were and what they did, since the Europeans wanted to "free" them to make them liable to tribute for the Spanish crown from which they had been exempted as members of their lords' households.

Now that we have several consecutive *visitas* for each of two Andean ethnic groups, we can compare and extrapolate from them in new ways. The Chupaychu spoke Quechua and the core of their territory was in maize country; the Lupaqa spoke Aymara and their core was planted with Andean tubers and grazed by vast herds. The first were a relatively small group, with some 3 to 4,000 households; the latter was much larger, with 20,000 hearths. Both groups perceived the Andean environment in "vertical" terms.²⁷ Both attempted to control a maximum of ecologic "floors" or "islands" away from the core area. However, the Chupaychu were limited to colonies that were within three or four days' walking, above or below the core, while the Lupaqa were numerous enough to maintain outliers 15 and 20 days away from Chucuito, in oases on the desert Pacific shore and in the Bolivian forest.²⁸ While we have all warned for years that the chroniclers' composite picture of Ta-

wantinsuyu did not take into account a good deal of local variation, it is only since the availability of the *visitas* that we can begin to spell out what the range of economies and social organizations may have actually been. The systematic search for *visitas* in both European and Andean archives is a major task before us.²⁹

ETHNOHISTORY AS COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE TWO DISCIPLINES.

I have already noted that these four developments are the result of contributions by both historians and anthropologists. The first have been more active in bringing out new editions of the classics and ferreting out life histories and intellectual backgrounds. They have also verified which were the primary sources. The anthropologists have spent more time finding, editing and analyzing Quechua texts and regional *visitas*. Independently of each other, both have attempted to understand the institutional patterns before and after the European invasion. The cumulative effect of these efforts is likely to become even more important as historians and anthropologists shift from parallel endeavor to active collaboration.

To begin, I would suggest one area where joint effort may prove profitable to the two disciples.³⁰ A major source of data both on Andean social organization and on the emergent colonial institutions are the records of land litigation in the XVI century. It was in the many pages of such a dispute that Mlle Helmer found the Chupaychu report, part of the earliest *visita* general. The suit was instituted by the widow of Francisco Martín de Alcántara, half-brother of the Pizarros, against Gómez Arias de Avila, an *encomendero* favored by La Gasca (Ortiz de Zúñiga [1562], 1967: 271). To prove her case, the widow introduced as evidence transcripts of documents going back to Pizarro's days as well as the protocol of the *visita*, which is but a fragment of the proceedings. Most of the document deals with events in the Huallaga valley in the first twenty years of the colonial regime. When the time comes to write the social and economic history of provincial European settlement in the Andes away from the palaces of the viceroys and the archbishops, the records of land litigation are likely to turn out to be first-class sources for the historian.

Another court case from the same period involves, at least on the surface, two groups of Andean villages.³¹ The issue at stake was an attempt by one of them to refuse to repair and man a bridge on the main road from Cuzco to Quito. The record of this dispute, kept by a Quechua-speaking colonial inspector sent out from Huánuco by the court in Lima, reflects the changes in the functions of bridges and roads once Tawantinsuyu had been destroyed.³² But to do his job the inspector also found it necessary to compare the Inca installation to 31 other bridges in the area, all of which he measured and in-

spected in person, accompanied by delegations of litigants.³³ The functional view of how local ethnic groups built and maintained such public works cannot be studied in as much detail in any chronicle.

The major contribution to Inca studies which I expect from litigation records is in the analysis of how rights in land were exercised, part of my effort to understand Andean land tenure. In 1956 I argued that the chroniclers' classification of Tawantinsuyu lands into peasant holdings and those of the kings and the sun was too simple.³⁴ I suggested then eight ways of gaining access to land which might well increase to 15 or 20 ways as research proceeds. Also, there is no reason to assume that these patterns of land tenure were uniform throughout Tawantinsuyu. They must clearly have been different on the irrigated North Coast³⁵ as contrasted with those of the Chupaychu maize growers or the Lupaqa potato eaters and alpaca herders. The *visitas* do provide some information, but the respondents are so aware of the threat to their resources implicit in the inquiry that their words are guarded and the information sketchy. In the litigation records, the adversary procedure of the courts makes it more likely that functional details about rights in land will be revealed.³⁶

As an example of the almost ethnographic thoroughness of the data, let me cite some evidence from our own fieldwork in Huanuco, 1963–65. One village on the upper Marañón is in the possession of unpublished litigation records which reach from before the Incas to the 1820's. In the late XVI century the village sued its neighbors, alleging that the borders imposed on it by the Inca were unfair and asking the European courts in Lima to redress this grievance. In the centuries that followed, the village either undertook or was the object of court action against everyone of its neighbors. In the process, the borders of its territories were declared in minute detail and inspected in the field as part of the proceedings. Let us focus on only one feature of land tenure, "verticality," which we saw was important among both Chupaychu and Lupaqa. In the early XIX century, just before independence, the village had difficulty holding on to the maize producing outliers, almost two days' walk below the core area, which it had controlled since before the Inca. The courts in Lima accepted the claim and ruled in their favor. Ethnographic investigation by César Fonseca, a member of our team, showed that these lands were definitively lost by the village only within living memory; informants at both ends of the vertical claim could locate the acreage in dispute.³⁷

While the records of litigation between Europeans may find their way on appeal to the archives of Spain,³⁸ actions between Andean communities or the defense of one's fields against European encroachment are more likely to be located in the regional or national archives of the Andean republics. Their study and at least summary publication is of the highest priority in the study

both of pre-European institutions and the societies emerging after the European invasion.

INQUIRIES INTO ANDEAN SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The study of rights in land opens the door to other aspects of social and economic organization. Some of the most imaginative uses of the sources and some of the most telling of critiques have developed as researchers have tried to understand not the "Incas" in general but a particular activity or institutional pattern. I think this is the most promising approach in re-evaluating our sources. More importantly, it leads us to a search for new information since the questions anthropologists and historians ask today become harder and harder to answer from the European chronicles.

Space does not allow a full account of such investigations, so I will limit myself to colleagues active today in Inca and Andean studies.

Beyond his well-known *Handbook* article (1946), John H. Rowe has made major contributions to our understanding of Andean social and political organization through his study of Inca state religion (1960) and the age-grading system (1958) and by drawing the distinction between two kinds of Tawantinsuyu officials confused by the European sources (1946: 264, n. 19).³⁹ Rowe's ethnohistory combines a re-study of the familiar chronicles with full-time dedication to Andean archeology and a knowledge of Quechua. A forthcoming monograph analyzes the ceremonial organization of Cuzco in Inca times and includes a re-study of the ritual calendar (correcting one offered in 1946) and a reconstruction of how the royal *ayllu* were grouped.

On the historians' side, Carlos Aranibar has undertaken a study of Inca religion. His thesis, "Los sacrificios humanos entre los incas a través de los cronistas," is unfortunately still unavailable to the public but from personal communication and his 1963 and 1967 essays one gathers that the study of religion was an opportunity for the re-evaluation of our sources. He argues for a "criterio claro sobre la jerarquía y dependencia de las fuentes;" otherwise, he warns, one will find evidence in the chronicles "a cualquier bizarra hipótesis." At the present time he is preparing a new edition of the *Confesionario* of 1585.

Like other students of the Andes, María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco began by using the published materials in the chronicles (1953, 1962a), but in recent years she has moved her search to administrative records, clarifying the functions of ethnic lords on the North Coast (1961), the lands of the royals in the Cuzco area (1962b, 1963) and the elucidation of equivalences in the measurement of land in the various ecologies (1964). She is now preparing for publication two manuscripts. One deals with the valley of Chincha and supplements the earlier visita of 1558. This text mentions the existence in the

valley of "6,000 mercaderes" and raises again the problem of how extensive trade and markets were in Tawantinsuyu. The other starts from the record of land litigation over some coca-leaf fields on the western slope of the Andes but eventually raises the whole issue of coast-highland relations in pre-European times.

Udo Oberem has combined contemporary fieldwork in Ecuador with an active interest in ethnohistory. The fate of the local ethnic elite in the early years of European rule sheds light not only on post-1532 phenomena but also on the rights and privileges these lords enjoyed before the invasion (1967). These can be compared to the fate of the royal descendants of Atahualpa, who survived in the Quito area (1968a). Ample materials on these and other Andean topics exist in both local and Spanish archives dealing with Ecuador (1968b). Oberem has given special attention to the inhabitants of the forested areas, east of the Andes (1958, 1966–67).

