Colour by Numbers: Racial and Ethnic Categories in the Viceroyalty of Peru, 1532–1824*

DAVID CAHILL

The distinction between ethnic and racial categories in social analysis is finely drawn, and rarely clear. In the case of Latin American societies, 'race' and 'ethnicity' are sometimes synonymous, and far more often deployed as if they were. Researchers are familiar with the ways in which processes of deracination, acculturation and miscegenation iron out the cultural edges that demarcate social groups, one from another; perhaps the classic example is the gradual loss of indigenous characteristics attendant upon native American migration to cities. Yet, even in the complete absence of rural-to-urban migration, such processes have been at work moulding present-day indigenous communities, which once recognised numerous ethnic distinctions within 'Indian' society, distinctions that were progressively diluted – though not wholly extinguished – during some three centuries of colonial rule. To draw attention to the protean nature of ethnicity in Latin American societies, however, is not to say that researchers are necessarily unaware of the problem, but rather that they often follow research agendas that may be inconvenienced by attention to such nuances. Thus, for example, a number of broad-brush racial *cum* ethnic classifications provided the basis for the fiscal demands of Crown and Church alike during the colonial period, and as such provide the essential pillars for much of the quantitative fiscal and demographic database that we possess.

To call into question these colonial categories thus might well seem akin to undermining our present understanding of population growth and decline from conquest to independence, and to eroding such consensus as exists among researchers on colonial social stratification.[1] To add to the

* The research in Spain and Peru on which this paper is based was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (United Kingdom).

[1] Thus, for example, the manner in which 'indio' is defined is a key determinant of our understanding of population growth and decline. See Ann M. Wightman, *Indigenous Migration and Social Change: The Forasteros of Cuzco, 1520–1720* (Durham and London,

David Cahill is Visiting Fellow in the School of Spanish and Latin American Studies, University of New South Wales.

confusion, anthropologists and sociologists studying contemporary societies have compiled their own racial and ethnic categories which, when anachronistically projected back onto the past, as they sometimes are, go entirely against the grain of colonial classifications and render impossible any measured comparison of republican and colonial societies, and therefore of *longue durée* historical development. There is simply no point in comparing like with unlike. Rather than vitiating current models, though, re-examination of some of the heuristic categories of Latin American social history should allow a more nuanced understanding of those very models. This essay will survey some of the pitfalls and ambiguities in employing some of the ethnic and racial categories used in colonial Peru, with a view to highlighting some variants and niceties of usage as well as some of the more egregious errors sometimes encountered in such usage. It will commence with a brief survey of ethnic differences within the Inca empire and within the pre-Columbian capital of Cuzco itself, so as to provide the necessary basis for a consideration of post-conquest classifications. It will then go on to consider the ways in which pre-Columbian ethnicity was subsumed within, adapted to, or eradicated by, 'hegemonic' colonial categories, and the manner in which these in turn were dependent upon Crown fiscal imperatives, which they did not long survive once independence from Spain was declared in 1824.

The argument, then, concerns the ways in which ethnic and racial categories were socially constituted throughout a time-span of some three centuries. At the outset, however, a word of caution is in order regarding context. These categories were in certain measure constructs, and they cut across other classificatory systems, notably those of class, estate, occupation, and culture. There exists among historians working on Latin American societies something of an open-ended debate which turns on the extent of correlation between ethnicity/race and social class.[2] It is open-

1990), pp. 139–42, for evidence that changes in this category masked the real rate of indigenous population decline in the period to 1720.

[2] Magnus Mörner, 'Economic Factors and Stratification in Colonial Spanish America with Special Regard to Elites', *Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. 63, no. 2 (1983), pp. 335–69. The theoretical and historiographical background to this contribution is more fully discussed in *idem*, 'Classes, Strata and Elites: The Social Historian's Dilemma', in Magnus Mörner and Thommy Svensson (eds.), *Essays in Social Stratification in History* (Gothenburg, 1988), pp. 3–50. A wealth of cognate material is summarised in Fred Bronner, 'Urban Society in Colonial Spanish America: Research Trends', *Latin American Research Review*, vol. 21, no. 1 (1986), pp. 7–72. Note, too, the remarks of Steve J. Stern, 'New Approaches to the Study of Peasant Rebellion and Consciousness: Implications of the Andean Experience', in *idem* (ed.), *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World, 18th to 20th Centuries* (Madison, 1987), pp. 15–18, on degrees of coincidence of ethnicity and class in revolt and rebellion.

