

THE ROLE OF CHINCHA IN LATE PRE-SPANISH PERU

Dorothy Menzel and John H. Rowe

The Chincha Valley is the largest valley on the south coast of Peru.¹ Many years ago Max Uhle propounded a theory that, before the Inca conquest, the cultural influence of Chincha was very extensive, covering large parts of southern Peru and reaching into Bolivia, Chile and Argentina. In support of this theory, Uhle referred to historical sources and claimed that he could see influences of the Chincha pottery style in different local styles over this entire area and even in the Inca style of Cuzco.² Although archaeologists have long recognized that Uhle's theory involved a great exaggeration of Chincha influence, echoes of the theory are still heard, and the situation will not be clear until we determine what, in fact, the role of Chincha was in late pre-Spanish Peru.³ There is both historical and archaeological evidence not available to Uhle which can be brought to bear on this problem. The historical evidence consists of scattered reference to Chincha in 16th and 17th century Spanish sources, very inadequately utilized heretofore. The archaeological evidence includes pottery and sites with monumental architecture. In interpreting the pottery evidence it is essential to be able to distinguish Chincha pottery from that of neighboring areas. It is particularly important to be able to distinguish Chincha pottery from that of Ica, because Uhle systematically confused these two local styles. The Ica style has now been studied in sufficient detail so that there is a good basis for comparison.⁴

Uhle made only a generalized reference to the historical sources, saying that "old Spanish historians" speak of an "alliance between the Chinchas and the Chancas of the province of Vilcashuamán; of the wars of these two nations against Cuzco, whose existence, as a result, was threatened more than once."⁵ We can find no record of any such statements in the 16th and 17th century Spanish sources. Uhle's only specific reference is to Fernando de Montesinos, who, he says, is the only chronicler who mentions the military expeditions made by the Chinchas as far as the country of the Chiriguano.⁶ Uhle gives no chapter or page reference, but the only passage he could have meant is one in which Montesinos speaks of military raids by the Chancas.⁷ Neither in this passage nor in any other does Montesinos say that the Chinchas were also involved. Perhaps Uhle was quoting from memory and had forgotten what the passages actually said.

There is, however, some historical basis for Uhle's impression that Chincha was a military power before the Inca conquest. The basis lies in the traditions of the Chinchas themselves as recorded by Pedro de Cieza de León. Cieza, who wrote in 1550 and 1553, probably derived his information on Chincha from Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás, the Dominican who established the first Christian

mission station at Chincha. At any rate, Cieza refers to Domingo de Santo Thomás as one of his principal informants.

According to Cieza, the Chinchas said that they were intruders who had conquered the valley with the aid of an oracle called in the Inca language *Chincha-kama* (Chincha creator). The valley rapidly grew populous, and the people of neighboring valleys sought to ally themselves with the Chinchas. The Chinchas used their new power to mount raids for plunder against the sierra provinces to the east of them, doing great damage in Rucanas and Soras and penetrating as far as the Collas, northwest of Lake Titicaca. This raiding was supposed to have taken place when the Incas were engaged in founding Cuzco, before they began their career of conquest.⁹

The Chincha traditions of successful raiding were not accompanied by any claim that Chincha had governed an empire, however. Fray Cristóbal de Castro, a later worker at the Chincha mission established by Domingo de Santo Tomás, reported in 1558 that according to local tradition the valleys of Huarco (modern Cañete), Chincha and Ica each had its own lord and government, while the people of Chincha lived in a state of chronic warfare with their neighbors.¹⁰ It is worth noting that the valley of Zangalla (Pisco), Chincha's closest neighbor, is not mentioned in the list of independent valleys.

Let us now turn to the archaeological evidence relating to Chincha. Much of the evidence available is contained in the Uhle collections at the Robert H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology at Berkeley; some additional data used here are from a surface survey conducted by Dwight T. Wallace in 1957-58.¹¹ The Uhle collections derive from cemeteries in the vicinity of the principal group of ruins in the Chincha Valley, that around the Huaca La Centinela. The pottery from these cemeteries falls into two contrasting stylistic groups. A. L. Kroeber and W. D. Strong, who studied the Uhle collections from Chincha in 1922-23, called one of these groups Late Chincha I and the other Late Chincha II and Inca.¹² We propose to call them the Chincha style and the post-Chincha assemblage, respectively. The Chincha style represents the native Chincha tradition, whereas the post-Chincha assemblage consists chiefly of vessels in a variety of styles of foreign origin, among which there is a considerable number of provincial Inca style vessels.