Some thirty years ago, one of the most promising historians studying Andean social organization was Ella Dunbar Temple. She pioneered the documented study of royal descendants (1937–40) and traced the genealogy of post-1532 provincial ethnic lords (1943). Since then she has edited *Documenta*, a journal hospitable to inter-disciplinary approaches, and for many years now has taught Inca institutions at the University of San Marcos. A mimeographed *copy* of her course (1959) suggests that when it is developed for publication her ideas about the functions of such strategic groups in Tawantinsuyu as the *aqlla*, the *yana*,⁴⁰ or the *mitmaq* would be of great interest to her colleagues in both disciplines. Her collection of first-hand sources is one of the most extensive in private hands.

The most controversial of recent studies in Inca social organization has been R. T. Zuidema's *The Zeque System of Cuzco* (1964). Starting from Polo's listing of the ceremonial lines connecting shrines in the capital city, Zuidema elaborates a model of what the Inca elite had in mind when they correlated royal lineages with religious responsibilities and preferential marriage. An opaque work, written in a vocabulary which is not meant to facilitate the task of the reader insisting on ethnohistorical or functionalist terminology, Zuidema's book has been reviewed at length by two colleagues: one is the U. S. anthropologist Eugene Hammel (1965) who did not see much future for the approach, the other is a French historian, N. Wachtel (1966), interested in the structural study of high civilizations. Wachtel has the highest opinion of the work, even though he had to suggest a re-grouping of the book's chapters to clarify the argument. In recent years, Zuidema has shifted his work to field ethnology in the Rio Pampas area of Ayacucho, where he hopes to find enduring evidence of his models guiding behavior of contemporary populations (1968).

Stimulated by Zuidema's work on Inca marriage, Floyd G. Lounsbury un-

dertook an examination of the kinship terminology reported in the grammars and dictionaries of Quechua. In a paper read at the Barcelona session of the 1964 Americanist congress he argued that the XVI century Quechua system was one of parallel descent, where men descend from men, and women trace theirs through women. A later version will be presented in 1970 as part of this year's Lewis Henry Morgan lectures at the University of Rochester. Although Lounsbury's work is not yet published, the Barcelona version influenced a similar treatment of Aymara kinship by Freda Yancy Wolf.

Among the younger historians in this field, Waldemar Espinoza Soriano joined the staff of the Universidad Nacional del Centro in Huancayo after four years at the Archivo de Indias. Although trained as a historian, Espinoza has taken part in several joint research projects with anthropologists, such as José Matos Mar's study of the town of Pachacamac in the Lurin valley (1964) and the publication of the visita of the Lupaqa.⁴¹ In recent years Espinoza has published one of the earliest visitas available to us, the one for Caxamarca (1967a); also a somewhat later one from Huancayo (1963). His most recent publication (1967b) concerns one of the least known ethnic groups in the Andes, the Chachapuya, who lived on the slopes east of Caxamarca. Litigation in the 1570's over rights of succession to local lordship provides us with testimony about events and institutions in the region going back to well before the European invasion. For some time Espinoza has been preparing a major study of the location and prevalence of the *mitmaqkuna*, the colonists sent out from the core area to ecologic and political outliers. From his years at Seville, Espinoza has many more unpublished texts awaited by both historians and anthropologists.

While most of the recent work of another historian, Ake Wedin (1963, 1966), constitutes a re-examination of the sources and their credibility, one of his essays fits in the present institutional survey since it deals with the decimal system allegedly governing Inca administration (1965). Wedin argues that the system originally applied to the military and doubts if it were ever part of civil administration. It is a plausible suggestion for a debate on the nature of Inca government which could be important. The decimal "system" should be tested for functional fit with the age-grading and census procedures. Rowe's suggestion, made more than twenty years ago (1948), that the decimal system, along with other administrative features, was borrowed when the Inca incorporated the North Coast kingdom of Chimor, deserves attention, particularly when we note that there was no trace of the decimal system in the southern part of the highlands.⁴² Some interesting details of how villages and ethnic groups were fitted in the decimal framework can be found in the essay of Gordon J. Hadden (1967) and the tables which accompany that work.

Murra's dissertation on the economic organization of Tawantinsuyu

(1956) has remained in manuscript, but several articles based on it, dealing with particular Inca institutions, are available: on political structure (1958), on agriculture (1960), on cloth and its manipulative use for power purposes (1962a), herds and herders (1965), and the yana retainers of the local ethnic lords (1966).⁴³ In 1969 Murra devoted the four Lewis Henry Morgan lectures to *Reciprocity and Redistribution in Andean Civilization*. His emphasis on reciprocity as a significant mechanism in Inca economics has been criticized by Angela Müller-Dongo (1968). His argument that redistribution discouraged trade and market places to the point where they were peripheral activities is considered exaggerated by Roswith Hartmann (1968).

In the context of exchanges, Emilio Mendizábal's dissertation on counting and measurements in Tawantinsuyu is a contribution to both ethno-science and to economics in the Andes.⁴⁴ It elaborates on María Rostworowski's summary of dictionary entries through a search for equivalences in a maximum of social settings.

INSIGHTS FROM COMPARATIVE WORK WITH SOCIETIES BEYOND SOUTH AMERICA.

The institutional inquiries inventoried in the previous pages bring us to fundamental question which both historians and anthropologists active in Andean studies must face. It has long been obvious that models derived from the socio-economic history of Europe cannot be applied to Andean civilizations. Who, after all, finds it useful in his research today to compare Tawantinsuyu to Rome, an analogy as popular in the XVI as in the XIX century? The dangers of such uncontrolled comparisons have only recently been restated by Aranibar (1963: 113–4).

A more sophisticated set of analogies is drawn by scholars who, without pointing to any particular European society, make comparisons with models which are no less European for being generalized. Baudin's socialist analogy (1928) has received most attention by being widely circulated in several languages. It is a testimony to the quality of Baudin's work that, although few today find his socialist interpretation of a non-industrial society useful in conducting research, many think that some of his specific insights about Andean matters are well worth following up.

Recently other systemic explanations have been offered by Wittfogel (1957) and Choy (1960). The first thinks that Andean civilizations were "Oriental" or hydraulic despotisms; the second prefers slavery as the diagnostic feature of Inca economy. While Baudin's interpretation has been the subject of considerable debate, Wittfogel's and Choy's hypotheses have not benefitted from systematic checking. I can think of at least one productive consequence of such

verification: since Wittfogel's classification depends on an understanding of the extent and importance of irrigation, checking him would reveal how little has been done to study water management and its socio-economic correlates, either archeologically or through written sources.⁴⁵ Similarly, to determine if there was slavery in the Andes and if it was a dynamic feature of social organization at the time of the European invasion, would lead to more thorough study of the prevalence, status and functions of the yana retainers than anything available today.

Confronted with such a multiplicity of models, some students retreat to making no comparisons at all. They immerse themselves in the "data" and leave cross-cultural comparisons for another day. Unfortunately, this frequently means the unconscious use of models from the student's own experience, which is even more distorting than the explicit projections. It also means one foregoes the advantages of course-cultural hints: in the debate on the yana condition, above, I would argue that M. I. Finley's essay (1964) on "Slavery and Freedom" is the most useful contribution, though it says not a word about the yana themselves.

A solution to this dilemma was suggested almost eighty years ago by Heinrich Cunow. Unfortunately, it did not have much echo in scholarly circles. Cunow (1891, 1896) thought that understanding of Andean social organization could come from the study of societies of comparable complexity the world over. The particular societies Cunow picked may have been less relevant than some of those we can draw on today, but his basic, ethnographic solution is, I think, one we can profitably learn from.

Systematic cross-cultural comparisons under controlled conditions are commonplace today when dealing with economic, political or religious organization of contemporary societies.⁴⁶ The basic anthropological contribution which has made these comparisons profitable in recent decades has been the intensive study in the field of living cultures of varying degrees of complexity in the Pacific and Africa. The high quality of field work prevailing since Malinowski's *Argonauts* (1922), Evans-Pritchard's *Azande Magic* (1937) or Firth's *Tikopia* (1936) make us confident that the features being compared are not superficial analogies but systemic, functionally integrated activities and institutions.

Many of these field investigations deal with complex societies and kingdoms: we learn about high status-lineages in Polynesia, Yoruba cities, the royal oral tradition of the Rwanda, Zulu armies, state bookkeeping by the Dahomean king's "wives," about administered trade. Civilization in these areas (in the sense of cities, states, social stratification) developed outside the Eurasian tradition and followed what seem to be distinct evolutionary paths. As in the Americas, civilization could be shown to emerge without the obli-

gatory use of domesticated animal energy and without much emphasis on machinery. The revenues needed by these states to maintain courts, priesthoods or armies were created not so much through technological innovations as through skilled ways of mobilizing and manipulating human energies. Detailed comparisons of the Andean *mit'a* with the *dopkwe* of Dahomey,⁴⁷ or of the ethnic leaders among the Chupaychu with the Tikopian *ariki*, or of the political functions of royal incest in the Andes and in the lacustrine kingdoms of East Africa⁴⁸ would all be, I submit, of enormous suggestive value.

