ARCHAEOLOGY, HISTORY AND LINGUISTICS IN THE ANDES

HOW BEST TO PREPARE FOR THE CAMBRIDGE AND LONDON SYMPOSIA

SYMPOSIA SESSIONS AND THEMES

The difference between the two symposia is that in Cambridge on '*Archaeology* and Linguistics' we look at the pre-Columbian period, while in London on '*History* and Linguistics' we cover the post-Columbian time-frame. Ethno-history falls mainly into the Cambridge symposium; interpretation of all other colonial texts (both on and in indigenous languages) is covered in London.

The symposia programmes are divided into sessions, each with a specific theme, identified in the programme by numbers inside rings, thus: ①, ②, etc.. In Cambridge most sessions focus on a particular region over a particular time period, following the standard Rowe chronology for the archaeological phases for the Andes for the sake of convenience. The combinations of region and period are generally intended to explore possible archaeological correlates for particular stages of expansion in either the Quechua or Aymara family. The session on how Quechua reached Ecuador, for example, focuses on this region (and possible impacts into it from the south) over the Late Intermediate and Late Horizon, the time-periods proposed by the competing hypotheses. In London there are also sessions on more general themes that apply across the Central Andes and throughout the historical period.

We have made some significant adjustments to the original programmes, in that in Cambridge particularly it seems to make best sense to proceed progressively from the known to the less known. So we start out from the modern-day distribution and patterns of diversity in the Andean languages, and first try to tease apart how much of the most recent expansions are attributable to the post-Columbian era (to which we return in more detail in London) or to the Late Horizon. All through the symposium we step further and further back in time, progressively stripping away the series of language expansions and archaeology to uncover the scenario for each immediately preceding stage. Please find the revised programmes attached.

Since this is a workshop-type meeting, to an avowedly cross-disciplinary purpose, the bulk of the time allotted to each session is to be given over to open discussion. As a platform for launching this cross-disciplinary discussion, however, each session will open with normally two **brief**, c. **5-minute** synopses of the theme from specialists with particular expertise in it: one by an archaeologist (in Cambridge) or historian (in London), from the point of view of his or her discipline; the other by a linguist, likewise. For some sessions in Cambridge a third synopsis is appropriate, from the point of view specifically of *ethno-history*, as for example in session ② on the final expansions of Aymara and Quechua in the far south, and session ⑦ on the chronology of these and other indigenous languages in the Cuzco region.

A few weeks before the Cambridge symposium we shall also pre-circulate a **position paper**. The aim is to provide an example of what we think is possible in the way of cross-disciplinary interaction, and very deliberately to provoke some new thinking. We look at some basic methodological principles in how to go about associating language dispersals with the archaeological 'cultures' or polities that provided the driving forces for them. This leads us to challenge many existing assumptions among Andean linguists, and to seek to 'break the mould' of that traditional thinking with our own new proposal for the entire histories of the Quechua and Aymara family expansions, and which forces in the archaeological record they were driven by.

YOUR PRESENTATION: A BRIEF, FIVE-MINUTE SYNOPSIS!

The role of the brief presentation you are asked to give, for the session(s) in whose theme you have particular expertise, is therefore twofold:

- First to provide an introduction to that particular session, in the form of a **synopsis** of its theme, setting out the basic issues and any competing hypotheses on that theme in your discipline, as a **framework** for the ensuing **cross-disciplinary** discussion.

- Then to close the synopsis in any way you might see fit to help **launch** — indeed stimulate and even provoke — that discussion.

The last pages of this document provide some **examples** of how we imagine synopses for session ② might work, from the respective points of view of linguistics, archaeology and ethno-history.

TASK 1: PROVIDING AN OVERVIEW AND FRAMEWORK FOR CROSS-DISCIPLINARY DISCUSSION

- Your synopsis is to be given from the point of view of your own discipline, but should be **oriented** principally for the benefit of specialists in the *other* discipline. Please make sure it is **intelligible** to them — do not stray into the more technical terms of linguistics or archaeological science, for instance.

- Indeed, you should not need to enter into such details, for you need to little more than 'think aloud' about all the questions that need to be borne in mind and debated on your theme, raising issues but not to going into them, for that is what the discussion is for. So your synopsis should keep to broad outlines, in order to remain **brief**: please ensure that you speak for no more than **five minutes**; the goal of each session is the discussion you launch, more than the synopsis itself!