The segment of the Chincha style represented by the Uhle collections dates at least in part to the period of Inca rule, for one of the burials found by Uhle contained two Inca style vessels, and two contained imitations of Ica pottery of the phase that appears in association with Inca influence at Ica.¹³ The post-Chincha assemblage should also date at least in part to the period of Inca rule because of the provincial Inca style vessels it includes. Some of the burials containing pottery of the post-Chincha assemblage also contain Venetian glass beads or other European objects, however, so it is evident that the post-Chincha assemblage persisted into the early Colonial Period. The stylistic division between the Chincha style and the post-Chincha assemblage therefore does not coincide either with the beginning of

Inca rule or with the Spanish conquest but falls somewhere in the period of Inca domination.

Chincha style pottery represents an entirely different stylistic tradition from that of Ica with which Uhle confused it. Most of the Chincha pottery shapes, the paste, pigmentation, and one of the two major design categories are unrelated to the tradition of Ica.¹⁴ Uhle and the later writers who treated the pottery of Chincha and Ica as a single style did so because they were particularly struck by one kind of decoration, found on about one third of the fancy ware of Chincha, which represents an imitation of features of the Ica design tradition in distinctive Chincha patterns.¹⁵ The Ica design features that are imitated are ones attributable to Phases 5 through 8 or 9 of the Ica sequence; that is, they represent the four Ica phases preceding the Inca conquest and perhaps also the one dating to the period of Inca rule. These Ica features occur together at Chincha, being found on the same vessels and in the same burials; they constitute survivals of a series of earlier Ica influences.

Apart from the design features just discussed, the Chincha pottery style had closer relations with the north than with Ica. Most of the common Chincha vessel shapes, notably jars and flasks, along with the figurines, resemble very closely the corresponding pottery of Cañete and, less closely, that of the central coast. The resemblances extend to the valley of Chancay, north of Lima. There are also significant northern resemblances in pigmentation, paste and firing.¹⁶ Despite the resemblances, however, the Chincha style is largely distinguishable from that of Cañete. It is a sufficiently distinctive style so that it should not be treated as a mere variant on any other.

The fluctuations in the prestige and power of a given center are best reflected in its influence on other areas and the influences from other areas which it received. In the case of Chincha, the Ica sequence provides a convenient reflection of the shifting patterns of influence.

Ica influence on Chincha decoration is part of a pattern of Ica influence on its neighbors which persisted throughout the Late Intermediate Period, a period of about 575 years preceding the Inca conquest (see the chronological table). In the Late Intermediate Period the Ica Valley was a major center of wealth and prestige, and its art styles influenced those of the nearby valleys from Chincha in the north to Yauca in the south, a distance of some 300 km (186 miles) in a direct line. Ica pottery was traded and imitated to a lesser degree over an even larger area extending north to Ancón on the central coast and into the highlands as far as Hancarama in the Department of Apurímac.¹⁷

During most of the Late Intermediate Period the Chincha style had no comparable influence, and for a long time it remained a purely local style. During the latter half of the Late Intermediate Period, however, the Chincha tradition began to have some influence at Ica. The first traces of such influence are found in Phase 5 of the Ica tradition, probably some 250 or 300 years before the Inca conquest.

Neither in this phase nor in the succeeding one, however, did this influence have a general effect on the Ica style; it took the form of special imitations of the foreign style. In Ica 5 we find new vessel shapes decorated with Ica tradition designs in a new black and white color pattern, the innovations resembling the corresponding Chincha features. The Phase 5 innovations disappeared within a short time and were replaced in Phase 6 by a different kind of Chincha influence, represented by occasional miniature imitations of Chincha vessels, made at Ica and incorporating Ica style features. These miniatures appear to be toys made for amusement. In Ica 7 we can for the first time identify traces of Chincha influence in the decoration of regular Ica style pottery. Then in Ica 8, some time in the early 15th century, there was a dramatic change, and imitation of Chincha became the mode among Ica potters.