To go back for a moment to rights-in-land. The confusion created by the European chroniclers when they attempt to account for the multiplicity of land tenure forms in the Andes can be clarified somewhat by the XVI century texts on royal Inca acreage discovered by María Rostworowski (1963). These deal not with "property" in general, but with specific estates. Comparing her Cuzco data with Lozi royal lands, the information on which was collected by Max Gluckman in the field, from living royal informants (1943, 1944), the issues are further clarified. We see in detail how the state and the kings can claim rights in all acreage, while ethnic and kinship groups retain co-existing and effective access to some of the very same fields. In our own fieldwork in Chaupiwaranqa (Pasco), where kings are long since gone but the communities refuse to yield control of the soil and other resources, the *manay* system not only regulates rotation of crops but also confirms annually and ritually each household's access to its own plots. Our data (Fonseca 1966) verify and confirm Núñez del Prado's information on *mañanakuy* in Chinchero (1949) and José Matos' report on how the *suyu* functions on the island of Taquile (1957). Were one trying to convey to a lay audience an understanding of pre-European land tenures in the Andes, the most suggestive reading would be Gluckman's Lozi work.

Once we become accustomed to such cross-cultural comparisons with living, non-European civilizations we can then move to another neglected area: confrontation with the Meso-American achievement. There is some danger that spurious analogies will be suggested by the fact that both areas were reported on by Europeans from the same peninsular cultural background, and if Américo Castro is at all right,⁴⁹ they were people recruited from even narrower ethnic enclaves within Spain. The risk of analogies that existed in the background of the chroniclers and not in the cultures they watched will be reduced if one has begun the comparison with societies of similar complexity outside the American continent. At the same time, one must reckon with the fact that American foci of high civilization may not be so completely independent of each other as we sometimes think. Historical connections and dependencies at several different times have been documented (Coe 1960) and most likely will be again along the Pacific coast and through the cordilleras.

Here are some structural or substantive cultural comparisons between Meso-America and the Andes which I would expect to be fruitful: plant domestication and agriculture,⁵⁰ urban settlement patterns,⁵¹ kinship features and their political use, differential importance of market places vs. administered trade, cloth and its manipulative use by the state and local elites, shrines and pilgrimage centers. Some scholars have already begun such systematic comparisons—Willey (1962), Katz (1960), Zuidema (1965a) and MacNeish—but a great deal remains to be done.

ETHNOHISTORY IN ACTION: A PROPOSAL FOR A LONG-RUN,
INTER-DISCIPLINARY, FIELD-ORIENTED RESEARCH PROJECT.

The objection can be raised that the interest in administrative *visitas*, in land litigation records, or in the comparative exercises emphasized in this review of Andean ethnohistory may well provide information and insight into the functioning of Andean institutions but is unlikely to further our knowledge of Andean historical processes. If one is interested in how fast Tawantinsuyu spread, the sequence of conquests or the frequency of rebellions in areas already incorporated by earlier kings, the wars of royal succession and the like, it is obvious that relatively little information on such themes will be dredged from the administrative papers.

Some anthropologists have stated that elucidation of Inca history must await clarification of the social organization. This is because they see the European sources as hopelessly confused by the rival claims of diverse royal lineages and by the European inability to understand what their informants were telling them (Zuidema 1965b, 1966).

A simple case in point from my own research is kingship among the Lupaqa: such perceptive chroniclers as Cieza and Garcilaso report that Q'ari was the name of the king and also of the dynasty reigning in Chucuito. The *visita* of Diez de San Miguel (1964) clarified the issue: Q'ari was only the upper moiety king. His structural equivalent, the lower moiety ruler of all the Lupaqa, Kusi, had been suppressed by ethnocentricity. It is well known to Europeans that kings come in lots of one. In that sense it does not matter if Zuidema's explanation⁵² of *who* the two kings were is historically accurate or not. What matters is Zuidema's insistence that dual organization prevailed in the southern Andes; this encourages our inquiry into the probability that a pair of kings were reigning simultaneously in Cuzco at any given time. The fact that the chroniclers insist on single rulers with overwhelming unanimity comes less from what their informants told them than from their common Iberian cultural background.

As anthropologists have pressed their cross-cultural claim, some historians

have felt this to be an arrogant appropriation of the whole field of Andean history (Brundage 1966). Others have thought that the sources have not been carefully weighed and evaluated because the anthropologists with their insistence on fieldwork lack training and sophistication when dealing with texts (Wedin 1963:8).

Personally, I feel such emotions are left over from the times when isolated giants tried to encompass the study of Andean civilizations within themselves. Today we know that no single personality and no single intellectual tactic will fathom the accomplishments of Andean man across the millenia. True, certain data can be reached only through archeology, for instance, the emergence of Andean agriculture and animal husbandry. Only trained historians can efficiently organize the intensive hunt for papers by XVI century writers with Andean mothers, men like Molina, Valera, Avila, Poma or Salcamayhua, on the bet that their experience will provide information and leads unavailable elsewhere. Only contemporary field ethnology will clarify the many forms taken by the "vertical" model of ecological control.

But I have suggested elsewhere that in addition to such single-tactic problems there are many others which can be studied adequately only if we co-ordinate several approaches.⁵³ The visitas of 1567 and 1574, covering the kingdom of the Lupaqa could be the starting point of a long-run, interdisciplinary study which could bring together:

1) Archeologists who would check the Lupaqa claim to control not only a portion of the altiplano around Lake Titicaca but also several non-contiguous oases from Ilo in Perú to Arica in Chile, as well as forest and coca-leaf pockets in many parts of Bolivia.⁵⁴ Excavation could also clarify how the Lupaqa kingdom was put together in pre-Inca times out of seven separate ethnic groups; how the maize and cotton-growing oases of the Lupaqa differed (if at all) from those nearby, belonging to the Pakaxa, another Aymara-speaking kingdom in the highlands; and what were the relations of such kingdoms to the Middle or Tiahuanaco horizon.

2) Historians, who would note that 1567 is a relatively late date on which to initiate the documentary study of an area so deeply immersed in colonial affairs as was the Lupaqa domain. Long before the visita of Diez de San Miguel this area received special consideration (hence written records) from the Europeans because the Lupaqa were considered rich.⁵⁵ They were one of the few groups never granted in encomienda but kept "en cabeza de Su Majestad." If by mistake some of the oases on the coast were so granted, Polo was able to convince Viceroy Cañete that the grant should be cancelled.⁵⁶ The Lupaqa also provided many of the miners at Potosí and had other important roles in the growth and organization of that center.⁵⁷ I am convinced that serious inquiry into Lupaqa affairs, based on materials in the archives will

turn up data from as early as the 1540's—thus clarifying Inca-Lupaqa relations, the political and economic organization of Chucuito as contrasted with the six other "provinces" and, with luck, more data about the career of don Pedro Cutinbo, who reigned for 16 crucial years before the visita of Garci Diez and was still alive and influential when that inspection came along.⁵⁸

There is no need to belabor here the next and obvious steps to be taken after one achieves the collaboration of historians and archeologists: we would enlist the help of linguists, ecologists, demographers and field ethnologists. Their profitable collaboration in a long-run study would begin with the Lupaqa visitas but would reach from there both back and forward from 1567. Given the degree of cultural continuity in the Andes, the ethnography of contemporary Andean populations as well as their history in colonial and republican times can be readily connected to archeological manifestations through the link of XVI century accounts. These various tactics would not only complement and verify each other; I would expect them to open new research leads which went far beyond the original questions. As in the case of the Huánuco study, ethno-history need no longer keep to a narrowly tactical definition: the use of archival sources for the study of non-European ethnic groups. The initial hint may have come from a visita, but soon the study can become a coordinated effort of the several tactical approaches which have too long been practiced separately.⁵⁹ Also, since the Lupaqa domain straddled the borders of what today are three separate republics, one could hope that this interdisciplinary, long-run research would also attract international sponsorship and an international staff.

ETHNOHISTORY IN ACTION, CONTINUED: SOME IMMEDIATE IF NARROWER PRIORITIES

Short of the kind of inter-disciplinary cooperation we tried for in Huánuco and I now propose for the Lupaqa, there are also some immediate and less costly joint tasks.

