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During the last two decades, pioneering efforts on several fronts have significantly revised our understanding of the economic organization of the Inca empire. John V. Murra, one of the recognized leaders in the field of ethnohistory and most responsible for these advances, describes the prehispanic highland economy in terms of reciprocity, redistribution and verticality. I propose to assess the adaptability of Murra’s model to the situation on the north coast of Peru, between Pacasmayo and Motupe, on the eve of the Spanish conquest.

Since reciprocity and redistribution have previously been shown to have been operative on the coast at this time, I will focus my remarks on the last of the above-mentioned principles by discussing: 1. the jurisdiction of local lords to determine the territorial extent of various political units with special emphasis on groups of *mitimaes* living apart from the main ethnic groups; 2. the natural resources controlled by each ethnic group; 3. the patterns of land tenure and labor specialization; and 4. the exchange between the various coastal groups and between these and their highland counterparts, with special attention given to the question of whether or not specialized traders or merchants existed, as María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, another expert, believes. If it can be shown that surpluses were exchanged outside the mechanisms of reciprocity and redistribution by “independent” traders, acting as individuals, Murra’s model will have to be altered for the coast.

In contrast to Murra, who effectively uses both the archaeological record and colonial documentation, my study will be based almost exclusively on early manuscripts. My conclusions must be accepted with this in mind. I offer them in the hope that they will stimulate discussion and be confirmed by further field investigation in a later research season.

During the last two decades, pioneering efforts on several fronts have significantly revised our understanding of the economic organization of the Inca empire. John V. Murra, one of the recognized leaders in the field of ethnohistory and most responsible for these advances, describes the prehispanic highland economy in terms of reciprocity, redistribution and verticality. He concludes that ceremonial exchange and the exploitation of multiple ecological niches suggest the self-sufficiency of communities or *señoríos* from Huanuco in the north to the Lake Titicaca region in the
south. María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, another pioneer in the field, calls the universality of this conclusion into question, however, with her evidence of the existence of specialized traders or merchants* on the coast. My purpose, then, is to discuss the issues of self-sufficiency and trade for the señoríos of the north coast between Pacasmayo and Jayanca on the eve of the Spanish conquest in an effort to assess the adaptability of Murra’s model to the area.

Reciprocity and redistribution have already been shown to have been operative on the coast at this time. Therefore, my discussion of the local economic and political situation will be summarily brief. It is included only as introduction and background material, a context or benchmark within or against which to judge the evidence of exchange between the various coastal groups and between these and their highland counterparts.

The area of this inquiry is today the modern provinces of Lambayeque and Pacasmayo. According to archaeologists, it had once been part of the united Kingdom of Chimor. When the Incas conquered the coast in the fifteenth century, the area was subdivided. This process of divide and conquer was repeated again at the time of the Spanish invasion, making the reconstruction of the polities of 1530 an extremely difficult task. Based on the encomienda grants of Francisco Pizarro, which represent the first of many changes made by the Spanish in the administrative structure of the Inca system, and other documents written within the first decade or so of the conquest, it appears that the area was divided into six señoríos: Jayanca, Túcume, Sinto, Collique, Saña and Pacasmayo, from north to south.

All six were very similar in structure. A paramount lord (curaca or cacique principal) exercised supreme and absolute authority on the local level over the masses, the so-called indios parques y mitayos. He was the "dueño de indios" with power over life and death. He personified his people and represented them, and in so doing his own interests, within the Inca empire. Tempering his potential to abuse power was the fact that his status and prestige were based on the number of his subjects and the wealth their labor could produce. A measure of this was the hospitality—the sumptuousness of his banquets or his generosity in providing chicha (maize beer)—exhibited to visitors and the general well-being of his people.