The inference to be drawn from the pottery evidence is that there was a shift in the prestige relationship between Chincha and Ica, with Chincha becoming dominant rather suddenly in Ica 8. The evidence does not suggest a conquest followed by direct Chincha rule at Ica, for no imported Chincha pottery has been found anywhere in the Ica Valley. Imperial rule usually involves the introduction of governing officials and garrisons which bring some of their own pottery with them.

The situation in Pisco, the valley which is intermediate between Chincha and Ica, is somewhat different. In Pisco fragments of imported Chincha pottery are present in the refuse, although not in large quantities. The Chincha pottery in question is in the same style as the Chincha style unit of the Uhle collection from Chincha. This situation suggests that there may have been direct Chincha rule at Pisco, with Ica perhaps in a tributary position.

The largest and most impressive architectural remains in the Chincha Valley are buildings of tapia construction which were apparently in use at the time of the Inca conquest, since at least two have Inca construction or refuse associated with them. It is thus reasonable to suppose that they date to the later part of the Late Intermediate Period. The largest and most impressive architectural complex in the valley is the one clustering around La Centinela, with La Cumbe and Huaca de Tambo de Mora nearby.¹⁸ This complex probably represents the Chincha capital; Uhle believed that the oracle of Chincha-kama was probably at La Cumbe.¹⁹ The next largest group of ruins is that of Lurin Chincha. These two centers were connected by a straight road and had other straight roads radiating out from them, separated by uniform angular distances. The roads are quite conspicuous on aerial photographs; they were discovered in 1958 by Dwight T. Wallace.²⁰ A similar pattern of tapia ruins and straight roads occurs in the Caucato section of Pisco, the part nearest to Chincha, but not in the rest of the Pisco Valley. The architectural evidence suggests that there was a highly centralized government in Chincha just before the Inca conquest, and that direct Chincha rule in Pisco may have been confined to one section of that valley.

The agreement between the archaeological evidence and the traditions of Chincha history is very satisfactory, and each complements the other. There was evidently a sudden increase of Chincha power about a century before the Inca conquest, traceable archaeologically at Pisco and Ica. Pisco was brought at least partially under direct Chincha rule, but Ica maintained some degree of independence. Chincha raids into the sierra would be quite expectable under these circumstances. It is not unlikely that archaeological reflections of such raids can be found when survey work is done in that part of the sierra.

The tradition preserved at Chincha regarding the Inca conquest was that the first attack was made in the time of Pachakuti 'Inka Yupanki, but Inca control was definitely established by his successor, Thupa 'Inka.²¹ Pachakuti reigned from about 1438 to about 1471, and Thupa 'Inka reigned from about 1471 to about 1493.²² As the tradition was reported by Cieza de León, Pachakuti sent a military expedition to the coast from the province of Soras. The expedition was under the command of an officer named Qhapaq 'Inka, probably the same person as the Qhapaq Yupanki of Cristóbal de Castro's account, and if so the brother of Pachakuti. The Inca force attacked Chincha and was repulsed. The attack probably took place when Pachakuti was campaigning in Soras, which must have been in the 1440's.

The Incas left Chincha alone thereafter until about 1476, after they had conquered the entire Peruvian sierra and the north coast from Lima to Tumbes. Then Thupa 'Inka invaded the south coast, occupying Acari and Nasca and moving northward to Ica and Chincha. There was no resistance until he reached Huarco (Cafete), where the natives put up a stout defense. Chincha was one of the valleys which surrendered without a fight.²³ In this confrontation the Incas had the advantages of control of the headwaters of the Chincha river, overwhelming force, and much diplomatic experience. It would be in accord with Inca diplomatic policy if the submission of Chincha was procured by the concession of extensive privileges; at any rate, the Spaniards who accompanied Pizarro got the impression that the lord of Chincha was a noble of special prestige and distinction in the Inca system.²⁴

The Inca settlement of the conquered territories grouped the Pisco and Ica valleys in a single province and made Chincha a separate province.²⁵ The capital of the Pisco-Ica province was probably at Zangalla (Lima la Vieja) in Pisco, where there is much more evidence of Inca occupation than at any known site in Ica. This arrangement reduced the local influence of Chincha and placed an Inca administrative center on one of the main roads connecting the coast with the sierra, the road up the Pisco Valley at Huaitará.