Guillermo Lohmann has given convincing evidence that the 1560's were a period of transition and self-analysis in the Andean vice-royalty. Friars as well as governors, lawyers and encomenderos, poured over the past and debated the future. Many of these papers of the 1560's are now available to us through the efforts of Levillier, Lohmann and other historians. In his survey, Lohmann noted that the decade of the sixties need not be taken literally. The visitas of Damián de la Bandera or of Castro and Ortega Morejón fell in the late 1550's, the work of Sarmiento or Molina into the early 1570's, yet all of them would be included in the epoch characterized for us by Lohmann.

Still, some important sources were put together long enough before the

1560's to require separate study and characterization. Aranibar has noted that some of the best and most reliable sources (like Cieza and Betanzos) prepared their manuscripts earlier and in a different tradition.⁶⁰ Postponing for the moment the debate over the feasibility of ever knowing very much about the history of Tawantinsuyu without a massive and costly archeological program, I would advocate that historians and ethnologists agree on a high priority concentration on the second and third decades of European rule, the 1540's and the 1550's.

To avoid being narrowly programmatic and to suggest what such high priority entails, let me concentrate on two personalities, active and important during the two early decades, who survived into Toledo's administration and were also influential during Lohmann's "1560's": Domingo de Santo Tomás and Juan Polo de Ondegardo. They may well be the best of their respective kind, but my bet is that 1) there were others like them, at least in some ways, and (2) even if they were unique, a great deal more could be learned about them and their period than we have so far learned.

Both men came to the Andes early, toward the end of the first decade of European rule, when Andean realities still had to be taken into account and the clichés of what "Indians" were like had not yet prevailed. The Dominican friar learned at least one of the Andean languages well enough to produce the first grammar and dictionary. He also coordinated the first *visita general*. I submit that the joining in a single person of such scholarly and administrative competences leads to a knowledge and understanding of things Andean which we have only begun to plumb.

Where are Santo Tomás' notes and drafts for his dictionary; where are the remaining 71 reports of the first *visita general*; how much of "Las Casas" is really by Fray Domingo? Angel Garibay has shown us how useful it was for our Meso-Americanist colleagues to have located the *cuadernos* in Nahuatl prepared by Sahagún's informants. Let me give only two brief examples of what Santo Tomás' *cuadernos* could do for us. Fray Domingo's dictionary lists what today seems an unusual translation for a common Andean concept: *ayni*. Where Europeans in the past and rural practice today refer it to reciprocal labor services, Santo Tomás claimed *ayni* meant vengeance. Later dictionaries give both meanings. I would argue that Fray Domingo gives us the more profound translation by hinting at social organizational ties which must be taken into account to understand both meanings. Revenge and certain services are part of reciprocity; the job before us is to use his hint to discover which was the network of kin that provided both.

My second example comes from the grammar. Santo Tomás began the practice, followed also by González Holguín and Bertonio, of listing kin terms not only in the dictionary but also as a separate chapter in the grammar. He

was first to be aware that simple listing would not do justice to the complexities of the Andean kinship system, which every confessor had to understand if erroneous charges of incest, for example, were to be avoided. He noted that if the great-grandfather survived to see his great-grandson, he would address the newcomer as "brother." Like Montaigne confronted about the same time with the news that along the St. Lawrence river terms of address seemed to ignore generations, Santo Tomás did not ascribe such variability in custom to the savagery of the informants. He thought the use was ironic and worthy of note. We know today, through Zuidema's and Lounsbury's studies, that the elder man and his great-grandson belonged to the same social category, hence were classificatory brothers, given the Andean three-cycle preferential marriage pattern.

Beyond his studies of Andean languages, our research should include more of Fray Domingo's correspondence with the king about archeological excavations as published by Lissón,⁶¹ more about his public debates with Polo on the convenience of placing all Andean populations in "cabeza de Su Majestad,"⁶² more about his activities as bishop of Charcas when he displeased the powers-that-be by refusing to keep in concentration camps those Andean medicine-men and priests who refused to convert to European religion.⁶³ The research into this major figure's career begun by José María Vargas and Patricia Bard⁶⁴ can be profitably continued by many more.

My second hero has recently received considerable recognition.⁶⁵ As the historians have begun to trace the minutiae of who copies from whom, it becomes apparent that Polo de Ondegardo's memoranda and letters were the major source circulating among the colonial elite on such diverse topics as Inca statecraft, Andean religion, the role and powers of the ethnic lords who survived the decapitation of Tawantinsuyu, Inca land tenure, the zeque system of Cuzco and what have you. Polo's knowledge was rooted in his practical experience as corregidor and encomendero in the southern highlands for several decades, beginning in the 1540's when Andean social and economic institutions were still in operation. As Aranibar has shown, Polo's information is contemporary to Cieza's and Betanzos'.

During La Gasca's campaign against Gonzalo Pizarro, Polo acted as quartermaster of the royal troops. To feed the 2,000 men during the seven weeks they were stationed in Xauxa, Polo used the Inca warehouses still functioning in 1548. Any other quartermaster might have done the same, but Polo was aware how extraordinary it was that an economic system should endure 16 years after the destruction of the power that had generated it. He was curious about how storage functioned; he gives us the name of the manager; and he uses these warehouses as an objective measurement of state vs. church landholdings. Since the storage facilities of the state were so much larger than those of the church,

the rights-in-land of the first were inevitably more extensive. Where are the records of these seven weeks in Xauxa? Polo tells us: "e muy gran recaudo e cuenta con ello en registros el dia de oy de todo lo que se llevo e gasto e personas que lo entendian sino que es tan gran proligidad tratar dello que no creo que se pudiera acabar. . . ." Is it too much to hope that what may have been boring to the courtiers expected to read his memorandum has been recorded elsewhere for the stated purpose of efficiently feeding royal troops?

Since Polo's role as advisor to a succession of governors, viceroys and ecclesiastic *concilios*, as locator of royal mummies, as topographer of the zeques and their shrines is well known,⁶⁶ I will end by emphasizing his understanding of subtler Andean perceptions, in this case their perception of their ecology. I have mentioned in passing Polo's memorandum explaining to Viceroy Cañete that the Lupaqa coastal oases belonged to that ethnic group even though they were so far from the core of their territory. He convinced the viceroy to remove the oases from one Juan de San Juan to whom they had been granted in encomienda and to return them to His Majesty's domain. That he may have done so for revenue-creating purposes does not diminish my interest in his mind or my desires to locate many more of his memoranda, letters, reports and answers to royal questionnaires.⁶⁷ He has provided us with an excellent explanation of the reasons why he thought the Europeans of his time should study Andean institutions. He has in passing given the first definition and justification of what later become applied and colonial anthropology:

. . . combiene a saver la costumbre destos naturales y horden que tuvieron para sustentarse y poblarse e para su conservacion, como los hallamos e arrimandonos a aquello, ordenar lo que sobrello paresciere, quitando lo ynjusto e añadiendo lo justificado, siempre se hallara probechoso, proque qualquiera que tomare otra comida creyendo ponerles nueva horden, aprisa, quitandoles la suya, saldra con dexarles sin nynguna, y que ellos ny el no se entiendan; y no consiguyra otro efeto; lo qual por ser cosa natural, no son menester rraçones, aunque bastaria una que no tiene rrespuesta, que avnque para hacerlos christianos esta savido el camyno y tenemos por maestro a la mysama sabiduria, est nesçesario sauer sus opiniones v costumbres para quitarselas⁶⁸

My choice of Domingo de Santo Tomás and Polo de Ondegardo as key figures in an intensified search may have followed from my anthropological interest in Andean cultures before the European invasion, but even those who are more concerned with post-1532 phenomena will recall that both men functioned in a world in which most of their readers and patrons were Europeans. Both of them were successful at a wide series of tasks entrusted to them by the colonial regime. If sometimes on opposite sides of particular issues like the perpetuidad of the encomiendas, they shared a similar point of view which

argued that the successful accomplishment of European aims passed necessarily through a sound knowledge of Andean institutions, languages, beliefs and accomplishments. Since this knowledge was utilized in the European-created situations of 1545 through 1575, their unpublished work, still to be located, will benefit both groups: those who study the new regime emerging and the Andean system waning during that period.