CONTENT

- The synopsis should give an **outline** survey of the various issues that are relevant for the purposes of interaction with the other discipline, to serve as a **framework** for the ensuing discussion. The synopsis is *not* intended as an opportunity for the speaker to set out just one particular hypothesis that he or she finds preferable (see below).

- You may wish to start out from the issues mentioned in the description of each session theme in the programme. These reflect our own impressions of what is most relevant, though of course since you are our expert in this field we also look to you to identify any significant issues we may have overlooked.

- An approach we suggest is to look at your theme in terms of the following questions.

  - How much do we really know about the archaeology/history/linguistics of that time period? In particular, what is the contrast between the following...

  - On which points is there broad consensus? Are any recent trends emerging in how the consensus might be shifting, in line with the latest 'state-of-the-art' understandings in your field?

  - Beyond the areas of consensus, what are the main competing hypotheses in your discipline? Which are the key issues on which they disagree? What is the nature (but not the detail!) of the case for and against each?

- This synopsis should be **balanced** and even-handed among the various issues and competing hypotheses. You should provide a presentation that colleagues in your own discipline would all agree is fair.

- The **focus**, at all times, should be on those aspects relevant to attempts to link the scenarios in the two disciplines.

- As for **format**, the synopsis goal should be met with just a few summary 'bullet point' slides. Maps too might be useful, though we shall in any case have a Google Earth map constantly available on the data projector, with all major archaeological and linguistic data shown.

TASK 2: LAUNCHING AND STIMULATING DISCUSSION

Given the participants, we envisage few problems in encouraging discussion (more likely, in getting people to stop!). Nonetheless, we suggest some useful ways of provoking feedback and discussion in response to your synopsis:

- Once you have (even-handedly!) set out the rival hypotheses, you may wish to *close* by taking a more committed position on why you personally think one or other is right or wrong. Indeed you might outline a new proposal (or even just speculation) of your own, which challenges established thinking on how the archaeological and linguistic records might best be matched up.

- Alternatively, you might reflect on which sorts of new insights or evidence you hope the other discipline might be able to contribute to advance the key debates in yours. And *vice versa*, how might your discipline inform debate in the other? You are at liberty, of course, allowed to be sceptical on how much interdisciplinary linkage is possible at all!

You may wish to co-ordinate a little in advance by email with the speaker who will be presenting the synopsis from the other discipline's point of view for the same session. We shall let you know who this is as soon as details are agreed with each speaker. Email addresses of all participants are given in the attached list.

SYMPOSIUM OUTPUT: THINKING AHEAD FOR YOUR WRITTEN PAPER

The publication objective of the symposium entails that by the end of the year each participant should submit a written paper for our edited volume, on an issue of particular personal interest within our cross-disciplinary theme. No text is required for pre-circulation, however; rather, the symposium is intended as an opportunity to give your ideas for a written paper a first, informal airing among colleagues in your own and other disciplines. If you have a "new proposal of your own", for example, you could outline it as 'task 2' of your synopsis contribution, as a platform for launching discussion. Indeed, to make the most of the opportunity for interaction in Cambridge, we invite you to do some preliminary thinking on your written paper *before* the symposium, as a basis on which to look for feedback from colleagues while you're here.

Publication will probably be under the auspices of our main funders, the British Academy, who usually publish through Oxford University Press. The London Symposium should lead to its own edited volume of papers, but obviously from each participant we only expect one written contribution across the two symposia, not one from each.

EXAMPLE SYNOPSIS OF ISSUES IN **LINGUISTICS** FOR SESSION ②

— i.e. the final expansions of Aymara and Quechua in the far south.

Why **LINGUISTICS** indicates **late** Quechua and Aymara expansions in this region, from an **origin further north**:

- The **dialect geography** of both the Quechua and Aymara families, and their contacts since very early times, points to original homelands in Central Peru.

- Toponymy and historical sources attest to much wider **presence of Puquina and Uru-Chipaya** languages, replaced in historical times by their speakers switching to Aymara or Quechua.

