



ACTAS DEL IV CONGRESO INTERNACIONAL

# ETNOHISTORIA

TOMO II

AS

## Capítulo 49

FACULTAD DE LETRAS Y CIENCIAS



PONTIFICIA  
UNIVERSIDAD  
CATÓLICA DEL PERÚ  
FONDO EDITORIAL 1998

*Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de Etnohistoria. Tomo II*

Copyright © por Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú. Av. Universitaria, Cuadra 18 s/n., San Miguel. Lima, Perú. Tlfs. 460-0872 y 460-2291 - 460-2870 Anexos 220 y 356.

*Derechos reservados*

ISBN - 9972-42-133-3

Prohibida la reproducción de este libro por cualquier medio, total o parcialmente, sin permiso expreso de los editores.

Impreso en el Perú - Printed in Perú.

## The maximilist and minimalist bias in andean scholarship: 20<sup>th</sup> Century trends

Richard P. Schaedel

In a recent article (Antiquity: 66:250:1992) that hopefully most of you have read, I made a passing reference to the Minimalist; trend in Andean scholarship; and I identified one of the earliest forerunners of the minimalist school as Adolf Bandelier (applied to Native American research, but specifically Andean). His spirit has been revived in the mid-seventies. About one and one-half years ago I reviewed three examples of scholarship on the formation of the Inka state (books by Patterson, Bauer and Parssinnen) to illustrate how this trend toward Minimalist manifests itself in the next two decades, using an article of mine (1978), entitled *The Early State of the Inkas*, which is admittedly written in a maximalist vein (in the sense of proposing a number of seminal hypotheses to explain how Inka Institutions functioned) as contrast.

My presentation today will compare the Andean case history with trends in Judaic scholarship, which has followed a remarkably similar trajectory throughout .his century. I recently discovered rambling through recent numbers of the JBA, searching out comparative sources for the origin of ethnicity, that Biblical or (if you prefer) Judaic studies - presents a similar case history between maximalists and minimalists with much more polemics.

The spoiler role of Bandelier was played in this case by the German scholar, Julius Wellhausen, who found most claims to verify the archaeological and ethnohistorical (read

palaeographic/epigraphic) record exaggerated, if not false. He advanced the theory that all of Hebraic history prior to the 6<sup>th</sup> century B. C. (during the Babylonian exile) was the result of fictional creations of Persian period scribes who presumably organized into colleges in order to make up Israel's history (to give legitimacy to Judaic origins as preserved), whose award-winning renditions of which became the Hebrew Bible in the oral tradition and codified in the Old Testament. The stories of the patriarchs in Genesis were allegedly composed by scholars to give continuity and dignity to Israel's past. The influence of Wellhausen must have been strong until well after his death in 1918 for it is not until the 40s that Albright and Gordon advance to propose the equation of the Patriarchal Age with the Middle Bronze Age. One must credit the impact of V. Gordon Childe's mid-century writings which gave a kind of universalist agenda to world archaeology and lead to the charge of Biblical vindication in Judaic paleography and archaeology alike. It perhaps crested in the 70s because some of the maximalist claims turned out to be spurious and provoked a counter movement which resulted among other excesses in the resuscitated Wellhausen doctrine.

Though somewhat bloodied by recent squabbles, the Albright standard bearers continue to make breakthroughs and, as nearly as I can determine, substantive biblical scholarship emerges relatively intact. Those of us who have bloodied ourselves in the Andean debate find the field in much greater (Amen, Mesoamericanists) disarray.

The history of the maximalism-Minimalism controversy in Judaic studies is well summed up in Dr. Kitchen's recent article in *Biblical Archaeology Review* (21;2;1995) entitled *The Patriarchal Age: Myth or History?* For convenience I quote Dr. Kitchen "over a century ago the great would-be reconstructor of early Israelite history, Julius Wellhausen, claimed that "no historical knowledge" of the patriarchs could be gotten from Genesis, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were merely a "glorified mirage" from later Hebrew history, projected back in time." Briefly Wellhausen's argument runs that the Pentateuch was

composed at different stages in Israel's history by four different writers—the stories in Genesis (patriarchs) were composed in the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium B. C. at around the time of the Babylonian exile (586 B. C.). They were projected back in time as a foundation mythology.

Dr. Kitchen then shows that the Biblical correspondences to the patriarchs are between 17<sup>th</sup> century B. C. with the 13<sup>th</sup> century B. C. given as the date for the exit of refugees from Israel. The patriarchs should be dated to the Middle Bronze Age. He follows a systematic line of arguments. In a magnificent display of scholarly arguments based almost exclusively on linguistic and paleographical evidence, Kitchen manages to move with ease between the third and first millennia B. C. in Mesopotamia, Egypt and Anatolia on the one hand, and Judaea with its neighbors on the other.