CONCLUSION

Despite the acknowledged and widely-felt need for collaboration in Andean studies between historians and anthropologists, one can discern considerable ambivalence in facing action. No international research center or journal dedicated to Andean research has emerged yet to provide a world-wide forum and continuity for the study of Andean civilizations. The complexity of the problem before us suggests that nothing less will do the job. A Center of Andean Studies, to include a clearing house for research and publications, was planned in 1963 at Huampaní, Perú, but did not progress in that form.⁶⁹ Some national institutions in the Andean republics and such widely-respected journals as *Revista del Museo Nacional* (Lima), *Cuadernos de Historia y Arqueología* (Guayaquil), or the publications of the Centro de Investigaciones Arqueológicas, Tiwanaku, do exist, doing a heroic job in the face of official neglect. Outside institutions have also sponsored continuing research: the seminar at Bonn, directed by Professor Trimborn, the Institut Français d'Etudes Andines, the Institute of Andean Research of New York, the University of Tokyo, the Misión Arqueológica Española of Madrid, or the Institute of Andean Studies at Berkeley are all active at this time. But there is relatively little collaboration across national or disciplinary lines. No international seminars have taken place recently to coordinate inter-disciplinary attacks upon common problems in the study of Andean civilization. The forthcoming publication of NISPA NINKU, an international newsletter in Spanish on Andean research, may help in this direction.

Let me conclude with an immediate proposal in which ethnohistory could play a linking, not just a tactical role. In 1970, the XXXVIII International Congress of Americanists will meet in the Andes. There is still time, as part of the Congress or tangentially to it, to gather a group of historians and anthropologists interested in the Incas, as a start.⁷⁰ If such a group could stay together beyond the initial confrontation when each discipline believes it has to present and defend its specific contribution, we could then concentrate on the research problems considered to be most urgent, discover how to utilize best the respective skills of the participants, and how to stimulate each other out of the crevices in which past isolation has kept us.

NOTES

1. One elaborate and expensive effort was recently published commercially without benefit of any editing: Biblioteca Peruana (1968).
2. Compare Aranibar (1963: 129–30) with Wedin (1963, 1966).
3. Hanke and Giménez Fernández (1954); Giménez Fernández (1953); Bataillon (1966).
4. A French translation prefaces the edition published by the Institut Français d'Etudes Andines. The Spanish original is to be found in Lohmann, 1965b.
5. The Andean reaction to the invasion is just beginning to be studied (Wachtel 1968). Kubler's article on the colonial Quechua written 25 years ago (1946), has not been superseded, but see Mellafe, 1967. Resistance to the invasion or siding with the invaders against Cuzco, later revitalization movements (Millones 1964, 1968), the careers of Andean personalities like Molina, Valera, Poma or Avila, all need attention. Research has begun into the lives and circumstances of the more accessible members of the surviving royal lineages at Cuzco (Rowe 1951, 1957; Lohmann 1965a; Wachtel, no date) but is still in its initial stages.
6. Aranibar (1963: 129–34).
7. Aranibar (1963: 110, 129); Wedin (1966: 55–73); Lohmann (1966).
8. Porras (1950–51); Vargas Ugarte (1935, 1959).
9. *Runa yn.o ñiscap machoncuna ñaupá pachá quillacata yachanman . . .*, vol. 3169, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid.
10. For details about the manuscript and Francisco de Avila, see Duviols (1967b).
11. Trimborn 1939; Galante 1942; Trimborn and Kelm 1967; Arguedas 1967. For comments before the most recent editions see Trimborn 1948, 1951, 1953, 1960; Murra 1961.
12. In addition to the recent translations, the availability of the legends has inspired José María Arguedas to take the title of his next novel, *El zorro de arriba y el zorro de abajo*, from one of the tales. Jorge Urioste, a linguist from Sucre, is now preparing a new translation into Spanish and English: *The Sons of Pariacaca: Cult and Myth in Huarochiri*.
13. See Jiménez de la Espada 1881 (Antecedentes); Céspedes (1946); Cline (1964).
14. Levillier 1921: 20–25; Espinoza 1967a.
15. The Chupaychu region covered by Mlle Helmer's text had been under European control for only seven years when the *visitadores* came. The ethnic groups of the upper Huallaga and upper Marañón valleys offered considerable resistance to the Europeans, some of it organized from Cuzco and some apparently local.
A further fragment from this visita general, summarizing population figures for the Lupaqa, near Lake Titicaca, can be found in Díez de San Miguel [1567], 1964: 202–203.
16. Some interesting analyses of demographic data from the visitas can be found in Hadden (1967); Sacchetti (1964); Smith (1970).
17. Damián de la Bandera [1557], 1881; Cristóbal de Castro and Ortega Morejón [1558], 1936.
18. The Ghent questionnaire of 1559 was used not only to conduct the Chupaychu visita but was also answered by Polo de Ondegardo in 1561 when he was passing through Lima. His answers have been published in *Revista Histórica*, Lima 1940.
19. Murra (1962a, 1966, 1967).

20. I have had a chance to consult this microfilm through the courtesy of Dr. Waldemar Espinoza, who located it in the Archivo de Indias. Since then, Chilean scholars at the Centro de Investigaciones Históricas of Santiago, and the German anthropologist Jürgen Golte, have also studied it. It is the best source we have so far on the cultivation of coca-leaf.
21. Toledo's instrucciones (the questionnaire used for the visita), and the names of the inspectors are available to us; see *Revista Histórica* (Lima 1924). Part of the visita, in which Toledo himself took part, has been reprinted by Levillier (1921, vol. 2).
22. Kubler (1946); Murra (1964: 438).
23. One volume of a summary of the whole visita, emphasizing demography and tribute obligations, was located in the Archivo de Indias by Dr. Espinoza and later by other scholars as well. In 1968 the University of San Marcos was contemplating publishing the summary, edited by Noble David Cook.
24. The information was collected by Pedro Gutiérrez Flores who was appointed a special visitador for the Lupaqa by Toledo. The fragment published (Gutiérrez [1574], 1964) is a census of llama and alpaca herds held by the several lineages and moieties. Since 1964 further pieces of this visita have been located in Seville by Franklin Pease G. Y. and Jürgen Golte.
25. Murra (1964).
26. Murra (1966).
27. Murra (1967).
28. Murra (1968).
29. Beyond Jiménez de la Espada's brief *Relaciones* (1881–97), the first to publish a complete visita was Domingo Angulo, who inaugurated the *Revista del Archivo Nacional* (Lima) in 1920, with a reproduction of the Chupaychu inspection. These early issues have long been out of print. The Universidad Nacional Hermilio Valdizán republished this report in 1967; the present author checked the new edition with the original manuscript and added new materials. A second volume, with the visita of the Yacha and several villages of *mitmaqkuna* from the South, awaits reprinting.
30. I have pointed to similar areas of collaboration in Murra (1964: 421–24).
31. The probability is strong that although the litigants are Andean villages, at least one of the sides in the dispute was backed in its suit by the encomenderos of the area.
32. Mellafe (1965).
33. Thompson and Murra (1966).
34. Murra (1956, chap. II).
35. Kosok (1964).
36. One of the unpublished sources brought back from Seville by Dr. Espinoza deals with litigation over some coca-leaf lands located on the western slopes of the Andes, above Lima, where no one grows coca-leaf today. The testimony of the litigants is without parallel in Andean ethnography: witnesses report reconnoitering and spying on the area on behalf of their ethnic group; how such groups shared a resource; the Inca intervention in the region. An essay based on this material is now being prepared by María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco.
37. Fonseca (1966).

CURRENT RESEARCH AND PROSPECTS IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

38. See litigation between sons of Juan Sánchez Falcón and those of Juan de Valladolid, both early encomenderos in the Huánuco region, in Archivo General de Indias (Seville), Escribanía de Cámara 497A. Access to this manuscript was facilitated by doña María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, at the time cultural attaché of the embassy of Perú in Madrid.
39. See similar and apparently independent clarification of the functions of the two officials in Guillén (1962).
40. Temple (1959: 118–22). One of her students, Sócrates Villar Córdova, has elaborated her ideas in a dissertation submitted to the University of San Marcos in 1958, but not printed until 1966. He deals primarily with the royal yana and did not use the material in the Lupaqa visita.
41. Some years ago Dr. Espinoza prepared an essay about the Lupaqa kings and their genealogy based on unpublished materials from the Archivo de Indias. Unfortunately, the manuscript was stolen in the Trujillo bus station.
42. For example, the Lupaqa visita. The questionnaire prepared for Diez de San Miguel inquired into decimal subdivisions, but the informants ignored the question.
43. The dissertation was written for the University of Chicago.
44. Mendizábal's dissertation was prepared for the University of San Marcos.
45. Kosok (1962, 1964); Schaedel (1952, 1966); Rodríguez Suysuy (1969).
46. Eggan (1958). See also the journal *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *passim*.
47. Herskovits (1938).
48. de Heusch (1958, 1966). Also Rostworowski (1960).
49. Castro (1962, 1966).
50. MacNeish (1968). Since then MacNeish has begun fieldwork in the Andes; Jeff Parsons and Kent Flannery, of the University of Michigan, are known to be making plans for field research, the first on the coast, the second in the highlands.
51. Rowe (1963); Millon (1968); Hardoy and Schaedel (1969).
52. 1964: 127–8.
53. Murra (1962b).
54. Schaedel (1957); Munizaga (1957); Vesceius (no date).
55. Murra (1964: 422–23).
56. Polo [1571] (1916: 81).
57. Diez de San Miguel [1567] (1964: 60–71, 177–79).
58. Beyond his testimony in various parts of the visita, Cutinbo is also mentioned in a manuscript by Pero López, now prepared for publication for the Newberry Library by the Colombian historian Juan Friede. See f. 48v.
59. See articles in *Cuadernos de Investigación*, I (1966); also Hadden (1967); Morris (1967).
60. Aranibar (1967: xxvi, lxxiii–lxxiv).
61. Lissón (1943).
62. Vargas Ugarte (1938: 84); Ugarte y Ugarte (1966).
63. Diez de San Miguel [1567] (1964: 235).
64. Vargas (1937); Bard (1967).