- Within the Quechua and Aymara of the southern region there is **very limited diversity**, much less difference than with their sister dialects/languages in Central Peru, at more or less the level of regional accents in English or Spanish in the New World.

- The local forms of Quechua across this region can all be **derived from** a recent expansion based on the Quechua of **the Cuzco region** at the time of the Incas (or even later).

- Toponymy also reveals Quechua progress at the expense of Aymara over relatively recent periods.

- Linguists normally see a first entry of Aymara into the Altiplano with the Late Intermediate 'Aymara Kingdoms' (but did they really speak Aymara?) But could the main spread have been even more recent?

- Linguistic debate on whether certain aspects of the **Quechua of N.W. Argentina** hark back to an input of Central Quechua speakers, suggesting resettlements into this territory from Central as well as Southern Peru.

EXAMPLE SYNOPSIS OF ISSUES IN **ARCHAEOLOGY** FOR SESSION ②

— i.e. the final expansions of Aymara and Quechua in the far south.

AIM: to identify plausible **driving forces** that could have brought these languages into the area from further north and spread them so powerfully here over the linguistically plausible time-depths. The **Inca Late Horizon** is a prime candidate, but powerful factors were clearly at play in the **Post-Columbian era** too. How much of the language expansions should be attributed to each? How can archaeology and (mytho)history tease apart their respective impacts?

Which particular real-world **mechanism of language expansion** seems most likely? Did major population movements bring into the region native-speakers of Quechua or Aymara from elsewhere? Or did other forces create a social, political and cultural context in which existing local populations had a clear incentive to switch to Quechua or Aymara (prestige, utility for trade as a lingua franca, etc.). Or were both mechanisms at play, and in what combination?

Suggested CONTENT is as follows.

GEOGRAPHY

• What is the extent and time–depth of the Inca Empire across the far south in the archaeological record and how did it change through time?

• How close is the match between the extent of the Late Horizon across Qullasuyu and the linguistic patterns?

• Is there any trace in the archaeology of a **two-part expansion**: one (earlier and more Aymara-speaking?) into the northern Altiplano, another (later and principally Quechua-speaking?) leapfrogging it further south?

DEMOGRAPHY; POLITICAL AND CULTURAL INFLUENCE

• What do we know about the reasons for Inca expansion here? E.g. economic motives: camelids, extraction of minerals in far south, etc..

• Following from this, what do we know about the nature of Inca control and cultural influence here — i.e. power imposed through what means? — and how it changed through time?

• What is the archaeological evidence for Late Horizon demographic movements: Inca resettlements, labour drafts or armies 'stranded' at the Inca collapse? Drawn from which other regions of Tawantinsuyu?

EXAMPLE SYNOPSIS OF ISSUES IN (ETHNO-)HISTORY FOR SESSION ②

— i.e. the final expansions of Aymara and Quechua in the far south.

AIM is as for the archaeology synopsis above. Suggested CONTENT as follows.

ETHNO-HISTORICAL SOURCES, FOR THE PRE-COLUMBIAN ERA

• What might **mytho-histories** of the Late Horizon expansions tell us? Can we trust the **ethnonyms**, toponyms and **anthroponyms** of rulers as means of identifying the languages that the different (ethnic?) groups spoke?

• What is the ethnographic or mytho-historical evidence for Late Horizon **demographic movements**: Inca resettlements, labour drafts or armies 'stranded' at the Inca collapse? Drawn from which other regions of Tawantinsuyu?

HISTORICAL SOURCES, FOR THE POST-COLUMBIAN ERA

• Abundant historical evidence of the **earlier strength of Puquina and Uru-Chipaya**, declining in the face of continued Aymara and Quechua expansion throughout the post-Columbian era (to this day).

• How significant were the colonial-era **labour drafts** for mining silver in Potosí (and the associated mercury mine in Huancavelica)? What evidence do we have for the demography: how many draftees, from which home regions (how far north in Peru), speaking which languages, how many stayed on in the mining areas?

• Spanish linguistic policies for interaction with the indigenous population, above all for the purposes of **evangelisation**. But how much linguistic impact could this really have had? Can it explain a language expansion? Did this 'official favour' play in favour of Aymara, and especially of Quechua even above Aymara?