

## CORRECTIONS AND COMMENTS, ÑAWPA PACHA 13

- p. 7, beginning of third paragraph, author prefers: The closest similarity within the Pucara style lies with the Pucara plaza stela....
- p. 8, fifth line from bottom: makes, not make.
- p. 10, tenth line from bottom, read: ...on the incomplete panel of the south face of the larger Yapura fragment.
- p. 14, line 24: reference to note 63 should follow "Kidder" in the previous line, since Kidder did not compare the Philadelphia statuette with the one in Bern.
- p. 14. Line omitted between sixth and seventh lines from bottom. Read: ...two arms bent upward and a typical Pucara relief ring above the animal; the piece is broken and does not show the lower portion of the animal's body.
- p. 16, note 10, add: ...and see p. 11 at reference to note 38.
- p. 17, note 21, first line, read: ...figs. 105 and....
- p. 17, note 23, third line, read: ...other reptilian and/or amphibian fauna,....
- p. 18, note 36, read: ...fig. 4, not figs. 4, 6.
- p. 18, note 37, fourth line, read: Margaret Hoyt (personal communication) has suggested a third logical alternative....
- p. 19, note 39, add at end: I have an earlier photograph of the same statue showing more details and the more complete form; it has a typical Pucara breech clout.
- p. 24, Rowe, 1963, read: pp. 1-27.
- p. 25, Fig. 1, first line. The length of the stela was "reconstructed" by adding the length of the Arapa fragment to that of the Thunderbolt fragment. The other dimensions are direct measurements, the same for both fragments. The last sentence of the key to fig. 1 is incomplete and should read: The centers of panel 1 on face A (see fig. 2a), and panels 1, 3, and 5 of face B (see figs. 3a and 4b) have been left blank, because wear made it impossible to distinguish the figures represented.
- p. 25, Fig. 5, add: Maximum width approximately 121 cm.
- p. 28, eleventh and fourteenth lines from bottom; p. 29, tenth line; and p. 30, seventeenth line from the bottom: Dorothy Menzel comments that, in Anna Shepard's terms, the symmetry described is biaxial radial symmetry.

- Plate VIII, caption, last line, read: Bolivia, not Bolifia.
- Plate XI, add to caption: Drawn by John H. Rowe and Catherine Terry Brandel.
- p. 38, line 8: discernible, not discernable.
- p. 47, line 5. The original ms. had "rock," which the editors changed to "stone." "Rock" is the term preferred by geologists in reference to material, and it should be restored here.
- p. 48, line 16, read: ...right circular element of face C.
- p. 51, line 2, read: (see left side of fig. 3).
- p. 55, lines 29-30. Line omitted. Read: ...also compares to that on the Santiago de Huata stela (fig. 5a), and can, of course, be compared to the scroll-like heads on the Yaya-Mama stela.
- p. 61, line 35, add, following the reference to note 58: Further, the very large size of the stelae is more comparable to Classic Tiahuanaco ones than to our Yaya-Mama group, and the use of incision on the Wankani stelae is a feature rare to absent in the Yaya-Mama style.
- p. 63, line 6, read: ...reptilian and/or amphibian fauna....
- p. 67, line 1: accommodate, not accomodate.
- p. 68, line 13, read: ...again suggesting a possible relationship to the Yaya-Mama checkered cross.
- p. 70, note 8, first line, read: rock, not stone.
- p. 72, note 56, after ...figs. 34-36, add: (in this monograph, what should have been fig. 35 was incorrectly numbered fig. 33).
- p. 73, note 72, second line, read: ...6b... not 6a.
- p. 75, note 106, add: Generalized comparison to the "Paracas Cavernas" style had been made earlier by Carlos Ponce Sanginés (Ponce Sanginés, 1961, p. 35; 1971, p. 18).
- p. 78, line 12: Emmett, not Edward.
- p. 81, Valcárcel, 1932, second line, read pp. 18-30, 122, not 18-20, 122-123.
- p. 82, last line, read: top near step 35 cm. wide, not 25 cm.
- p. 99, paragraph 2, line 2: Grieder informs us that the Panamericana has been remeasured and Las Haldas is now at km. 444 instead of 333.