In Chincha there is a concentration of Inca structures and pottery around the Huaca La Centinela which indicates that this place, which we have already identified as the Chincha capital, was also the Inca administrative center. Uhle found a cemetery (Site E) on the Pampa de Canelos, a dry terrace overlooking La Centinela, with a number of burials containing locally made pottery in the Inca

style of Cuzco; the Inca style of these vessels is as pure as that of any imitation Inca pottery found on the coast.²⁶ The significance of this fact is difficult to evaluate, since the only other Inca provincial capital where burial associations have been recorded is Pachacamac, and Pachacamac enjoyed a unique privileged position, as will be explained below.

At the time of the Spanish conquest, Chíncha had a notable reputation for wealth in precious metals, especially silver. The members of Pizarro's expedition picked up a report, recorded by Jérez, that the richest mines of precious metals were at Quito and Chíncha.²⁷ Chíncha still had its silversmiths at the end of the 16th century.²⁸ The tombs of Chíncha were particularly rich in gold and silver, and there was extensive looting of pagan burials in the early Colonial Period.²⁹ Even in Uhle's time traces of this wealth remained; some relatively poor Chíncha burials which he recorded were accompanied by metal objects, mostly of silver.³⁰ At Ica, in contrast, metal objects are found only in the richest burials.

Through a curious set of circumstances, Chíncha had a double allegiance during the period it was under Inca rule; it was not only subject to the Inca government but also to the oracle of Pachacamac. This fact requires some explanation of the special position of Pachacamac in the Inca state.

Pachacamac, an ancient religious center on the central coast, was dominated by a powerful oracle. The deity of this oracle was a creator god who was believed to control the crops and punish neglect of his cult by sending earthquakes.³¹ Thupa 'Inka, who incorporated Pachacamac into the Inca Empire about the same time he took Chíncha, made an agreement with the priests of the oracle which left them considerable independence and gave them opportunities for extending the oracle's power and influence. By the terms of the agreement, the oracle of Pachacamac was permitted to establish certain branch oracles presided over by deities who were "sons" of Pachacamac, and one of these oracles was installed at Chíncha.³² Chíncha is the place furthest south for which a branch oracle is mentioned; it is also the place furthest south which sent a mission to Pachacamac at the time of the first Spanish visit to Pachacamac in 1533.³³ The Pachacamac oracle exacted annual contributions ("tribute") from a very extensive section of the Pacific coast; Estete reported that its area of dominance extended as far north as Tacamez (Atacamez) near Esmeraldas, on what is now the coast of Ecuador.³⁴

Chíncha's subordination to Pachacamac in Inca times is clearly reflected in the archaeological record by the central coast contributions to the post-Chíncha assemblage. The variety of foreign styles which constitute the post-Chíncha assemblage includes imitation Cuzco Inca and Chimú pottery, imitation Ica Inca and Ica 9 pottery, and Pachacamac Inca pottery, together with other central coast type vessels of the Late Horizon.³⁵ In the burials from Site E on the Pampa de Canelos, close by La Centinela, this foreign pottery was found virtually to the exclusion of vessels of the local tradition. In burials from other cemeteries pottery of the native Chíncha tradition is only slightly more common.

At Site E, Pachacamac and other central coast type pieces make up a prominent ingredient of the post-Chincha mixture (cf. the following article and its Appendix A, 5.4 and 5.5). Furthermore, the imitation Cuzco Inca pottery from this cemetery resembles so closely imitation Inca forms standardized at Pachacamac that this pottery probably also represents a form of Pachacamac influence (cf. the following article and its Appendix A, 5.3). Pachacamac Inca and other central coast type pottery constitutes 34 percent of all post-Chincha fancy ware and 39 percent of the fancy ware at Site E. If the imitation Inca pottery from the burials is considered as part of Pachacamac influence, vessels showing such influence constitute 76 percent of the fancy ware in the burials from this cemetery; post-Chincha burials from other cemeteries do not contain imitation Cuzco Inca pottery. As noted above, the post-Chincha assemblage apparently developed during the Inca occupation and lasted into the early Colonial Period.

