

Chapter 2

The *Estado* as a Proto-State Polity

Tom D. Dillehay

Scholarly Considerations of Polity/State Formation

Several scholars have recently emphasized the social and strategic importance of ancient states or polities as foci for the emergence and growth of bureaucratic institutions, intra- and interregional interaction, as frameworks for the expansion of long-distance exchange, large-scale public ceremony, corporate labor projects, craft production and so forth, and as filters for the dissemination of new consumptive values and codes of conduct (e.g., Flannery and Marcus 2012; Feinman and Marcus 1998; Liu 2003; Spencer 2010; Wright and Jonson 1975; Yoffee 2005). Other discussions have traced the inception of state development by examining the appropriation of material resources by local elites (e.g., Blanton and Fargher 2008; Feinman and Marcus 1998; Grinin et al. 2004; Liu and Chen 2003; Stanish 2003). And others have studied how large-scale political and economic transformations had their roots in alterations of the social and physical landscapes (e.g., Carnerio 1970; Millaire 2010; Kolata 2004). A multitude of different empirical and conceptual approaches have enhanced understanding of the transition from advanced “chiefly” polities to early states (Feinman and Marcus 1998; Spencer 1987, 2010), and for new exploratory approaches to the rise and meaning of ancient states. There also has been debate regarding the scale of ancient states and the nature of the political relationships through which they were developed and maintained. Some scholars have studied the diversity in political organization rather than focusing on a singular structure (e.g., Blanton et al. 1996; Migdal 2001; Murray 2011; Kolata 2013).

While these foci have produced important results, two key problems persist (e.g., Yoffee 2005): (1) a reliance on societal typologies that can inhibit investigation of political dynamism, especially the practices, institutions, and symbols through which states were formed, maintained, and transformed; and (2) inadequate consideration of factors that limited societal integration, especially how intrasocietal and intersocietal conflicts both shaped and undermined state formation. Functionalist

T. D. Dillehay (✉)

Department of Anthropology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA
e-mail: tom.d.dillehay@vanderbilt.edu

and systems-oriented approaches have long dominated the processualist literature and served as the default approach to studies of state formation (Fried 1986; Spencer 2010; Wright 1998; Yoffee 2005). This approach entailed the emergence of the state as an integrative “solution” to problems (e.g., in response to scalar stress, invasion by outsiders, management of information, material, labor, etc.) rather than as an emergent property of domination, hegemony, or other processes of power (Gramsci 1971; Scott 1998, 2001; Kolata 2013).

Ancient states generally have been associated with an image of power as a “thing”—one that was concentrated in the beginnings of a differentiated administrative apparatus and the top echelons of the ruling regime, from which it spread outward across distant lands, and downward into the lives of people (c.f., Spencer 2010; Wright 1998). This perception has examined how power and authority were initially allocated, relegated, shared, delegated, and worked to constitute distinctive, yet complementary administrative spaces and how, conversely, the arrangement of autonomous peoples was organizationally integrated into the state apparatus to generate effective power. That is, the idea of state formation was perceived as the effect of coordinating the multiple practices of intergroup or collective action, organizing different administrative levels and populations, marking and policing boundaries, dividing territories, role-sharing, collecting tribute, organizing large-scale projects, and so forth (cf., Millaire 2010; Moseley 1992; Scott and Bhatt 2001; Spencer 2010). Scholarly attention to these practices has kept the research focused on “how” questions: How different spaces were constituted as authoritative and powerful, how different agents were assembled and identified with specific roles and powers, how different yet complementary domains were constituted as administrable, and how these different entities operated together. Although these foci have been important venues of research, they have not always answered questions of why different polities and peoples failed or succeeded in working together, why certain practices and roles positioned certain territories or peoples as subjects with variable capacities for collective action and outcomes during different stages of polity formation, and why some polities were noncentralized and others centralized. Whether early or late in time, the process of incipient state formation seems to have been elucidated through both long- and short-term patterns of continuity, interaction, and integration and through the material practices through which agency, identity, and leadership and subject roles were constituted (Kenoyer 2008; Liu 2003; Rothman 2001; Scott and Bhatt 2001). Of particular interest for the Araucanian case is how and why specific new territories were incorporated and organizationally integrated by higher forms of authority to solve a collective problem, that was, how to keep the Spanish out of their homeland.