His subjects willingly worked for him in exchange for ceremonials, mediation with the supernatural and access to the natural resources he controlled. Most lived apart from his administrative and ceremonial center near these resources in relatively small hamlets, usually under the rule of a lesser or secondary lord (principal) and his lieutenants (mandones). By far the greatest number of his subjects were farmers, living in close proximity to the fields they cultivated in cotton and foodstuffs. Others were fishermen, who lived separately from the farmers in hamlets, situated for easy access to specially designated beaches and areas of shellfish collection. On his periodic junkets to their scattered villages and hamlets, the curaca assigned these commoners specific tasks, in addition to farming and fishing, by way of tribute. They might be asked to cultivate a field, clean an irrigation ditch, guard herds, serve at the tambo or inn, repair roads or bridges, guide travelers, carry messages or deliver the goods...
they produced to his administrative center, warehouses or other villages under his control. Sometimes whole villages (*parcialidades*) left home to comply with these temporary labor obligations, giving a sense of movement to this otherwise sedentary population.⁴)

In a somewhat more privileged position, in that they might be exempt from some or all of these duties, were the few skilled craftsmen—perhaps no more than 5 to 6 percent of the total population—who served the lord.⁷) Table 1 summarizes the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIALISTS</th>
<th>Túcume</th>
<th>Jayanca</th>
<th>Collique</th>
<th>Pacasmayo</th>
<th>Saña</th>
<th>Sinto</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albañiles</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabesteros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteros</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocineros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1530s</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pre 1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbicos</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicheros</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estereros/Petateros</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haceros/Leñadores</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaqueros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1530s</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>pre 1532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hueseros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercaderes</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olleros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovejeros/Pastores</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pescadores</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pintores (de mantas)</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateros</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roperos</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salineros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapateros/Alpargateros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sastres</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silleros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejedores</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pre 1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tintoreros</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venaderos</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I believe the lack of data for Pacasmayo and Saña to be few documentary sources rather than an undifferentiated population.

available data on the existence of artisans in the six señoríos by the year of the first documentary reference to them. Over twenty different types of specialists are included.8) Some, such as the hamaqueros, quickly became obsolete with the prohibition of transportation by litter. The existence of others, such as tejedores, cumbicos, tintoreros, pintores de mantas and roperos, suggests a great deal of expertise and division of labor, especially in the weaving, decoration and storage of cloth.

Some of these specialists, such as the chicha brewers, the cooks and the bearers, along with pages and other servants, made up the curaca's court and lived and worked permanently at his center of administration. They depended on him for subsistence and probably for at least part of their raw materials. Other specialists, like the farmers and fishermen, lived in their own villages, often near the source of the raw material that they used, e.g., the salt makers near salt pans and the potters near sources of clay.9)

From the variety of these craftsmen, their spatial distribution and the geography of the river valleys inhabited by the people of the different señoríos we know that each curaca had a similar and wide range of resources at his disposal. They all had access to marine life. The lords of Saña, Collique and Túcume controlled marshlands behind the beaches where their people caught fresh water fish and aquatic fowl and cut reeds (totoro, junco and carrizo) for matmaking, canoe and raft construction, and building. Inland from these swamps were montes and forests, jealously guarded as a source of firewood and poles. Four of the six señoríos included specialized salt producers, although the location of their sources has not yet been determined.10)

Metal ore, heretofore frequently believed to have been imported, was available within the jurisdiction of at least some of these coastal lords. Colonial documents mention gold and silver mining at Sinpallpon (Sanpallpon?) in the Túcume area in 1562, and an eighteenth century document reports an early source of silver in the Saña valley. Archaeologists have found sources of copper in Jayanca and Túcume, and at least one student of the problem states that there were sources of copper ore in nearly every valley between 200 and 2,000 meters.11)

The documentary record also indicates that the curacas controlled lands and peoples in their mountain hinterland. Túcume had lands in Guambos (near Cajamarca) in 1540. A lord of Saña used lands bordering those of a highland noble of Niepos in the foothills of the Andes near present-day Oyotún.12)

But, much more frequent than reports of distant land holdings in different ecological zones are reports of subjects living apart. One curaca in 1566 reported having a group of his subjects in a town more than 30 leagues inland from the sea. This was common. Table 2 shows that five of the six señoríos are known to have had what the Spanish labeled mitimaes, dating from the Inca conquest and reorganization of the area, associated with them.13)