The first contact with the Spanish invaders which Chincha experienced took place early in 1533, when a mission from Chincha travelled to Pachacamac to make peace with Hernando Pizarro, the mission mentioned above. The Spanish occupation of the entire south coast was effected in 1534. Chincha was one of the few provinces not granted to individual Spaniards in encomienda but reserved to the Spanish crown; in consequence, it was governed directly by royal officials from a relatively early date.³⁶ The Dominican monastery and mission which introduced Christianity was established between 1540 and 1542.³⁷ Thus, effective Spanish control was established early in Chincha, as on the central coast; in contrast, the first Christian mission in Ica, a Franciscan effort, was initiated in 1560, and direct Spanish civil government was introduced there in 1563.³⁸

Chincha suffered severely in the Spanish civil wars, particularly in the campaign of 1537 between Pizarro and Almagro.³⁹ The native population declined catastrophically in the half century following the conquest, from over 30,000 heads of households in 1533 to 979 counted in 1583.⁴⁰ The decline was probably a reflection of a combination of epidemics of diseases of European origin, such as measles and smallpox, and famine resulting from the disruption of native organization produced by years of destructive warfare. Severe general epidemics are reported for Peru for 1546 and 1558, and famines occurred in 1539 and 1548.⁴¹ All coast valleys in Peru showed a heavy loss of population in the 16th century, but Chincha was one of the valleys which suffered the most. It is reasonable to suppose that the early Spanish occupation and the early decline of population resulted in an early abandonment of the pagan cemeteries, with consequent interruption of the part of the archaeological record they represented. Converts to Christianity were supposed to be buried in the church or in other consecrated ground.

The contrast with Ica is as clearly marked in the archaeological record as in the historical one. In Chincha the post-Chincha assemblage is the latest unit in the pagan cemeteries. In Ica, after a time in the Late Horizon when the grave lots reflect heavy Inca influence and contain occasional Chimu trade pieces, there was a revival of the native artistic tradition represented by grave lots some of which contain Spanish trade goods. The revival was accompanied by a systematic rejection of Inca features.⁴²

Chincha thus provides a classic example of the concordance of historical and archaeological evidence and of the way in which each can be used to illuminate the other. The conclusions to be drawn from both kinds of evidence are that Chincha enjoyed a brief period of power without empire in the early and middle 15th century, maintained its prestige under the Incas, and declined very rapidly after the Spanish conquest.

Authorship and acknowledgements. In the collaboration which this paper represents, Dorothy Menzel is primarily responsible for the archaeological interpretation. Rowe contributed chiefly some field observations to this side of the study. The historical summary is largely Rowe's work, but Menzel made the crucial discovery that Montesinos did not say what Uhle credited him with saying. The authors extend their thanks to Seth Leacock, who did an earlier study of the Uhle collection from Chincha, and Dwight T. Wallace, whose contribution is acknowledged in the text. An earlier version of this paper was presented by Menzel at the 10th Annual Meeting of the Kroeber Anthropological Society, Berkeley, California, April 30, 1966.

NOTES

¹The Chincha Valley has 22,120 hectares under cultivation today, an area which makes it the sixth largest valley on the Peruvian coast. The larger ones are Lambayeque, Piura, Pacasmayo, Chicama, and Lima. The first four are on the north coast, the fifth is on the central coast (Romero, 1953, p. 96).

²Uhle, 1922, pp. 85-88, 93-95. Cf. also Uhle, 1924, p. 59.

³The reader should consult Kroeber's excellent critique of Uhle's theory: Kroeber, 1944, pp. 16-19.

⁴Menzel, ms.

⁵Uhle, 1922, p. 86.

⁶Uhle, 1922, pp. 86-87.

⁷Montesinos, *Memorias antiguas*, cap. V; 1930, p. 25.

⁸Cieza de León, *Crónica del Perú*, cap. LXI; 1862, p. 414.

⁹Cieza de León, *Crónica del Perú*, cap. LXXIV; 1862, pp. 423-424.

¹⁰Castro and Ortega Morejón, 1936, p. 236.

¹¹Wallace, 1959. The survey was carried out under the auspices of the U. S. Educational Commission in Peru and the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. The collections were deposited in the University of San Marcos Museum in Lima.