Thinking more specifically in terms of integration and organization, some recent research has viewed pre-state “chiefdoms” (or intermediate-level societies) supporting and organizing themselves through the mobilization of surplus resources within their territory and the management of a political economy (e.g., Kirch 1984; Feinman and Nicholas 2004; cf., Feinman and Marcus 1998), one without specialized administrative duties (i.e., Wright 1977; Herzfeld 1992). In less complex proto-state societies, such as the Araucanians, major political and economic roles were

allocated on an ascriptive basis and the division of labor was usually noncentralized, unspecialized, and based on family and patrilineal kin units (Dillehay 1976, 2007). Most early states, on the other hand, were societies with a centralized and internally specialized administrative structure. A centralized authority developed in order to bring relatively autonomous subsystems within the contours of a larger institutionalized administrative system. In this type of arrangement, the central decision-making process was divided into separate functions that were performed by a variety of bureaucratic specialists, usually organized into a hierarchy. Most states thus delegated partial authority to subjects (Spencer 1990), which gave them the potential to intervene into local affairs, finance themselves with a variety of extractive techniques, and to expand their political and economic territory beyond the spatial limits generally associated with chiefdoms (Spencer 2010). From this general perspective, the shift from chiefdom to state societies is partly defined by a shift in administrative principles and regulatory strategies (cf., Scott 1999; Kirch 1984; Yoffee 2005), which includes the delegation of authority to the lower tiers of the administration.

By extension, it is inferred that the success of many ancient states was partly linked to the onset of bureaucratic governance, specialized roles among its composite subsystems, and the relegation of authority to achieve specific tasks (e.g., Topic 2003). Such an administrative system could not form without leaders' and followers' solving a collective-action problem, such as choices made in the emergence of political complexity and threats from outside forces (cf., Lichbach 1996; Cioffi-Revilla and Starr 1995; Starr 1978; Von der Muhll 2003). Among these and other circumstances, increased complexity, stress, and external threats could bring together multiple polities under the same umbrella to unite for or against a particular cause (Renfrew 1986; Yoffee 1995). These different units also could share the same ideological and cultural framework, with symbols that signify their common identity, as was the case among the four domains forming the composite Araucanian *Estado* (Zavala 2000; Rosales [1674] 1989; Bengoa 2003; Dillehay 2007).

In sum, several different perspectives of state development are available in the literature and focus on a multitude of different variables and interpretative scenarios. The primary focus in this study is the Purén domain and its integrative political role within the *Estado*. Set within the scholarly context discussed above and within the available historical and archaeological evidence, the emphasis here is more on the political cohesiveness and obligation, social reciprocity, cultural materiality, and administrative structure of the Purén domain and the Araucanian polity and less on political economy, territorial expansion, land use, and political symbolism.

The Matter of State in the Andes

Explaining early state formation has proven to be a difficult and contentious task for scholars working in the Andes. Until recently, most models of the Andean state formation have generally classified state-level polities as representative of one of two

types: centralized or decentralized. Centralized, territorial, or macro-state models describe geographically large, stable, and tightly integrated political units (Trigger 2007; cf., Haas et al. 1987; Moseley 1992; D'Altroy 2003; Isbell and McEwan 1991; Netherley 1993; Kolata 2004). While differing in details, a central tenet of these models is that rulers usurped the responsibilities of subordinated groups, usually through military conquest or coercive hegemonic processes. To manage newly integrated states, rulers developed specialized administrative bureaucracies that represented a qualitative departure from earlier forms of chiefdom-level political organization (Stanish 2004; Topic 2003). In the Andes, the Moche, Wari, Tiwanaku, Chimú, and Inca societies have been cited as examples of centralized states. In contrast, decentralized models, describing peer polities, segmentary states, and city-states, generally propose that early states were territorially small yet politically centralized (cf., Haas 1982; Moseley 1992; Shady 2001). A pseudo-segmentary state model has been applied implicitly in various areas of the Andes (e.g., Moche; Castillo and Uceda 2008). This model generally proposes that rulers were an additional layer in a redundant political and economic hierarchy partitioned yet unified through politically charged ritual practices, kinship, and land-use practices. City-state models emphasize spatial relationships among a network of small urban centers and rural hinterlands linked through a primary city, rather than focusing on a specific expansive form of political organization (see Moseley and Cordy-Collins 1990; Kolata 1999, 2013; Bauer 2004).