The literature suggests several functions for mitimaes. Some had a garrison function of fortifying a newly-conquered area with people loyal to the Inca. Others were transferred from densely populated areas to less-densely populated areas or uninhabited ones to reduce population pressure and better utilize natural resources.
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Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Señorío</th>
<th>Spanish Repartimiento</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>Pacasmayo</td>
<td>Moro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>Pacasmayo</td>
<td>Chepén</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chontal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Collique</td>
<td>Callanca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Saña</td>
<td>Saña</td>
<td>shepherds, weavers</td>
<td>Chontal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1550–1560s</td>
<td>Sinto</td>
<td>Lambayeque</td>
<td>shepherds</td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Sinto</td>
<td>Sinto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Sinto</td>
<td>Chiclayo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Jayanca</td>
<td>Jayanca</td>
<td>potters</td>
<td>Guambos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561–82</td>
<td>Túcume</td>
<td>Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cajamarca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: AGI/J: 458, 1746 and 1871; 460, 377v and 457v; 461, 1256, 1257v and 1534v; 462, 1860v and 1875; 509A; and Patronato: 1. 108, r. 7, 1562, 48; and 1. 185, r. 24, 1541, 78; BNP/A157, 110–10v; ART/Mata: 18-IV-1564; Rostworowski, “Plantaciones prehispánicas de coca en la vertiente del Pacífico.” in *Etnia y sociedad* [1977: 191]; and Espinoza “El Valle de Jayanca y el Reino de los Mochica siglos XV y XVI” [1975: 269–270].

A third type were colonists situated in an area to provide access to resources that were unavailable in the home region. The last seems to have been one of the functions of several of the mitimaes groups under discussion. Some of the mitimaes who lived in the nine towns ("pueblos") in Cajamarca loyal to the curaca of Saña must have included shepherds and weavers, because they periodically sent him wool cloth. The mitima of Lambayeque also served as shepherds. Although we do not know their function, it is clear from early manuscripts that the rather large number of 200 mitimaes of the Spanish repartimiento of Moro in the señorío of Pacasmayo remained loyal and subject to their coastal lord into the 1560s. The contact between the lord of Jayanca and his highland colonists, tenuous and deteriorating in 1540, revived thereafter. Jayanca potters in Guambos continued to serve their coastal lord at least until Cuenca’s visit in 1566.

The coastal señoríos, in short, included persons living at various altitudes from sea level on up into the Andes. The range of inhabited ecology suggests that the señoríos were self-sufficient in basic subsistence needs. But, if the señoríos tended to be self-sufficient, how can the existence of the “merchants” on Table 1 be explained?

That specialized groups of merchants existed in the 1560s on the north coast there can be no doubt. As early as 1560 Melchior Osorno was given formal possession of the merchant lord Don Pedro Blo of Lodifac in Ferreñafe (part of what had been the prehispanic señorío of Túcume). More documentary evidence comes from petitions of other merchants presented to Doctor Gregorio González de Cuenca, the judge of the Real Audiencia in Los Reyes who visited the district six years later to regulate Indian life. Among the ordinances he wrote were several which prohibited Indians from riding on horseback with saddle and bridle and traveling freely within
the district. Such rulings prompted traders to ask for exemption. They had to be able to travel freely in the area, they reasoned, to exercise their profession of "buying and selling", "trading", "bartering" or "exchanging" with other Indians. Yaypen of Illimo, for example, came forward saying

yo soy mercader con mys mercaderias tratos y granjerias me sustento y pago my tributo andando conprando y vendiendo como es uso y costumbre entre los yndios

Lechec, another "merchant" of Túcume, petitioned Cuenca for freedom to exchange his clothing, wool, shell beads and other things among the Indians of the surrounding repartimientos. Indians from Sinto and Collique petitioned to the same effect. Pochoc, born in the village of Pololo, asked to be able to trade (rescatar) the items the Indians used and needed in nearby villages. He went on to state that he had no land or irrigation water with which to plant, suggesting that he was a full-time specialist.16

Other petitions from artisans show that a few of them traveled to exchange their products with others. Potters of Pacasmayo and Collique "sold" and "traded" their pots (tinaiones grandes and medianos) in nearby towns. Salt was the article of exchange which provided the livelihood for 20 or so salt makers from Túcume. Carpenters of Collique and Túcume produced goods ("obras") to "sell" within their own area and in towns along the coast.17

Among the most frequent petitioners were the lords of groups of fishermen from Collique, Sinto and Túcume, who asked to be allowed to sell their catch in nearby towns.