- 12Kroeber and Strong, 1924.
- 13Burials C-7 (4-3760), E-1 (4-3903A, 4-3903C; one Inca plate described by Uhle is missing).
- 14See the following article.
- 15Kroeber and Strong, 1924, figs. 6a, b, 7a, pls. 11a, b, d; 12a, b.
- 16Kroeber, 1937, pls. LXXXII-LXXXV; Kroeber, 1926, pls. 80B-F, 81C-G, 82C, E.
- 17Two Ica style vessels from Ancón, found in the same burial, are illustrated by Reiss and Stübel (1880-87, vol. 3, pl. 96, figs. 4-6). An Ica sherd from Zapallar in the Chillón Valley has been published by Lothrop and Mahler (1957, pl. VIIb), and another Ica vessel was found by Arturo Jiménez Borja at the Huaca Pan de Azúcar, Lima (not published). At Huancarama an Ica style bowl in the collection of the town school was recorded by Rowe and D. T. Wallace in 1954.
- 18Kroeber and Strong, 1924; Uhle, 1924; Menzel, 1959, p. 127.
- 19Uhle, 1924, pp. 63, 64, 67-69.
- 20A section of the present Panamerican Highway follows one of these ancient roads.
- 21Cieza de León, Segunda parte, cap. LIX; 1880, pp. 222-224; Crónica del Perú, cap. LXXIV; 1862, p. 424; Castro and Ortega Morejón, 1936, p. 237.
- 22Rowe, 1945, p. 277.
- 23According to Cieza de León; see references in note 21.
- 24Cieza de León, Crónica del Perú, cap. LXXIV; 1862, p. 423; Pizarro, 1944, p. 41; Jérez, 1862, pp. 325, 327.
- 25Cabello Balboa, pte. III, cap. 26; 1951, p. 409; cf. Menzel, 1959, pp. 127-128.
- 26Kroeber and Strong (1924, pp. 9-16) used the collection from Site E as the basis for a pioneer discussion of the characteristics of the Inca style.
- 27Jérez, 1862, p. 335.
- 28Lizárraga, cap. LIX; 1909, p. 519.
- 29Cieza de León, Crónica del Perú, cap. LXXIV; 1862, p. 424; Lizárraga, cap. LIX; 1909, p. 520; Borregán, 1948, pp. 105-106.

- ³⁰Kroeber and Strong, 1924, pp. 39-45.
- ³¹Noticia del Perú, 1918, p. 326; Estete in Jérez, 1862, pp. 339-340.
- ³²Santillán, 1879, p. 33.
- ³³Estete in Jérez, 1862, p. 340.
- ³⁴Estete in Jérez, 1862, p. 339.
- ³⁵The name "Pachacamac Inca" refers to a very fancy pottery style of smoked blackware found at Pachacamac exclusively in Inca associations. It appears to have been a special prestige style of Pachacamac, associated with Inca domination and comparable in meaning to the Ica Inca and Acari Inca styles to the south (Menzel, 1959, pp. 131-140 and the following article).
- ³⁶Chincha was governed by a Spanish corregidor from a date between 1556 and 1558 (Rowe, 1957, pp. 161-162).
- ³⁷The monastery was founded between the arrival of Domingo de Santo Tomás in Peru in 1540 and the year 1542, when it is mentioned in a letter of Vaca de Castro to the King (Porras Barrenechea, 1951, p. xv; Tibesar, 1953, p. 42).
- ³⁸The first baptisms recorded in Ica took place in 1560 (Zambrano, ms., cap. 2); the Villa de Valverde de Ica was founded in 1563 (Vargas Ugarte, 1949, p. 132).
- ³⁹Cieza de León, Guerra de las Salinas, caps. XIII, XXIV; XXXIX; 1878, pp. 58, 126, 201.
- ⁴⁰Population at the time of the conquest, 30,000 heads of families (Lizárraga, cap. LIX; 1909, pp. 519-520); 40,000 (Segovia, 1943, p. 17). Population in 1583 from Henríquez de Almansa, 1925, p. 194.
- ⁴¹1546: Herrera y Tordesillas, década VIII, lib. II, cap. XVI; 1944-47, vol. 9, p. 385; 1558: Montesinos, Anales, 1906, vol. 1, p. 254; 1539 famine: Montesinos, Anales, 1906, vol. 1, p. 114; 1548 famine: Montesinos, Anales, 1906, vol. 1, p. 195.
- ⁴²Menzel, 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Borregán, Alonso

1948 Crónica de la conquista del Perú [1565]. Edición y prólogo de Rafael Loredo. Publicaciones de la Escuela

de Estudios Hispano-Americanos de Sevilla, no. general XLVI; serie 7.a, no. 3. Sevilla.