Other studies have sought to reconcile traditional models of state formation by theorizing cycling between different forms of political organization (Dillehay and Kolata 2004; Conlee et al. 2004; Janusek 2004). Similarly for Mesoamerica, Marcus' (1998) "dynamic model" asserts that episodes of large-scale political integration and episodes of political disintegration were "different stages in the dynamic cycles of the same state" (Marcus 1998). She argues that political cycles followed a standard pattern such that the earliest states in a region were geographically large, with hinterland areas tightly integrated into a regional bureaucracy and controlled by rulers of a political seat. Although not yet explicitly applied to the Andes, this model is valuable for its recognition of political instability and its diachronic perspective (e.g., Stanish 2001, 2003, 2004).

Another approach is the "dual-processual" model of Blanton and colleagues (Blanton et al. 1996), which includes network and corporate strategies. This model focuses on the means of obtaining and retaining leadership authority rather than on the scale and type of integration. In the network leadership strategy, personal or group access to valued goods and esoteric knowledge from external sources enabled the development of local political authority and economic prominence. Inequality and authority were legitimized through an exclusionary ideology emphasizing kinship ties. States with political authority based on network leadership were often decentralized; they tended to be small scale and unstable because faction leaders constantly competed for adherents. In contrast, corporate leadership strategies focused on the control of local resources and infrastructure while limiting expressions of hierarchy. This leadership emphasized collective affiliation through shared ritual, centralized management of staple food production and distribution, and promulgation

of a moral code emphasizing social inclusion. States with political authority based on a corporate strategy were often centralized; they tended to be larger in scale because leaders overcame the factionalism inherent in the network strategy. Aspects of this model have been applied to different areas of the Andes (see Dillehay 2007).

A weakness of these models is that they employ a dichotomizing vocabulary that lends itself more to classification than to analysis of the dynamic practices, institutions, and symbols through which polities were formed, maintained, and transformed. The emphasis on classification often leaves little interpretive space for political agency and behavioral practices that do not fall near one or another of the models' predefined poles. A binary vocabulary also encourages researchers to categorize a particular archaeological case as centralized/corporate or decentralized/network without considering other data that might provide a more nuanced examination of past political, economic, and social organizations. These models also encourage researchers to treat polities as homogeneous historical "moments" rather than dynamic social phenomena that may have changed considerably from inception to collapse (*sensu* Marcus 1998). Even the cycling models focus on changes from one type of political organization to another rather than fully considering transformations in the practices, institutions, and symbols through which polities developed. In addition, there is little consideration of what political behavior might look like in the interstices between centralized/corporate and decentralized/network and how these novel forms might have developed. Furthermore, the ways that various forms of political organization were structured by and how they structured individual and community lifeways are often overlooked, contributing to a lopsided view that emphasizes the centrality of political institutions. This is often done at the expense of examining how social acts, social institutions, and the internal units making up the polity can contribute to the constitution of particular forms of political organization. Although these models have their limitations, they have been useful in forwarding our understanding of Andean states. Nonetheless, we still need to rethink some of the fundamental assumptions about the fate of the different groups forming states and realize that the hybridity and syncretism they produced led to new social landscapes within them. Not yet fully conceived are the kinds of repercussions these new landscapes had for polity integration, centralization, assimilation, and control. These are concerns most relevant to the social and demographic mixing historically described for the different Araucanian groups not only fragmented by turbulence and loss due to the war with the Spanish but also reconstituted with more stable groups to form the *Estado*.

As a south-central Andean society and culture (Dillehay 2007), the Araucanian *Estado* or polity is a good comparative case for several of the issues and models discussed above because it does not fully conform to the expectations of any of them. The nuances of political integration and potential limits to it in the changing Araucanian landscape of the late sixteenth to early seventeenth centuries are evident from Spanish written records concerning large-scale public events, where local and regional affiliations were constantly developed and changed (see Chapter 3). Evidence pertaining to ways in which common folk in hinterland communities acted semi-independently of, or in opposition to, local and nonlocal political leaders also

are documented (Bengoa 2003; Dillehay 2007; Zavala 2008). The regional diversity recorded in community structures, ceremonial actions, social valuables, commensal feasting, and long-distance contacts (Zavala and Dillehay 2010; Dillehay and Zavala 2013) suggests both strong and weak integration and a degree of independence by some populations, as noted earlier for the shifting alliances of *indios amigos* and *indios enemigos*. In contrast, there also was emulation of certain architectural mound styles and public ceremonial sites in some areas, which suggests social or ritual identities with leading politico-religious nodes (cf., Janusek 2008), particularly those in the Purén and Lumaco Valley (Dillehay 2007). Practices such as the construction of *rehuekuel* ceremonial spaces, and the rituals carried out in these spaces, created shared experiences uniting large groups of diverse populations with each other and with the leaders and/or sponsors of these actions. These ritual and other public acts were inclusionary, generating notions that particular individual war leaders and patrilineages were exceptional, powerful, legitimate, and authoritative, further demarcating the unique status and identity of areas like the four domains of the *Estado*, while also heightening social hierarchies and producing a variety of social and demographic repercussions and archaeological material expressions.