ended in the sense that intra- and inter-regional differences are often so great that new research on social stratification appears only to exacerbate the difficulty of arriving at valid 'global' generalisations. No consensus on this question of correlation has emerged, so that re-examination of present heuristic labels is timely. To attempt even to summarise the main features of this debate would surpass the bounds of this article, but three points should be noted in passing. The first is that the question is complicated for the study of colonial societies by the continuing importance of the notion of 'estate' and associated codes of behaviour and honour,[3] in varying degree aristocratic, whereas the introduction of more modern notions of class associated with industrial development and modernisation complicates the discussion in republican societies. The second point is that a lack of attention to cultural milieus and degrees of acculturation has marred studies of Latin American stratification, simply because quantitative data are privileged in such studies. Third, though network analysis and patron-client analysis are increasingly regarded as important in Latin American social-historical analysis, the quantitative stratification studies from which social generalisations emerge are simply not constructed to take sufficient account of alternative multi-class, multi-ethnic models based on genealogies and social alliances. The end result of all this has been fragmentation of efforts and results, with deleterious consequences for the teaching of Latin American social themes with any precision. Yet, for all that, colonial Spanish American societies provide a social laboratory of unsurpassed richness in which to test the adequacy of traditional social theory and associated models. The first Spaniards in Peru found a society already complex, and equipped with its own share of internal contradictions.

Ethnicity and the Inca state

The arrival of Pizarro's horde was the catalyst for the atomisation of the Incario into its constituent ethnic parts.[4] The great historical spectacle of

[3] Patricia Seed, *To Love, Honor, and Obey in Colonial Mexico: Conflicts over Marriage Choice, 1574–1821* (Stanford, 1988), for the importance of notions of honour in a colonial society. See also José Antonio Maravall, *Poder, honor y élites en el siglo XVII* (Madrid, 1979), Part 1.

[4] Of all the conquest historians, from Prescott through Means to Hemming, the author who best brings out the ethnic dimension is Waldemar Espinoza Soriano, *La destrucción del imperio de los Incas* (Lima, 1973). Espinoza focuses particularly on the role of the Huancas (Wankas), a group studied in detail by Terence N. D'Altroy, *Provincial Power in the Inka Empire* (Washington, 1992). Important works which deal skilfully with ethnic tensions and alliances in the colonial period are Steve J. Stern, *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640* (Madison, 1982), and Karen Spalding, *Huarochirí: An Andean Society under Inca and Spanish Rule* (Stanford, 1984).

the Incan civil war – more properly a power struggle between two factions of the one dynasty – so ably exploited for his own ends by Francisco Pizarro, has often served to deflect attention from the innate instability of Tahuantinsuyu, the Incan State. It had relied on conquest, and reconquest when intermittent revolt necessitated it, to forge the empire itself, which was thenceforth reinforced through marriage alliances, the education of ethnic lords' children (and thereby hostages) in Cuzco, and sumptuary gifts to those self-same lords. Yet it remained a fragile polity that repressed desires for local autonomy, not least by peoples with a living memory of their own glory and power as independent kingdoms and chiefdoms. Close ties of kinship with the ruling class in Cuzco could perhaps make their relative servitude tolerable or comparatively benign, but never acceptable. When the Spaniards wound their way from Túmbez to Cuzco in 1532, they easily won over ethnic lords (*kurakas*, *señores*, *caciques*), and these pledged arms, provisions and manpower in what they perceived as their own struggle for autonomy from Cuzqueño suzerainty.

Yet these lords presided over ethnic space within a quadripartite world centred on Cuzco, and these four quarters similarly bore ethnic connotations, so that to belong to one ethnic group endowed that group with a double ethnic identity. Thus, for example, members of the Lupaqa 'kingdom' (centred on Lake Titicaca) belonged to the Collasuyu quarter of the empire, and were identified both as 'Collas' and 'Lupaqas'. Of this double ethnic identity there can be little doubt: the native Andean chronicler Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala assigned pejorative ethnic traits to the inhabitants of Collasuyu: fat, lazy, slow-witted, dirty, imbecilic, cowardly but rich.[5] Such 'ethnic' descriptions were, in fact, commonplaces of Spanish accounts of race mixture in the Americas, being assigned indiscriminately to Indians, blacks, mestizos and other castes; these epithets were similarly directed by peninsular Spaniards against their American counterparts, the Creoles, who for their part were never loathe to reciprocate in kind.[6] Traditional definitions of ethnicity in the Andes

[5] Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala, *El Primer Nueva Corónica y Buen Gobierno* (John V. Murra & Rolena Adorno, eds., trad. Jorge L. Urioste, Mexico, 1980) tomo I, fol. 78 [78], p. 61; 178 [180], p. 157. In this account, the 'Colla' category is all-embracing and generic, though there were several distinct ethnic groups within the Collasuyu quarter.