Latin American Research Review

65. Aranibar (1963: n. 8).
66. Aranibar (1963: 124–126, n. 8). See also Polo's comments on the 1562 visita to Huánuco (to be published in vol. II of that visita, ff. 214r–v).
67. Even a collection of the known papers by and about Polo would be very useful. For example, a set of two letters to Gonzalo Pizarro in Pérez de Tudela (1964), or his *hoja de servicios* [1552], in the Archivo de Indias, which Pierre Duviols has been preparing for publication.
68. Polo [1571] (1916: 81–2).
69. Two research institutions did spring from that meeting: the Plan de Fomento Lingüístico of the Universidad de San Marcos and the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
70. The XXXIX Congress of Americanists will be held in Lima in 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALBORNOZ, CRISTOBAL DE

- 1967 Instrucción para descubrir todas las guacas del Piru y sus camayos y haciendas [158?]. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, 56: 17–39. Paris.

ANONYMOUS

- 1920 Relación del origen e gobierno que los Ingas tuvieron . . . declaradas por señores que sirvieron al inga Yupangui . . . Colección de libros y documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú. Segunda serie, no. 3: 55–86. Lima.

ARANIBAR, CARLOS

- 1962 Los sacrificios humanos entre los Incas a través de los cronistas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of San Marcos, Lima.
- 1963 Algunos problemas heurísticos en las crónicas de los siglos XVI–XVII. *Nueva Corónica*, 1: 102–35. Lima.
- 1967 Introducción. In Cieza [1553], 1967.

ARGUEDAS, JOSE MARIA (translator)

- 1967 *Hombres y Dioses de Huarochirí* [1598?]. Lima.

AVILA, FRANCISCO DE (compiler)

- 1598 Runa yn.o ñiscap machoncuna ñaupá pacha quillacacta yachanman . . . , Vol. 3169, fols. 64ff. Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. See Trimborn (1939), Galante (1942), Trimborn and Kelm (1967), Arguedas (1967).

BANDERA, DAMIAN DE LA

- 1881 Relación general de la disposición y calidad de la Provincia de Guamanga. . . [1557]. In Jiménez de la Espada, *Relaciones geográficas de Indias*. Madrid.

BARD, PATRICIA J.

- 1967 Domingo de Santo Tomás, a Spanish friar in 16th century Peru. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Colombia University.

BATAILLON, MARCEL

- 1966 *Etudes sur Bartolomé de las Casas*. Paris.

BAUDIN, LOUIS

- 1928 *L'Empire Socialiste des Inka*. Paris.

BERTONIO, LUDOVICO

- 1956 *Vocabulario de la lengua Aymara*. . . [1612]. Fascimile ed. La Paz.

CURRENT RESEARCH AND PROSPECTS IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

BIBLIOTECA PERUANA

1968 El Perú a través de los siglos. 3 vols. Lima.

BRUNDAGE, BURR C.

1963 Empire of the Inca. Norman.

1966 Response to Zuidema's review of the Empire of the Inca, *American Anthropologist*, 68: 229–30.

CABELLO VALBOA, MIGUEL

1951 *Miscelánea antártica [1586]*. Lima.

CASTRO, AMERICO

1962 *La realidad histórica de España*. 2nd ed. México.

1966 Prólogo. In *Malagón Barceló*, 1966.

CESPEDES DEL CASTILLO, GUILLERMO

1946 La visita como institución indiana. *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, 3: 984–1025, Sevilla.

CASTRO, CRISTOBAL DE, AND DIEGO DE ORTEGA MOREJON

1936 Relación y declaración del modo que este valle de Chíncha y sus comarcas se gobernaban . . . [1558]; in Trimborn, 1936.

CHOY, EMILIO

1960 "Sistema social incaico." *Idea*, 10–12.

CIEZA DE LEON, PEDRO

1967 *Señorío de los Incas [1553]*. Lima.

CLINE, HOWARD F.

1964 *The Relaciones Geográficas of the Spanish Indies, 1577–1586*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 44: 340–374.

COBO, BERNABE

1956 *Historia del Nuevo Mundo [1653]*. Madrid.

COE, MICHAEL D.

1960 Archeological linkages with North and South America at La Victoria, Guatemala. *American Anthropologist*.

CUADERNOS DE INVESTIGACION

1966 Published by the Universidad Nacional Hermilio Valdizán. Huánuco, Perú.

CUNOW, HEINRICH

1891 *Das Peruanische Verwandtschaftsistem und die Geschlechtsverbaende der Inka*. *Das Ausland*, 64: 881–6, 914–9, 934–9, 951–6. Stuttgart.

1896 *Die soziale Verfassung des Inkareiches*. Stuttgart.

DIEZ DE SAN MIGUEL, GARCÍ

1964 *Visita hecha a la provinca de Chucuito . . . en el año 1567*. Casa de la Cultura. Lima.

DOCUMENTA

Published by the Sociedad Peruana de Historia. Lima.

DURAND, JOSE

1948 *La biblioteca del Inca*. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 2: 239–64. México.

1956 *Nuevos estudios sobre el Inca Garcilaso*. In *Symposium*, 17 to 22 June 1955. Lima.

1961 *El proceso de redacción de las obras del Inca Garcilaso*. *Annales. Faculté des Lettres, Aix*.

Latin American Research Review

DUVIOLS, PIERRE

- 1967a Un inédit de Cristóbal de Albornoz. In Albornoz [158?], 1967. 56: 7–17.
1967b Estudio biobibliográfico—Francisco de Avila. In Arguedas, 1967: 218–40.

EGGAN, FRED

- 1954 Social Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Comparison. *American Anthropologist*, 56: 743–63.

ESPINOZA SORIANO, WALDEMAR

- 1963 La guaranga y la reducción de Huancayo. *Revista del Museo Nacional*, 32: 8–80. Lima.
1964a Biografía de Garcí Diez de San Miguel, corregidor y visitador de Chucuito, in Diez de San Miguel [1567], 1967: 371–417.
1964b Bosquejo histórico del pueblo de San Salvador de Pachacamac. In Matos Mar and others, 1964: 132–55.
1967a El primer informe etnológico sobre Cajamarca. Año de 1540. *Revista Peruana de Cultura*, 11–12: 5–41.
1967b Los señoríos étnicos de Chachapoyas y la alianza hispano-chacha. *Revista Histórica*, 30: 224–332. Lima.

EVANS-PRITCHARD, E. E.

- 1937 *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*. Oxford.

FINLEY, M. I.

- 1964 Between Slavery and Freedom. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 6: 233–49.

FIRTH, RAYMOND

- 1936 *We, The Tikopia*. London.

FONSECA MARTEL, CESAR

- 1966 La comunidad de Cauri y la quebrada de Chaupiwara. *Cuadernos de Investigación*, 1: 22–33. Huánuco.

GALANTE, HYPOLITUS

- 1942 Francisco de Avila. De priscorum Huarochiriensium origine et institutis. Madrid.

[GARCILASO]

- 1956 Actas del simposium, 17–28 de junio, 1955. Lima.

GIMENEZ FERNANDEZ, MANUEL

- 1953 *Bartolomé de las Casas*. 2 vols. Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos. Sevilla.

GLUCKMAN, MAX

- 1943 *Essays on Lozi Lands and Royal Property*. The Rhodes-Livingston Papers, no. 10, Northern Rhodesia.
1944 *Studies in African Land Tenure*. *African Studies*, March 1944: 1–8.

GUILLEN GUILLEN, EDMUNDO

- 1962 El tocric y el tucuyricoc en la organización política del imperio incaico. Actas y trabajos del segundo congreso de historia del Perú, 2: 157–203.