Basically, Kitchen presents seven theses ranging from: 1) the close correspondence of slave prices between paleographic sources and the Old Testament, 2) changes in the patriarchal naming process. The scholarship is brilliant. (House of David) - While historian Kitchen effectively disposed of the relatively weak resurgence of the Minimalists with compelling testimonial evidence, he only notes in passing the recent archaeological findings which have been generally supportive of the Maximalist thesis, but lately subjected to a bombarding from the mortars of the minimalists. Here we pass the baton of interpretation to the new "Israeli School" to the archaeologists for whom the maximalist spokesman is Schlomo Bunimovitz, who in an excellent review of this century's Biblical archaeology notes among other things the "coming of age of Biblical archaeology" to which he attributes the current blending of ethnohistorical and archaeological research during the eighties and early nineties, adducing Dever's diagnosis in 1980 that "the professionalization and secularization of Biblical archaeology during the last two decades has gone too far in severing the archaeology of Palestine from literary sources." Perhaps Bunimovitz is overly sanguine about the blending of ethnohistory and archaeology as this breakdown of this

meaning might indicate "especially appealing to archaeologists is the fact that this quest emphasizes mundane social history instead of traditional political history involving only the deeds of great men and public events" (67). As I point out in my critique of Bauer and Parssinnen, they are so besieged by their pursuit of mundane social history that they deny the circumstantial evidence for the tradition.

For a very clever and witty summation on the Minimalist/Maximalist controversy, I refer to David Noel Freedman and Jeffrey C. Geohagan's paper in March/April BAR entitled *House of David is there!* Apparently in response to a recent article by Phillip El. Davies (a rather vitriolic minimalist who dislikes the label) entitled *House of David, built on sand* (1994)"" BAR, Breedman and Geohagen attempt to debunk Mr. Davies' debunking of the recently discovered TEL DAN inscription in which the reconstruction of the *bytdwd* text interpretation is rejected as corresponding to the Dynasty of David. The argument, as to how to insert meaningful vowels between sextet of consonants which would not come out Byd (dynasty) and Dawud (David) and still meaning something is the challenge which Davies accepted but could not field. The total controversy revolves upon reconstructing DWD since Davies conceded that Dyb means *house of*.

James Hoffmeier, a Judaic maximalist, wrote an interesting letter (BCA 1995) commenting on Davies aforementioned *House of David built an sand* article, points out (citing David Hackett Fischer's *Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*, that the minimalists fall prey to the "fallacy of presumptuous proof" in which the minimalist advances a proposition; then shifting the burden of proof or disproof on the others. Comparing analogous statements for the Andean and Israeli dynastic successions Davies said David is "as historical and King Arthur," Had Zuidema used the same term for Pachacutec he would have illustrated this fallacy as nicely as Davies.

Returning now to the Andean case history, let me prefix

my review of the three books by selecting out some points in my 1978 article which in a retitled republication I called the Formation of the Inca State, since that had a little more meaning than the one placed in Skalnik & Claessen's Anthology of the Early State of the Inkas. 1) One of the first overriding suggestions was a two phase stateship to cover the century of State Formation (accepting Rowe's chronology) from Pachacutecs almost immediate establishment of the Redistributive State to Huayna Capac's consolidation of the despotic state. 2) I attributed the transformation of politico-economic institutions from Lupaca prototypes (as suggested by Murra) for example making his "retainers" predecessors of the Despotic State's *de iure* Yanac; 3) The Lupea type of vertical archipelago economy, exploiting juxtaposed but contrastive ecological floors represented the prototypes of the Inka mitimaes. 4) In general, I proposed both ideationally and phenomenologically that the Inka state was the ecological codification of socio-economic principles worked out in the Central and Southern Andes for at least a millenium, and they thereby obtained from the cultivable land a renewable productivity far above what has been achieved since. Wachtel (1973) succinctly stated this in a paragraph.

In addition to these four hypothetical breakthroughs, I reconstructed one of the many mysteries that Poma de Ayala had left us to decipher from his fascinating iconography, the validation of the Council of Twelve is the governmental device which mediated between the provincial government and the 4 Suyus to the Federal District. One of the other points that later writers ignored was the suggestion that the panacas were the corporate holders of state property and not cumulative capitalists, allowing for corporate system of management for state farms (be they in Cochabamba or Urubamba).