Pedro Corina of Sinto stated:

Don Pedro Corina principal de unos pescadores digo que yo vivo de tratar y contratar con los yndios deste repartimiento y de los demas comarcanos vendiendo, conprando y trocando por pescado lana chaquira y algodon y otras cosas con lo qual me sustento y pago my tributo y sustento my cassa e hijos porque no siembro ni tengo tierras para ello

Don Diego Mocchumi, principal of the repartimiento of Túcume, told the same story.

yo e mys yndios somos pescadores y nuestra granjeria y donde procede el tributo es el pescado q[ue] vendemos asi para nuestra comida y nunca tenemos costumbre de fazer sementeras de maiz ny tenemos tierras para ello

In a separate petition he reiterated these facts.
Don Diego Muchumy digo que los yndios de my parcialidad son pescadores y tienen rescate con los yndios de los repartyos comarcanos vendiendo les el dho pescado por mayz y algodon y otras cosas [frijoles]

He complained that Indians ate his fish without paying for it and asked Dr. Cuenca to establish an exchange rate or equivalency between fish and corn.18)

By the 1560s, too, there existed periodic markets frequented by Indians. The "tianguez" of Jayanca every Thursday was one such market where artisans sold their produce.

By 1578 Ferreñafe had become known as a center of cotton trade. There and elsewhere farmers, fisherfolk and artisans met at the plaza and exchanged chicha, corn, wool, shell beads, cotton, ceramics and other goods.19)

In other parts of Peru, trade was not only local, but extra-regional and long-distance. Rostworowski reports that Chinchanos carried salted seafood to Cuzco and maintained commercial relations with the peoples of present day coastal Ecuador. Puerto Viejo, in the north, was a major inter-regional trading center, especially for conch shells. The chronicler Arriaga reported that these were traded by Indians of the coast with those of the sierra. Coca was another important item exchanged between the mountains and the coast. Trade between the six señoríos with polities of the sierra hinterland, however, is not directly mentioned in the testimonies reviewed to date. Petitions from residents of the highland "province" of Guambos also suggest that although they exchanged foodstuffs amongst themselves, they did not trade with the coast.20)

Although we have no evidence of prehispanic trade in the commercial sense with the sierra (highland) we know that coastal polities did send "tribute" to lords who controlled the headwaters of the rivers of the region. Augusto D. Barandiarán reports that the Morropanos delivered cargoes of salt, chili pepper and cotton cloth to the cacique of Penachi in return for water rights. A mid-seventeenth century manuscript, possibly the source of Barandiarán's information, adds that Jayanca's cacique "bought" the quebrada of Canchachalá from the cacique of Penachi years before the Spanish invasion and continued to pay tribute until Cuenca's visit. Indeed, Dr. Cuenca, himself, confirms this version in a progress report to the king when he mentions settling a water dispute involving Jayanca with a new regulatory code that may have ended this practice in 1566.21)

This evidence of prehispanic exchange between polities and the presence of specialized "independent" traders in this part of the north coast in the 1560s need not necessarily be contradictory. Traders may represent the breakdown of the prehispanic order based on reciprocity and redistribution controlled, on the local level, by the curaca and his agents. Changes made by the Spanish in the area rapidly destroyed
the basis of the traditional economic order. The mere act as early as 1534 of subdividing señoríos to create more encomiendas greatly reduced the numbers of a lord’s subjects and the range and diverseness of the natural resources at his disposal. European diseases, harsh treatment and rebellions and wars also took their toll of the native population.