GUTIERREZ FLORES, PEDRO

- [1574] Padrón de los mil indios ricos de la provincia de Chucuito. In Diez de San Miguel, 1964: 301–63.

HADDEN, GORDON J.

- 1967 Un ensayo de demografía histórica y etnológica en Huánuco. In Ortiz de Zúñiga, 1967: 371–80. Huánuco.

CURRENT RESEARCH AND PROSPECTS IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

HAMMEL, EUGENE A.

1965 Review of Zuidema, 1964. In *American Anthropologist*, 67: 781-5.

HANKE, LEWIS AND MANUEL GIMENEZ FERNANDEZ

1954 Bartolomé de las Casas, 1474-1566. *Bibliografía Crítica*. Santiago de Chile.

HARDOY, JORGE E. AND RICHARD P. SCHAEDEL (eds.)

1969 El proceso de urbanización en América desde sus orígenes hasta nuestros días. Buenos Aires.

HARTMANN, ROSWITH

1968 *Maerkte im alten Peru*. Bonn.

HELMER, MARIE

1955-56 La visitación de los indios chupachos: Inca et encomendero [1549] *Travaux, Institut Français d'Etudes Andines*, 5: 3-50.

HERSKOVITS, MELVILLE J. AND FRANCES S.

1938 *Dahomey, an Ancient West African Kingdom*. 2 vols. New York.

HEUSCH, LUC DE

1958 *Essais sur le Symbolisme de l'Incèste Royal en Afrique*. Bruxelles.

1966 *Le Rwanda et la Civilisation Interlacustre*. Bruxelles.

JIMENEZ DE LA ESPADA, MARCOS (editor)

1881-97 *Relaciones Geográficas de Indias*. 4 vols. Madrid.

KATZ, FRIEDRICH

1960 Einige Vergleichsmomente zwischen der sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Organisation der Inka in Peru und der Azteken in Mexiko. *Estudios de Cultura Nahuatl*, 2: 59-76, Mexico.

KOSOK, PAUL

1961 El valle de Lambayeque. In *Actas y trabajos del segundo congreso nacional de historia del Perú*, 1: 49-67.

1964 *Life, Land and Water in Ancient Peru*. New York.

KUBLER, GEORGE

1946 The Quechua in the Colonial World. In *Handbook of South American Indians*, 2: 331-410.

LEVILLIER, ROBERTO

1920-27 *Gobernantes del Perú*. 14 vols. Buenos Aires.

LISSON, EMILIO

1943 La Iglesia de España en el Perú. *Colección de documentos para la historia de la iglesia en el Perú, que se encuentran en varios archivos*. 4 vols., 22 numbers.

LOHMANN VILLENA, GUILLERMO

1965a Un testamento inédito del inca Sayri Tupac. *Historia y Cultura*, 1: 13-8. Lima.

1965b Juan de Matienzo, autor del *Gobierno del Perú*: su personalidad y su obra. *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, 22: 767-886. Sevilla.

1966 Unas notas acerca de curiosos paralelismos y correspondencias entre cuatro documentos históricos sobre la época incaica. *Fénix*, 16: 174-197.

1967 *Etude préliminaire*. In MATIENZO [1567], 1967.

LOPEZ, PERO

Unpublished chronicle, prepared for publication by Juan Friede. Newberry Library, Chicago.

Latin American Research Review

- MALAGON BARCELO, JAVIER
1966 *Estudios de Historia y Derecho*. Xalapa, Veracruz.
- MALINOWSKI, BRONISLAW
1922 *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London.
- MATICORENA ESTRADA, MIGUEL
1955 *Cieza de León en Sevilla y su muerte en 1554*. *Documentos. Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, 12: 615–74. Sevilla.
- MATIENZO, JUAN DE
1967 *Gobierno del Perú [1567]*. *Travaux de l'Institut d'Etudes Andines*, 11. Lima-Paris.
- MATOS MAR, JOSE
1957 *La propiedad en la isla de Taquile (Lago Titicaca)*. *Revista del Museo Nacional*, 26: 211–71. Lima.
- MATOS MAR, JOSE AND JOSE PORTUGAL MENDOZA AND OTHERS
1964 *El valle de Lurin y el pueblo de Pachacamac*. Lima.
- MEANS, PHILIP A.
1928 *Biblioteca Andina*. In *Proceedings, Connecticut Academy of Sciences*, 29: 271–525.
- MELLAPE, ROLANDO
1965 *La significación histórica de los puentes en el virreinato peruano del siglo XVI*. *Historia y Cultura*, 1:65–113. Lima.
1967 *Consideraciones históricas sobre la visita*. In *Ortiz de Zúñiga*, 1964: 325–44. Huánuco.
- MILLON, RENE
1968 *Teotihuacán, primera metrópoli prehispánica*. *Gaceta Médica de México*, 98: 339–350.
- MILLONES, LUIS
1964 *Un movimiento nativista del siglo XVI: el Taki Onqoy*. in *Revista Peruana de Cultura*, 3: 134–140.
1968 *Introducción al estudio de las idolatrias*. *Letras* 78–9. Lima.
- MORRIS, CRAIG
1967 *Storage in Tawantinsuyu*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- MUELLER-DANGO, ANGELA
1968 *Sozialpolitik im Inka-Staat*. Dortmund.
- MUNIZAGA, CARLOS
1957 *Secuencias culturales en la zona de Arica*. In *Arqueología Chilena*, Santiago de Chile: 79–126.
- MURRA, JOHN V.
1956 *The Economic Organization of the Inca State*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
1958 *On Inca Political Structure*. *Bobbs-Merrill Reprints in Social Sciences*, A-169.
1960 *Rite and Crop in the Inca State*. In *Culture in History, Essays in Honor of Paul Radin*, Stanley Diamond, editor, 393–407.
1961 *Social, Structural and Economic Themes in Andean Ethno-history*. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 34: 47–59.
1962a *Cloth and its Functions in the Inca State*. *American Anthropologist*, 64: 710–28.

CURRENT RESEARCH AND PROSPECTS IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

- 1962b An Archaeological "Re-study" of an Andean Ethno-historical Account. *American Antiquity*, 28: 1-4.
- 1964 Una apreciación etnológica de la visita. In *Diez de San Miguel*, 1964: 421-44. Lima.
- 1965 Herds and Herders in the Inca State. In *Man, Culture and Animals: The Role of Animals in Human Ecological Adjustments*. AAAS, publication 78.
- 1966 New Data on Retainer and Servile Populations in Tawantinsuyu. *Actas y Memorias*, XXXVI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, 2: 35-44. Sevilla.
- 1967 La visita de los Chupachu como fuente etnológica. In *Ortiz de Zuñiga*, 1967: 383-417.
- 1968 An Aymara Kingdom in 1567. *Ethnohistory*, 15: 115-51.
- NUÑEZ DEL PRADO, OSCAR
- 1949 Chinchero, un pueblo andino del sur. *Revista Universitaria del Cuzco*, 97: 177-230.
- OBEREM, UDO
- 1958 Diego de Ortegón's Beschreibung der "Gobernación de los Quijos, Zumaco y la Canela" 1577. *Zeitschrift fuer Ethnologie*, 83: 230-251. Braunschweig.
- 1966-67 Handel und Handelsguetter in der Montaña Educadors. *Folk*, 8-9: 243-258. København.
- 1967 Don Sancho Hacho, ein cacique mayor del 16. Jahrhunderts. *Jahrbuch fuer Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Latein-Amerikas*, 4: 199-225. Koeln.
- 1968a Mitglieder der Familie des Inka Atahualpa unter Spanischer Herrschaft. *Jahrbuch fuer Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Latein-Amerikas*, 5: 6-22. Koeln.
- 1968b Amerikanistische Angaben aus Dokumenten des 16 Jahrhunderts. *Tribus, Veröffentlichungen des Linden-Museum*, 17: 81-92.
- ORTIZ DE ZUÑIGA, IÑIGO
- 1967 Visita de la provincia de León de Huánuco [1562]. 1: *Visita de las cuatro waranqa de los chupachu*. Huánuco.
- 1955-62 *Visita fecha por mandado de su Majestad. . . . Revista del Archivo Nacional*. Lima. (A new edition, uniform with the first volume, is ready for the press, to be published by the University of Huánuco).
- PEREZ DE TUDELA, JUAN (EDITOR)
- 1964 *Documentos relativos a don Pedro de la Gasca y a Gonzalo Pizarro*. 2 vols. Madrid.
- POLO DE ONDEGARDO, JUAN
- 1916 *Relación de los fundamentos acerca del notable daño que resulta de no guardar a los indios sus fueros Colección de libros y documentos referentes a la historia del Perú*, serie I, 3:45-188.
- 1940 *Informe . . . al licenciado Briviesca de Muñatones, 12-xii-1561. . . . Revista Histórica*, 13: 125-196.
- POMA, GUAMAN
- 1936 *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno [1615]*. Paris.
- PORRAS BARRENECHEA, RAUL
- 1937 *Las relaciones primitivas de la conquista del Perú*. Paris.
- 1945-54 *Fuentes históricas peruanas*. Lima.
- 1946 *El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega [1539-1616]*. Lima.
- 1950-1 *Crónicas perdidas, presuntas y olvidadas sobre la conquista del Perú*. Sociedad Peruana de Historia. Lima.