Political Authority and Legitimacy

A commonality among models of ancient states is that political authority is the tool through which rulers led; it can be defined as “the power to direct others, and the recognition of the legitimacy of these commands” (Smith 2003, p. 108). Legitimacy is the ability of a group (usually elites) to synchronize its interests with the interests of the common people in order to persuade subjects to follow them (e.g., Smith 2003, p. 108; Goldstone and Haldon 2009). That is, both commoners and elites are able to exact power in varying degrees in order to influence how society and politics were created and changed. In these definitions, anyone can have agency within the political sphere. These points are important to the Araucanian case because they focus on the political agency of both nonelites and elites and consider the changing strategies designed by a society at large to achieve its political goals.

Political authority for Araucanian leaders rested, in a large part, on patrilineal dynasties that had varying control over the political, economic, ideological, and social dimensions of their different *lof* and *regua* communities (Bengoa 2003; Dillehay 1992a, b, c; Faron 1962; Zavala 2008). The degree of political centralization of these communities is the problematic part. As discussed in Chapter 1, political organization of the *Estado* was comprised of locally centralized patrilineages that were constantly changing their organization in order to maintain authority. These fluctuations sometimes involved the banding together of different communities (either through coercion or cooperation) to create higher levels of regional organization that had specific geopolitical nodes such as the *ayllaregua* of Purén, Tucapel, Angol, and Arauco or the interregional organization of the *butanmapu* (Zavala 2008; Zavala and Dillehay 2010). These nodes served as the catalysts of the increasingly expanded

political administration that had its roots and authority in the leadership structure of local patrilineages and in the administrative organization of large-scale public religious ceremonies (e.g., *coyantuns*, *cahuins*, *borracheras*, and *nguillatuns*).

To take this connection between ceremony and political administration a step further, in his study of the “symbolic roots of western bureaucracy,” the anthropologist Herzfeld suggests that the development from ritual to secular administration of control was a trait of both ancient and modern societies. His idea is that both public ritual and administrative control were founded on a set of shared beliefs, identities, and ideals between leaders and followers that solidified their social arrangements, molded political change into their daily routines and enduring institutions, and created impersonal roles and functions between them. He argued that all forms of administrative behavior are directly analogous to people’s shared identity with participation in collective ritual:

Both [ritual and administration] are founded on the principle of identity: the elect as an exclusive community, whose members’ individual sins cannot undermine the ultimate perfection of the ideal they all share. Both posit a direct identification between the community of believers and the unity of that ideal... We may view the continual reaffirmation of transcendent identity as an effect of some bureaucratic labour. The labour itself is highly ritualistic: forms, symbols, texts, sanctions, obeisance.... (Herzfeld 1992, pp. 20, 47).

We can apply elements of this observation by exploring how particular patriarchal administrative procedures of the Araucanians arose through the extension of traditional ritual control over public ceremony to administering the war, recruiting new alliances at public events, organizing community labor and increased food surplus, and sustaining the linkage between powerful ancestors in the world of the living who legitimized the beliefs and practices of their descendents. In the long run, the administrative side of Araucanian polity formation was the translation of ritual authority at local gatherings into durable forms of institutional, political, and economic power. This eventually centered upon the establishment of dominance over increasingly larger scales of intercommunity labor and participation in larger gatherings, both of which were focused on defense of the ethnic territory (see Zavala 2008; Dillehay 2007).