Cabello Balboa, Miguel

- 1951 Miscelánea antártica [1586]; una historia del Perú antiguo, con prólogo, notas e índices a cargo del Instituto de Etnología (Seminario de Historia del Perú - Incas). Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Facultad de Letras, Instituto de Etnología, Lima.

Castro, Cristóbal de, and Ortega Morejón, Diego

- 1936 Relación y declaración del modo que este valle de chincha y sus comarcas se gobernaban antes que / oviese yngas y después q(ue) los vuo hasta q(ue) los (christian)os e(n)traron en esta tierra. [1558]. Quellen zur Kulturgeschichte des präkolumbischen Amerika, herausgegeben von H. Trimborn; Studien zur Kulturkunde, 3. Band, pp. 236-246. Strecker und Schröder Verlag, Stuttgart.

Cieza de León, Pedro de

- 1862 La crónica del Perú [1550]. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, tomo 26, pp. 349-458. M. Rivadeneyra, Impresor, Editor, Madrid.

- 1878 Guerras civiles del Perú; tomo primero, Guerra de las Salinas [1553]. García Rico y C.a, Madrid.

- 1880 Segunda parte de la crónica del Perú, que trata del señorío de los Incas Yupanquis y de sus grandes hechos y gobernación [1553]. La publica Márcos Jiménez de la Espada. Biblioteca Hispano-Ultramarina, tomo V. Imprenta de Manuel Ginés Hernandez, Madrid.

Henríquez de Almansa, Martín

- 1925 Relación hecha por el virrey D. Martín Enríquez de los oficios que se proveen en la gobernación de los reinos y provincias del Perú. 1583. Gobernación del Perú; cartas y papeles, siglo XVI; documentos del Archivo de Indias. Publicación dirigida por D. Roberto Levillier. Tomo IX, pp. 114-230. Colección de Publicaciones Históricas de la Biblioteca del Congreso Argentino, Madrid.

Herrera y Tordesillas, Antonio de

- 1944-47 Historia general de los hechos de los castellanos, en las islas, y tierra-firme de el Mar Oceano [1601-1615]. Prólogo de J. Natalicio Gonzalez. Editorial Guaranía, Asunción, Buenos Aires. 10 vols.

Jérez, Francisco de

- 1862 Verdadera relacion de la conquista del Perú y provincia del Cuzco, llamada la Nueva-Castilla [1534]. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, tomo 26, pp. 319-348. M. Rivadeneyra, Impresor, Editor, Madrid.

Kroeber, Alfred Louis

- 1926 The Uhle pottery collections from Chancay, with appendix by Max Uhle. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. i-ii, 265-304. Berkeley.
- 1937 Archaeological explorations in Peru; part IV, Cañete Valley. Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropology, Memoirs, vol. II, no. 4, pp. 219-273. Chicago.
- 1944 Peruvian archeology in 1942. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, no. 4. New York.

Kroeber, Alfred Louis, and Strong, William Duncan

- 1924 The Uhle collection from Chincha. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. i-ii, 1-54. Berkeley.

Lizárraga, Reginaldo de

- 1909 Descripción breve de toda la tierra del Perú, Tucumán, Río de la Plata y Chile [1605]. Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, vol. 15; Historiadores de Indias, por M. Serrano y Sanz, tomo II, pp. 485-660. Bailly-Bailliere é Hijos, Editores, Madrid.

Lothrop, Samuel Kirkland, and Mahler, Joy

- 1957 A Chancay-style grave at Zapallan, Peru; an analysis of its textiles, pottery and other furnishings. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, vol. L, no. 1. Cambridge.

Menzel, Dorothy

- 1959 The Inca occupation of the south coast of Peru. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, vol. 15, no. 2, Summer, pp. 125-142. Albuquerque.
- 1960 Archaism and revival on the south coast of Peru. Men and cultures; selected papers of the Fifth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Philadelphia, September 1-9, 1956, edited under the chairmanship of Anthony F. C. Wallace, pp. 596-600. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

ms. The Late Ica pottery of ancient Peru. In preparation.

Montesinos, Fernando de

- 1906 Anales del Perú [1644], publicadas por Victor M. Maúrtua. Imp. de Gabriel L. y del Horno, Madrid. 2 vols.
- 1930 Memorias antiguas, historiales y políticas del Peru [1642]. Colección de Libros y Documentos referentes a la Historia del Perú, tomo VI (2a. serie). Librería e Imprenta Gil, S. A., Lima.