Dr. Cuenca’s ordinances further weakened the system. In order to alleviate the tribute burden of the Indians, for example, he pegged it to the population and specified what items and labor services should be provided to the curacas and encomenderos. As a result, lords complained vociferously that their share was too little. They grumbled of being impoverished to the point of being reduced to the level of commoners. They argued that they would not be able to maintain the same levels of hospitality and exchange as previously. Therefore, their status and position would decline. They would lose respect and their ability to govern. For the curacas who had already suffered some status loss as a result of the demographic decline and the Spanish practice of appointing Indian officials for their own purposes, sometimes without due regard to their ancient custom of succession, a significant decline in their material wealth meant another serious limitation on the exercise of power.22

Dr. Cuenca’s other disposition restricting the use of chicha had the same effect. Many were the petitions from perplexed lords asking for special license to provide chicha to subjects engaged in communal tasks. Don Christóval Payco, principal and tercera persona of the Spanish repartimiento of Jequetepeque and principal of the town of Lloco, asked Cuenca for permission to serve chicha to workers on community projects, explaining,

por que la principal causa porque los yndios obedescen a sus caciques e principales es mediante aquella costumbre que tienen de dalles de beber que a el como a principal del doh repartimiento se manda por la tasa que los yndios de su parcialidad le hagan una chacara de maiz como hasta aqui la an hecho y que sino obiese de dar de beber a los yndios que la obiesen de beneficiar y a los demas que an de hacer la sementera de la comunidad para pagar el tributo no se querrian juntar para ello...

The lords of the repartimiento of Moro and several others also asked Cuenca for licenses to distribute chicha at communal gatherings.23

Such regulations effectively undermined the authority and ability of the curacas to lead by destroying the material base of the traditional economic system. Already some Indians refused to serve their lords, perhaps because the lords could no longer fulfill subjects’ expectations. The cacique of Túcume complained that his Indians did not obey him as they once did past leaders in the time of the Incas. In 1540 the subjects of Jayanca in the mountains no longer served the lord because he had not called on them. Perhaps this was his way of reducing his obligations. Contemporaries described Don Juan, cacique principal of Collique, as a “cacique de los viejos que avia en los valles al cual sus yndios temían.” The cacique of Túcume, who himself was identified with the fast-disappearing old-style caciques, said that “Don Juan
The implication of both of these statements is that their replacements were parvenues, even impostors, that did not enjoy the same legitimacy and authority associated with predecessors.24)

As the traditional, prehispanic system broke down, then, the Indians would have been forced to supply their needs through the mechanism of the market. Those left outside the purview of the curaca’s reciprocal exchange network as his resources dwindled would have been the first to become dependent on the market for their needs. It is significant that farmers, perhaps the most independent group of subjects in terms of their subsistence did not ask Dr. Cuenca for permission to travel and trade. It was the specialists, those most dependent on their lord for food, drink and raw materials, that petitioned him. The chicheros (beer brewers), who made it clear that they were not “merchants” or “farmers”, came to trade with the latter in the plaza—their chicha for corn (their raw material), wool, shell beads and other goods. They were also dependent on the market by the 1560s to supply them with the clay jars in which they brewed their beer. The metal workers, weavers and carpenters of Jayanca also frequented the markets to supply their needs. The breakdown of the traditional system created a need for an alternative mechanism of exchange. By the 1560s some Indians had become merchants to meet the need. Dr. Cuenca in undermining the lord’s authority, in establishing equivalencies between products, in setting tribute in terms of silver pesos and in designating specific market days hastened the spread of a modified “market” economy.25)

That the Spanish did not understand the system that they were, perhaps inadvertently destroying, is also evident from the language they used to describe it. The situation of 1560, the date of our first documentary proof of traders and the start of a decade of major administrative changes on the coast, was still one of difficult communication between the Spanish and the Indian groups. Interpreters, called lenguas or tongues, were the key to an imperfect understanding between the Indians on the coast and those of the sierra and between both of these groups and the Spanish. Lizarraga, referring specifically to the Chicama valley directly to the south of the area under consideration, states that between 1555 and 1560

Los indios deste valle tienen dos lenguas, que hablan: los pescadores una, y dificultosisima, y otra no tanto; pocos hablan la general del Inga....