Organizing a more aggregated and purposive labor effort among communities for public projects was a major enterprise of the new administration. Many of the technologies upon which new modes of warfare and organizational structures of agrarian production were based—such as defensive networks, intensive irrigation agriculture, and the expanded construction of raised agricultural fields in wetlands—imposed a new and more complex division of labor upon the workforce (Dillehay 2010). Prior to the arrival of the Spanish, it was probable that most public labor projects related to the preparation and administration of public ceremonies (Rosales [1674] 1989; Dillehay 2007). This experience provided the institutional foundation for administering even larger projects such as the collective action of warfare, mass food production, and the infrastructure of this production system (i.e., canals, raised agricultural fields, road networks). These circumstances must have created an unprecedented social and cognitive distance between the production of utilitarian commodities (e.g., pottery, clothing, and ordinary household tools) and

their deployment in wider and more diverse interactions among nonlocal leaders of the *regua* and *ayllaregua* and different groups of commonfolk labor forces. As developed in later chapters, it seems that this distance also likely created the need for more standardization and simplicity of utilitarian goods in order to accommodate more rapid and widespread socioeconomic integration among different leaders and commoners. In this regard, like any state or polity, the Araucanian society was becoming more internally differentiated and hierarchically organized, the integrity of which was identified, celebrated, and reinforced in larger public rituals, more labor projects, and commensal politics. It was within this growing complexity that I believe many forms of administration, including the enhancement, if not creation, of ritual specialists (i.e., shamans, priests, ceremonial stewards), evolved for more intergroup cohesiveness and public gatherings. These events required more labor and preparation of food and drink than before, because they lasted for several days and were attended by larger numbers of people, especially warriors who would display the items they had taken from Spaniards killed and recount tales of success in battle. (It was during these occasions that warriors gained great prestige among their peers and the population at large (Leiva 1977; Alvarado 1996).) The size of some of these ceremonies and their social implications are revealed by quotes from two chroniclers, Quiroga and Rosales, both writing in the 1600s:

They celebrate in designated places, pleasant and cool...because some lineages invite others and seven or eight thousand souls come together (Quiroga [1690] 1979, p. 22).

And the head *toquis* or the highest-ranking caciques ordinarily summon everyone in the land to these feasts. And during some of these they have, in addition to their dances, their entertainments in which they represent different figure and in others men and women exchange clothing. They also hold other feasts called *Guicha-boqui* in which they set up a tree in the center of the circle of poles with four [ropes] hanging from it adorned with different colored wool yarn which are held so that all the relatives of the one offering the feast may dance who, since he is the lord of the land, calls forth all the nobility who live therein.... And in the top of the tree which is always a cinnamon tree at all the feasts the place the son of the highest-ranking *cacique* or *toqui* who sponsors the feast...and he is adorned with lances and stones as all the nobility tell it.... Referring to the high-ranking personages from their lineage who have died in past years and giving their blessing to the living who are present.... The most solemn feast is the one convoked by the *boquibuyes*, who are the priests of the Devil, may they leave their prison and abandon their habit. For this [feast] they not only summon their relatives to bring them *chicha* and meat but also [they call on] their allies from far away who are not obligated to this service and require from them *sheep of the land* [llama] which are the most greatly esteemed. And although at other drinking feasts, they only kill one or another because of the esteem they have for them. But at this drinking feast they kill all [the animals] the *Cullas*, as they call these friends, and bring them there. And there is a great feast and dance, which lasts ten or twelve days (Rosales [1674] 1989, pp. 141–142).

In summary, public feasting and ceremony in sacred places were extremely important to the war effort because it brought together different groups to reiterate their commitment to the defense of their lands, to continue to link the living and the ancestral dead, and to reenforce and legitimize the power and authority of *toqui* war leaders and their ancestral lineages (Dillehay 2007). The coordinated administration of different communities to engage in and to support the war grew from the deeply rooted experience of identifying with and organizing such events.