Noticia del Perú [1535]

- 1918 El descubrimiento y la conquista del Perú; relación inédita de Miguel de Estete. La publica con una introducción y notas Carlos M. Larrea. Boletín de la Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Estudios Históricos Americanos, año I, no. 3, octubre-diciembre, pp. 300-350. Quito. (not by Estete).
- Pizarro, Pedro
1944 Relación del descubrimiento y conquista de los reinos del Perú [1571]. Prólogo de Ernesto Morales. Colección Eurindia. Editorial Futuro, Buenos Aires.
- Porras Barrenechea, Raúl
1951 Prólogo. Grammatica o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los reynos del Peru, por el maestro Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás. Edición facsimilar publicada, con un prólogo, por Raúl Porrás Barrenechea. Universidad Nacional de San Marcos, Instituto de Historia, Publicaciones del Cuarto Centenario, I, pp. V-XXVIII. Lima.
- Reiss, Wilhelm, and Stübel, Alphons
1880-87 The necropolis of Ancon in Peru; a contribution to our knowledge of the culture and industries of the empire of the Incas, being the results of excavations made on the spot. Translated by Professor A. H. Keane. A. Asher & Co., Berlin. 3 vols.
- Romero, Emilio
1953 Geografía económica del Perú. Tercera edición. Emp. Tip. "Salas é Hijos," Lima.
- Rowe, John Howland
1945 Absolute chronology in the Andean area. American Antiquity, vol. X, no. 3, January, pp. 265-284. Menasha.
1957 The Incas under Spanish colonial institutions. Hispanic American Historical Review, vol. XXXVII, no. 2, May, pp. 155-199. Durham.
1966 An interpretation of radiocarbon measurements on archaeological samples from Peru. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference, Radiocarbon and Tritium Dating, held at Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, June 7-11, 1965, pp. 187-198. Springfield, Va.
- Santillán, Fernando de
1879 Relación del origen, descendencia, política y gobierno de los Incas [1563]. Tres relaciones de antigüedades peruanas, pp. 1-133. Ministerio de Fomento, Madrid.

- Segovia, Bartolomé de
1943 Relación de muchas cosas acaecidas en el Perú... [1553].
Los Pequeños Grandes Libros de Historia Americana, serie I,
tomo IV, first paging, pp. 1-88. Lib. e Imp. D. Miranda, Lima.
- Tibesar, Antonine
1953 Franciscan beginnings in colonial Peru. Publications
of the Academy of American Franciscan History, Monograph
Series, vol. 1. Washington.
- Uhle, Max
1922 Fundamentos étnicos y arqueología de Arica y Tacna.
Segunda edición. Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Estudios Histó-
ricos, Quito.
- 1924 Explorations at Chíncha. University of California Publi-
cations in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 21, no.
2, pp. 55-94. Berkeley.
- Vargas Ugarte, Rubén
1949 Historia del Perú; virreinato (1551-1600). A. Baiocco
y Cía. S. R. Ltda., Lima.
- Wallace, Dwight Tusch
1959 Informe del reconocimiento del valle de Chíncha. Revista
del Museo Regional de Ica, año X, no. 11, diciembre, pp. 31-
40. Ica.
- Zambrano, Juan
ms. Relación de la filiación de sangre y nobleza de Don
Bartholo García y Espilco. 1732. Manuscrito del Museo y
Archivo Histórico "Casa Vilca," Ica.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Relative Chronology		Ica Styles	Chincha Styles	Comments	
COLONIAL PERIOD	1550	Ica 10	Post-Chincha assemblage	— 1540-42, first mission — 1534 Spanish conquest	
LATE HORIZON	1500	Ica 9			Ica Inca Inca Chimu
LATE INTERMEDIATE PERIOD	8	1450 Ica 8	Chincha (terminal phase)	— 1476 Inca conquest of south coast — 1440- Inca attack on Chincha	
	7	1400 Ica 7	Chincha tradition		
	6	1350 Ica 6			
	5	1300 Ica 5		B	
	4	1250 Ica 4		A	
	3	1150 Ica 3		C	
	2	1100 Ica 3		B	
	1	1050 Ica 3		A	
	2	1000 Ica 2			
	1	950 Ica 1		B	
	900	Ica 1		A	900 (Rowe, 1966, p. 194)