In the three recent Andean book published (Patterson, Bauer and Parssinen, which I now review in the order published), there was no discussion of my hypothesized principles to explain a maximally operative, functioning Inka

state. Most were ignored, while contradictory and quite abstract principles were offered to generate or support a model of the self destructive state (we could credit the generation of the model to Conrad and Demarest (1984) were it not for the fact that Patterson was either ignorant or spurned, crediting them as inspiration to his formulation).

We begin with Patterson's opusculum. Almost completely based upon the reconstruction of structural features, and embodying a built-in dialectic (announced in the title) it manages to obliterate any possibility of reconstructing the antecedent forms in the formation of the Inka state, and leaves the process of disintegration to fall in place by the weight of the narrative. Indeed, when he states in his prelude that the Inka state was "the result of a rapid rise an even quicker disintegration" he announces what in the trajectory of universal pristine or early great states would amount to the Guinness Book of World Record's 1st place to the Inkas for having the shortest-lived state in universal history (semantically intriguing because although short in time, it was longest in space). In fact, Patterson describes it as a single episode and a short one at that, in the development of native Andean states. Thus, does he let all the air out of the balloon that had been slowly disinflating since it was first almost overblown to explosive dimensions by Phillip Ainsworth Means in 1932 in his memorable passage in praise of beneficent despotism.

Patterson makes a total hash out of the "development of the native Andean states" from the problematic "small states" of La Florida society through the closing century of the much vexed 1st millenium B. C. until the Late Intermediate "Dark Ages" (where were you- Gran Chimu- when the lights went out?). We are given a ballet of paramounts, principalities and autonomous communities jumping back and forth over the threshold of statehood, but none staying there very long. For those who want a roller coaster ride through 2500 years of Peruvian prehistory, patterson's *chapter* (pp 9-42 entitled The



Historic Landscape) of 31 pages should be an exhilarating experience.

The substantive argument carries *the Inka* achievement from recognizable community in 13th-14th century to disintegrating empire in less than 200 years. He is totally disinterested in the situation (context) of unravelling how it was possible to form such a huge state in not time flat (the Inkas closest competitors were the Mongols, and they travelled on horseback, which most of us Andeanists agree is what fascinates us about the Inka). But even more important is the fact that 90% of the Inka settlement (circumstantial evidence) is in-tact from Ecuador to Chile and we have testimonial evidence from a host of indigenous and native chroniclers who were writing less than a century after this comet-like state came into existence. No other case of pristine statehood enjoys those double documentary advantages in such profusion. Whatever accolade one might award to Patterson, one might perhaps attribute to him the founding of "the episodic school of political development."

Bauer's recent publication, though modest in size with a text of only 150 pages, is pretentious in title: *The Development of the Inka State*. At least, unlike Patterson, he confines himself to the foundation (or as he puts it, tendentiously), the development of the Inka state. Bauer prefixes his narrative with some significant remarks on Inka chronology. Let me particularly draw attention to a quote from Zuidema (1982) who by the time he was writing this treatise was spearheading the Minimalist surge in Andean scholarship:

"I would consider the whole of Inka history up to the time of the Spanish conquest and even to a certain extent beyond, as a mythological 'history', then integrated calendrical, religious, ritual and remembered facts into one ideological system, which was hierarchical in terms of space and time".

This "hierarchical ideology", advises Tom, should not be

confused with the western linear conception of history (which will have to be established by archaeology alone). Could the epigones of Wellhausen done any better, (except for grammar) if one replaces Hebraic for Inka?

Back to Bauer, who after this brief but important exegesis a la Zuidema, is released from the Promethean task to which John Murra had condemned us Andeanists by insisting that archaeologists and ethnohistorians corroborate each other (the earliest citation is an archaeological "restudy" of an Andean ethnohistorical account - 1962). Bauer can generally relegate his cultural findings to the "remembered facts of Andean hierarchical (i.e. his settlement and community pattern data) ideology basket, and devote his mostly ceramic findings to reconstructing a western linear conception of history (but of course dependent on now abysmally inadequate extant material culture).

Thus, after investigating Mauka Llakta and carrying out the first scientific excavation of the site, Bauer arrived at the same conclusion that Muelle, Pardo (1940s) and I in 1970 had come to the conclusion that it was an Inka site modelled after the mythical origin in Paccari Tambo. He totally disparaged the theory that most of us who have visited the site have presumed, i.e. that it was a provincial capital, Why? Because he could find no colcas as others had found among the Wankas, or at Huanuco or Pumphiu. He cited LeVine's dissertation where she deduced that "state communication and transportation" were the guiding principles of determining provincial capital location, Even if we concede that the Inka might have articulated this principle which is implicit in positioning of state nodes anywhere in the world, here was always the overriding consideration of sacred space having locational priority. I would suggest that both Hyslop and Julien record provincial capitals in the southern highlands with no colcas extant, which would be enough evidence for me to keep Mauka Llakta as potential provincial capital.