Joel Rabinowitz suggests that speech peculiarities within coastal señoríos might have complicated communication even more. Spaniards, even priests who had lived in the area for decades, that could converse directly with the Indians were still a rarity. Cuenca’s visita (inspection tour) was conducted in almost every area with the help of interpreters.26)

Bilingual Spanish and mestizo scribes wrote the petitions presented by the Indians. Their attempts at finding the proper Spanish words to describe the exchange “a modo indio” may account for the wide range of words used in the petitions to describe the transactions. The verbs trocar or cambiar were used often and
perhaps most faithfully describe the activities of the Indians. Another favorite, the verb *rescatar*, connotes ransoming: *recobrar por precio lo que el enemigo ha robado*. Rescatar in this respect might mean to win back or obtain what had previously been taken or denied them by the enemy or to win their freedom by obtaining what they needed. It is significant that da Gama uses the word *rescatar* to describe the transactions by which the Indians of Jayanca obtained the gold and silver demanded by their Spanish encomenderos in 1540. *Granjear*, another term found frequently in the documents of the period, means to get, to obtain, to win, to conciliate or gain the good will of another. The last definition is precisely the basis of exchange under the traditional system. Although the verbs *comprar* (to buy) and *vender* (to sell) also frequently appear, we have no evidence that money was used. The so-called Indian merchants and traders of the 1560s were exchanging as they had in the past. But, instead of the vertical or hierarchical exchange patterns between lord or his agent and commoner, the exchange was horizontal among commoners. The impersonal market place was replacing the personal and reciprocal exchange with the lord.

Given this language problem and the fact that the Spanish interpreted the native reality according to their own cultural heritage, it is also probable that what the Spanish early identified as merchants might have been in reality *mitayos* (temporary drafted laborers) or porters, retainers of the lords, carrying tribute and supplies between the various settlements within a lord’s jurisdiction for distribution or storage. The Indians, parroting Spanish as they learned the language over the next two or three generations, may have called themselves merchants when in this capacity, without necessarily implying being full-time specialists, engaged in trade for personal gain.

In summary, let me point out that I started with a question and end with a conditional statement: if traders represent a symptom of the breakdown of the traditional system and the transition to a "market" economy and if porters were mistaken as merchants, Murra’s model would seem to apply to the polities of the prehispanic north coast as well as to those in the highlands.

There are several reasons for this tentativeness. First among them is that my paper is based primarily on manuscript records. The evidence therein needs to be tested and confirmed by field research. Discussion of state administered exchange within señoríos may be premature, pending a more definitive outline of the jurisdictional limits of these units. This definition awaits close collaboration between historians, archaeologists, anthropologists and others familiar not only with the coast but also with the highland hinterland. Also, there is always the possibility that ongoing archival exploration may turn up additional evidence that might alter the conclusions. Second, I cannot explain the existence of the Chincha merchants, except to say, as Rostworowski herself suggests, that they may have been a vestige of the old system. After the Inca conquest of the area, the formerly "independent" traders may have been incorporated into the empire as state agents, charged with procuring the goods otherwise unavailable within the imperial system.
NOTES

Abbreviations:
- Archivo Castillo Muro Sime (ACMC)
- Archivo del Fuero Aqrario (AFA)
- Archivo General de la Indias (Seville) (AGI):
  - Justicia (J)
  - Audiencia de Lima (AL)
- Archivo Nacional del Perú (ANP):
  - Residencia (R)
- Archivo Notarial Carlos Rivadeneira (ANCR)
- Archivo del Departamento de La Libertad (ART):
  - Corregimiento Justicia (CoJ)
  - Corregimiento Ordinario (CoO)
  - Corregimiento Pedimento (CoP)
  - Corregimiento Residencia (CoR)
  - Intendencia Asuntos de Gobierno (IAG)
  - Intendencia Compulsa (IC)
  - Intendencia Ordinario (IO)
  - Intendencia Pedimento (IP)
- Biblioteca del Real Academia de Historia (BAH)
- Biblioteca Nacional del Perú (BNP)
- Colección Vargas Ugarte (Lima) (CVU)

* My definition of merchant or specialized trader implies an independent group, a la pochteca of Mexico, who lived in its own sector apart from other specialists and who traded to accumulate personal wealth. María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco uses the term in this sense in regard to Chincha. See her book, Etnía y Sociedad [1977: 108, 138 and 253].