Latin American Research Review

- 1955 El Inca Garcilaso en Montilla [1561–1614]. Lima.
1962 Los cronistas del Perú (1528–1650). Lima.
- RODRIGUEZ SUYSUY, ANTONIO
1969 Chan Chan: ciudad de adobe. Observaciones sobre su base ecológica. In Hardoy and Schaedel, 1969: 133–52.
- ROSTWOROWSKI DE DIEZ CANSECO, MARIA
1953 Pachacutec Inca Yupanqui. Lima.
1960 Succession, Coöption to Kingship, and Royal Incest among the Inca. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 16: 417–27.
1961 Curacas y sucesiones, costa norte. Lima.
1962a Pesos y medidas en el Perú pre-hispánico. In *Actas y trabajos segundo congreso nacional de historia del Perú*, 2: 103–15.
1962b Nuevos datos sobre tenencia de tierras reales en el incario. *Revista del Museo Nacional*, 31: 130–64.
1963 Dos manuscritos inéditos con datos sobre Manco II, tierras personales de los incas y mitimaes. *Nueva Corónica*, 1: 223–39, Lima.
1964 Nuevos aportes para el estudio de la medición de tierras en el virreinato e incario. *Revista del Archivo Nacional*, 28: 3–31. Lima.
- ROWE, JOHN HOWLAND
1946 Inca Culture at the Time of the Spanish Conquest. *Handbook of Southamerican Indians*, 2: 183–330.
1948 The Kingdom of Chimor. *Acta Americana*, 6: 26–59.
1951 Colonial portraits of Inca nobles. *The Civilizations of Ancient America. Selected Papers, XXIX International Congress of Americanists*: 258–268. Chicago.
1957 The Inca under Spanish Colonial Institutions. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 37: 155–90.
1958 The Age-grades of the Inca Census. *Miscellanea Paul Rivet*: 500–21. México.
1960 The Origins of the Creator Worship among the Incas. In *Culture in History, Essays in Honor of Paul Radin*, edited by Stanley Diamond: 408–429.
1963 Urban Settlements in Ancient Peru. *Nawpa Pacha*: 1–27. Berkeley.
- SACCHETTI, MAURIZIA
1964 Notizie Etnografiche sulle popolazioni della provincia di Chucuito (Peru) in una relazione del XVI secolo. *Revista di Etnografia*, 18: 126–36. Napoli.
- SANCHEZ FALCON, JUAN (SONS OF, VS. SONS OF JUAN DE VALLADOLID).
[1590] Unpublished litigation, *Archivo General de Indias, Escribanía de Cámara*, 497A. Sevilla.
- SANTILLAN, HERNANDO DE
1950 Relación del origen, descendencia, política y gouierno de los incas. In *Tres relaciones peruanas*, Editorial Guaranía: 43–131. Asunción.
- SANTO TOMAS, DOMINGO DE
1951a Gramática o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los reynos del Peru [1560]. Lima.
1951b Léxico o vocabulario de la lengua general del Perú [1560]. Lima.
- SCHAEDEL, RICHARD P.
1951 Major Ceremonial and Population Centers in Northern Peru. In *The Civilization of Ancient America, Selected Papers, XXIX International Congress of Americanists*: 232–43. Chicago.

CURRENT RESEARCH AND PROSPECTS IN ANDEAN ETHNOHISTORY

- 1957 Informe general. In *Arqueología Chilena*: 5–42. Santiago.
- 1966 Incipient Urbanization and Secularization in Tiahuanacoïd Peru. *American Antiquity*, 31: 338–44.
- SMITH, C. T.
 1970 The Depopulation of the Central Andes in the 16th Century; the Province of Chucuito. *Current Anthropology*, in press.
- TEMPLE, ELLA DUNBAR
 1937–40 La descendencia de Huaina Capac. *Revista Histórica*, vols. XI, XII, XIII and 1948 XVII. Lima.
 1943 Los caciques Apolaya. Imprenta del Museo Nacional. Lima.
 1959 Historia del Perú—Instituciones Incas. Mimeographed text, University of San Marcos. Lima.
- THOMPSON, DONALD E. AND JOHN V. MURRA
 1966 The Inca Bridges in the Huánuco Region. *American Antiquity* 31: 632–39.
- THRUPP, SYLVIA L. AND ERIC R. WOLF (EDS.)
 Comparative Studies in Society and History. A Quarterly. Cambridge University Press.
- TOLEDO, FRANCISCO DE
 1924 Libro de la vista general. *Revista Histórica*, 7: 115–216. Lima.
- TRIMBORN, HERMANN (ED.)
 1936 Quellen zur Kulturgeschichte des praekolumbischen Amerika. Stuttgart.
- TRIMBORN, HERMANN
 1939 Daemonen und Zauber im Inkareich. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Geographie und Voelkerkunde, 4. Leipzig.
 1948 Ritos desconocidos de Huarochirí. *Actas y memorias, Sociedad Española de Antropología, Etnografía y Prehistoria*, 23: 186–95. Madrid.
 1951 Die Erotik in den Mythen von Huarochirí. *Jahrbuch, Linden Museum*: 131–4.
 1953 El motivo explanatorio en los mitos de Huarochirí. *Letras* 49: 135–46. Lima.
 1960 Mehrfaeltige Goetter in den Mythen von Huarochirí. *Ethnologica, Neue Folge*, 2: 548–51. Koeln.
- TRIMBORN, H. and A. KELM
 1967 Francisco de Avila. Gebrueder Mann. Berlin.
- UGARTE Y UGARTE, EDUARDO L.
 1966 Los caciques de Chucuito y Arequipa contra la perpetuidad de la encomienda [1562]. *Hombre y Mundo*, 1: 30–50. Arequipa.
- URIOSTE, JORGE
 Sons of Pariacaca. Myth and Cult in Huarochirí. Mimeographed version, Cornell University, 1969.
- VALCARCEL, LUIS E.
 1959 Etnohistoria del Perú antiguo. Lima.
- VARGAS, JOSE MARIA
 1937 Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás, defensor y apóstol de los indios del Perú; su vida y escritos. Quito.
- VARGAS UGARTE, RUBEN
 1935 Manuscritos peruanos en las bibliotecas del extranjero (Biblioteca Peruana, 1). Lima.

Latin American Research Review

- 1938 Manuscritos peruanos en el Archivo de Indias (Biblioteca Peruana, 2). Lima.
1959 Manual de estudios peruanos. Fifth ed. Lima.
- VESCELIUS, GARY
Unpublished studies in the archeology of southernmost Peru.
- VILLAR CORDOVA, SOCRATES
1966 La institución del yanacona en el Incanato [1958]. Nueva Corónica, fasc. 1. Lima.
- WACHTEL, NATHAN
1966 Structuralisme et histoire: à propos de l'organisation sociale de Cuzco. *Annales*, 21: 71–94. Paris.
1968 La vision des vaincus. 2 vols. Thèse de troisième cycle, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. Paris.
Studies of Sayri Thupa's Will. Unpublished.
- WEDIN, AKE
1963 La cronología de la historia incaica. Madrid.
1965 El sistema decimal en el imperio incaico. Madrid.
1966 El concepto de lo incaico y las fuentes. Gotheborg, Sweden.
- WILLEY, GORDON R.
1962 The Early Great Styles and the Rise of the Pre-Columbian Civilizations. *American Anthropologist*, 64: 1–14.
- WITTFOGEL, KARL
1957 *Oriental Despotism, a Comparative Study of Total Power*. New Haven.
- ZUIDEMA, R. T.
1964 The Ceque System of Cuzco; The Social Organization of the Capital of the Inca. Leiden.
1965a American Social Systems and their Mutual Similarity. *Bijdragen, tot de taal-, land-, en volkenkunde*, 121: 103–119.
1965b Review of Brundage's *Empire of the Inca*. *American Anthropologist*, 67: 176–77.
1966 "A Reply to Brundage." *American Anthropologist*, 68: 231–32.
1968 A Visit to God. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land-, en volkenkunde*, 124: 22–39.