The theoretical underpinning of Bauer's treatise is

embodied in the somewhat ludicrous conclusion at the end where he states "the development of the Inca state did not cause major physical changes in the subsistence settlement systems or regional social reorganization South of Cuzco, as predicted by the traditional theory of state development." One of the bits of genius of Inka governance was certainly to allow the pre-existing systems to take care of themselves in reproducing their own economies. Nonetheless, in a given region they usually set up their capital, which reflected the distribution of federal functions to the provinces and was usually accompanied by housing accommodations for orejones who were at least resident in the capitals on a rotating basis. If we use the Inka testimony on what went into a provincial capital, the storage was certainly not a *sine qua non*.

The third and final head of this deconstructionist hydra that I propose to lop off is *Tawantinsuy: the Inca state and its political organization* by Marrti Parssinen, a scholar whom I would prefer to introduce into the Andean community with more warmth and enthusiasm for his comprehensive contribution to Andean political history. Unfortunately, I must bypass the many new and useful "remembered facts" (as per Zuidema) or snapshots assembled in this Potpourri of things Andean, to concentrate on the overall focus of his camera (i.e., conceptualization).

Time does not permit an exhaustive analysis of Parssinen's fallings in this area, but one rather egregious example should suffice. Parssinen devotes a whole sub-chapter (257-260) to what he boldly titles "The myth of the Inca Council." Here he could have used the 1982 citation of Zuidema that Bauer (of the same academic Andean panaca) used, citing the Incaic heirarchical ideology as the receptable of unresolved problems for the myth he was condemning. Unfortunately, Parssinen was not of Zuidema's panaca (hence his failure to include the 1982 piece in his relatively complete citation of Zuidema) but rather a devoted follower and one must say unashamed admirer of Murra (who wins Parssinen's citation derby by a wide margin (25 citations) over Rostworoski

and Rowe (17 and 14). After a rather swift allusion to what he apparently finds the too contradictory historical sources to the council, he concludes his judgement by citing the lack of substantiation of local ethnohistorical references to this vital arm of the Federal bureaucracy he concludes.

"In general it seems that the idea of a Supreme Council is too European to have been a real one. Probably Murra is correct when he advised us (here an unfortunate use of the editorial we) to leave the whole idea as an invention of some chroniclers". Apparently Murra neglected to advise fellow panaca member Rolena Adorno who relates the council of 12 to the *suyu* concept as unmistakably Andean.

This trend toward the re-evaluation of the traditional chronicler's accounts by both archaeological and ethnohistoric validation has produced in the sixties and seventies (when Murra began stimulating this approach) and the contributions in both fields have substantially modified our understanding of the comet-like state that was Tawantinsuyu, but since the mid-seventies it has generated the Minimalist current in which, however much it may contribute to local and regional level reconstructions, results in the process of deconstruction of Tawantinsuyu, which is more dangerous than the Zuidema destructuring because the institutions, however feebly alleged, remain preserved in his ideological mausoleum. When one treats of the phenomena of the Inka one cannot avoid reconstructing, however hypothetically this hegemony of 8,000,000-10,000,000 souls functioned, and whose lives it has managed to affect down to the grass roots level.

The task of deconstruction to which I have alluded consists of demonstrating the weakness of the systemic components of the hegemony to the point where we arrive at the Wellhausen *Hohere Kritik* which basically states that as one reconstructs the trees, the forest disappears as a mirage. In the case of Patterson (and Conrad and Demarest) the ingenious invention of Pachacutec's administration to attribute to the panacas the corporate holding of state property, was discarded

in place of the principle of divided Inheritance (as the fallacy of presumptuous proof) positing a kind of rapacious capitalism for which no models exist. In the case of Parssinen, the whole institution of the Supreme Council is removed. He offers no substitute as to how the provinces were mediated by the Council of 12 at the regional level with the Federal bureaucracy.

Just as the Judaic scholars were able to rally around the slogan The house of David is There!, I hope I can urge you to say *Pachacutec Lives!*

Let me conclude this somewhat flippant overview of recent Andean scholarship with a serious exhortation that I used to conclude my lecture in San Rafael in 1994:

Hago una llamada a todos los andinistas a abandonar este minimalismo y esta tendencia deconstructiva, que en sí mismos abandonan la ciencia y el humanismo.