Ancestral and Ritual Authority

From the initial stages of development of the Araucanian polity, linkages between the living and the dead had both private and public aspects, involving ritual techniques such as the dedication of ancestor images (Faron 1962; Foerster 1993) as well as the increased construction of functioning and highly visible ceremonial mounds at various points within the landscapes of the ancestral dead (e.g., *kuel*, *rehuekuel*; Dillehay 1985, 1992a, b, c, 2007). The elaboration of these sacred landscapes represents a structural shift in ritual behavior that accompanied the early polity. Mounds existed prior to the arrival of the Spanish but were smaller, fewer in number, and associated with geographically-limited intermediate-level societies. As discussed in Chapter 7, mound building seems to have increased significantly in the sixteenth century certainly in large part as a response to war and the need for the commensal feasting to establish and maintain alliances, recruit warriors, and gain community support. This change had to have been centered upon the adoption of a more enhanced public system of ritual practices and labor efforts, and, especially from an archaeological perspective, a more widespread and intensified shift from underground to aboveground mound burial of important leaders who became ancestors revered in public ceremony. Aboveground burial would have extended the spiritual and physical needs of the living by bringing important dead, especially *toqui* war leaders, more visibly into the time and space of the living. This expanded system of aboveground burial and display is also considered to be a form of memorial funerary display, based upon the placement of the corpse and its tomb and offerings before the visible ceremonial world of the living (Dillehay 1985). This new practice was to keep the ancestors in the world of the living as recipients of ritual offerings and care from the living (Dillehay 2007). This practice was subsequently extended to all living and ancestral parts of society through public ceremony at mounds and remained a cornerstone of political power down to the present-day time in areas of the Purén and Lumaco Valley. The resulting, open-ended relationship between the living and the dead and the social construction of memorial landscapes of ancestors provided the Araucanians with an enhanced ritually based ideological framework for extracting labor for public projects on an unprecedented scale. Other extractive frameworks were the architectural elements of ritual nodes at the mound complexes (*rehuekuel*), agricultural systems, road networks, and defensive locales, all having become parts of an equally more enhanced administrative system designed to employ warrior labor for fighting and both male and female labor for additional food production (see Bengoa 2003).

To the Araucanians, ancestral rites and burial expressions also were (and still are) important to group perpetuity and intergenerational solidarity (see Faron 1962 on ancestors). Although not well understood, aboveground public funerary rites at *kuel* mounds were probably first formulated in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, as evidenced by archaeology (Dillehay 2007), when more fluid social relations probably existed between local communities and their territorial neighbors in terms of marriage exchange. A common aim of these strategies must have been to redefine

exchange interactions with and, at times, stronger relations between kin and non-kin groups, conceived in cosmological terms and centered upon the persona of the patrilineal leader(s) and upon patrilocality. During the early contact period, the new spaces created by these interactions were increasingly filled by an ideology of the “other” (Boccaro 1999, 2000; Zavala 2008), which can be seen taking shape in the display of trophy heads of Spanish captives by warriors and of restricted artifact types, such as ceremonial vessels, textiles and other objects, and in the increased construction of ceremonial nodes in the form of the *rehuekuel* mound complexes. The legitimation of power at these nodes must have progressed in step with a monopoly by some leaders over local and regional recruitment, labor, and exchange, which furnished leaders with techniques of domination ranging from new methods of warfare (eventual use of the horse and metal weapons) to new modes of consumption and meaning, including the display of trophy heads and other foreign objects during public ritual to redefine patterns of warriorhood and to gain social prestige (Leiva 1977; Alvarado 1996).

It was within these newly structured and larger ceremonial settings, which are mentioned repeatedly by all chroniclers (see Chapter 3), that local community labor must have shifted to food surplus and building infrastructure for defense, a condition, which, I submit, led to a decrease in the elaborateness of the material culture for purpose of establishing intergroup familiarity and thus cohesiveness. That is, the material culture of the Araucanians became more homogenized and minimalized stylistically, and certain classes of artifacts (i.e., ceramics, *kuel*, ceremonial fields) and other symbols were decontextualized and recontextualized for the purpose of standardization and familiarity to different communities now participating in more widely dispersed public acts. The standardized ritual *kuel* and ceremonial fields thus provided familiarity and legibility across a wide variety of domestic and public locales which meant easier administrative control. The logic of this framework seems inescapable, but flowing beneath its surface are assumptions about warriorhood, personhood, and kinship and their potential as a wider symbolic framework for the long-term political organization of the polity during the Arauco War. As I have discussed before and as presented by shamans in present-day healing rituals at *kuel* ceremonial fields, *kuel* took the form of culturally constructed and reproduced “kinsmen” capable of transcending both life and death, the boundaries of which were presented as coterminous with those of the habitable world of the living kin (Dillehay 2007). The *kuel*, the spirit body of a deity or an ancestral ruler, provided a material core, a sacred place, from which emanated further mechanisms and structures of control over people, households, land, goods, and the dead.

Simply put, public ceremony came to dominate the society during the war years. Leaders employed its context to recruit followers, labor for public projects, strengthen their power and authority, and threaten those leaders and communities pondering whether to join the Spanish cause. The preparation of these ceremonies and their size were impressive, often requiring weeks or months of planning for thousands of attendees. These events were interwoven with requirements for followers to contribute to leader-sponsored labor projects, which also is the case today

The Teleoscopic Polity

Andean Patriarchy and Materiality

Dillehay, T.D.

2014, XXVII, 388 p. 102 illus., 60 illus. in color.,

Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-03127-9