4) “un yndio parque que en castellano es hombre bil y bajo y sujeto a pagar mita y tributo” AGI/AL: 167, 1648.

6) Rostworowski, Curacas, 8; AGI/J: 458, 1778v–79; 461, 866v, 1400v, 1521, 1524 and 1553; Patronato: 1. 189, r. 11, 1566; and ART/Mata: 25-IV-1565; and 16-V-1565.

7) This estimate is based on the relative proportions for Chincha reported by Rostworowski, “Chincha,” 137 and Ramirez-Horton, footnote 14.

8) Not included are tamberos, pajes, porteros, labradores and other specializations that may have been mitayos and, therefore, only temporarily employed in such tasks.

9) AGI/J: 461, 1468v, 1481, 1482v, and 1484v-87.

10) AGI/J: 461, 1028v and 1234v; ART/IC: 11-XII-1787; IO: 18-I-1800; IAG: 12-III-1802; AFA/1. 2. c. 1, 1599–1602; and 1AG: 12-III-1802; AFA/l. 2. c. 1, 1599–1802; and Hda. San Luis, 191; and Table 1.


12) Espinoza, 270; AFA/1. 1, c. 4. 1613 and c. 19, 1694. 142v and 176.

13) AGI/J: 458, 1829v; Patronato: 1. 185, r. 24, 1541, 78; and ART/Mata: 18-IV-1564.

14) Some of these probably were shepherds in charge of llama herds, because an Indian official (“governador”) of Moro owned llamas and wore sandals made of their wool in 1582. ART/CoO: 11-VIII-1582.

15) Dr. Cuenca’s ordinances for Jayanca indicate that it was common for coastal caciques to have Indians in the mountains subject to them. AGI/Patronato: 1. 189, r. 11, 1566; J: 461, 1452 and 1527v; and Espinoza, especially 256 and 269–270; Margarita Gentile, “Mitimaes de Nasca en Arequipa siglo XVI,” in Marcia Koth de Paredes and Amalia Castelli, compilers, Ethnohistoria y antropologia Andina [1978: 135–40]; and Wachtel, 74, 80 and 99.


17) AGI/J: 457, 786v, 458, 2053v; 461, 1028v, 1459, 1461v–62, 1467, and 1468; and 462, 1871.

18) AGI/J: 456, 1922v, 1928, and 1936v; 457, 716, 840, 843v, and 1460; 461, 1091v, 1458v, 1462v, 1464v–65, and 1517v; and 462, 1871.

19) AGI/J: 461, 1567; Patronato: 1. 189, r. 11; and BNP/A538, 1580.

20) Rostworowski, “Chincha,” 99 and 108; “Pescadores,” 254–255; “Plantaciones pre-hispánicas de coca en la vertiente del Pacífico,” in Etnia y sociedad [1977: 177]; and AGI/J: 461, 1481v; and Arriaga (Cap. IV, 211) as cited by Ravines [1978:60] The documents reviewed include 22 grants of encomiendas in the sixteenth century for Túcume (1536–49); Saña (1548–62); Jayanca (1545); Jequetepeque (1535–90); Sinto and Collique (1590); Illimo (1539–60); and Ferreñafe (1536–97).


22) Rostworowski, Curacas, 104; AGI/J: 458, 1261; and BAH/9-9-2-1664.

23) AGI/J: 458, 2550v and 1779; and 461, 1769–71.

24) AGI/J: 459, 3085v–86; and 461, 1407 and 1521v.

25) AGI/J: 458, 2090v; and 461, 1481v.
27) AGI/J: 457, 871; 462, 2172v; and Sebastian de Covarrubias, Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española (1611) [1943: 906].
28) CVU, 1-1: Carta de Santo Tomás, 1-VII-1550.
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