[6] Bronner, 'Urban Society', pp. 42–4, neatly summarises the research on this point, but see especially D. A. Brading, *Miners and Merchants in Bourbon Mexico 1763–1810* (Cambridge, 1971), ch. 5, in some degree elaborated upon in *idem*, *The First America: The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots and the Liberal State, 1492–1866* (Cambridge, 1990). The classic contemporary account of rivalry between Creoles and peninsular Spaniards is Jorge Juan and Antonio de Ulloa, *Noticias Secretas de América* (ed. José Manuel Gómez Tabanera, Madrid, 1988 [1826]).

thus in the first instance connoted a geographical or territorial affinity, a usage that continued throughout the colonial period, despite erosion of other determinants of ethnicity (see below). Thus, for example, colonial subjects tended to identify themselves as belonging to a '*patria*', which until the late eighteenth century usually denoted the '*patria chica*'; this in its turn connoted a town, parish, province, valley, *puna* or microregion, usually the circumscribed 'little world' of the peasant and, indeed, of most provincial town dwellers as well.[7]

There existed substantial ethnic differentiation even within each major ethnic grouping, distinctions which long antedated Incan conquest of individual chiefdoms. In part this reflected the circumstance that these *etnías* had themselves been forged through earlier conquest of still smaller ethnically distinct groups. In part, too, it reflected the pervasiveness of the economic 'archipelago' system now recognised as having been a fundamental structure of pre-Columbian Andean societies, whereby members of one group obtained access to the resources of other ecological/altitude zones through the establishment of 'outlier' settlements in those zones.[8] Thus for example a highland group with access to pastoral products, tubers, salt, maize and other grains, would strike a deal with other (probably ethnically distinct) groups on the coast and on the eastern mountain slopes (*ceja de selva*) to settle small groups (*kamayuqkuna*) for the purpose of obtaining fish, chili peppers and other coastal products, on the one hand, and fruits, herbs and condiments from tropical areas, on the other.[9] Important ritual sumptuary goods such as gold, silver, shells,

[7] On the changed rendering of '*patria*', see Pierre Vilar, 'Patria y nación en el vocabulario de la guerra de la independencia española', in *idem*, *Hidalgos, amotinados y guerrilleros. Pueblo y poderes en la historia de España* (Barcelona, 1982), pp. 211–52. Formulations of the notion of the 'little world' are found in Robert Redfield, *The Little Community: Viewpoints for the Study of the Human Whole* (Chicago, 1955); and Eric J. Hobsbawm, 'Peasants and Politics', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 1 (1973–4), pp. 7–8.

[8] John Murra, 'El "control vertical" de un máximo de pisos ecológicos en la economía de las sociedades andinas', in Iñigo Ortiz de Zúñiga, *Visita de la provincia de León de Huánuco en 1562* (Huánuco, 1972), vol. 2, 429–76; reprinted in Murra, *Formaciones económicas y políticas del mundo andino* (Lima, 1975), pp. 59–116; *idem*, *La organización del estado inca* (Mexico City, 1978), *passim*. Murra acknowledges that the concept was first developed by Carl Troll, 'Die geographischen Grundlagen der andinen Hochkulturen des Inkareiches', *Ibero-amerikanisches Archiv*, No. 5 (first series) (1931), pp. 258–94. For the application of this perspective to colonial history, Thierry Saignes, 'The Ethnic Groups in the Valleys of Larecaja: From Descent to Residence', in John V. Murra, Nathan Wachtel and Jacques Revel (eds.), *Anthropological History of Andean Polities* (Cambridge, 1986 [1978]), pp. 311–41.

[9] Frank Salomon, *Native Lords of Quito in the Age of the Incas: the Political Economy of North Andean Chiefdoms* (Cambridge, 1987); also *idem*, 'Vertical Politics on the Inka frontier', in Murra et al., *Anthropological History*, p. 104: 'Kamayuqkuna, specialists who exploited or processed a particular resource not as a subsistence activity but as a

feathers and vicuña fleeces, all necessary for buttressing the local power of *kurakas*, were similarly obtained by such means.[10] In such manner large ethnic groups, in certain measure defined territorially, had permanent pockets of ethnic 'minorities' settled on their land. The 'home' populations of these migrants would normally reciprocate this provision, though there were groups whose territory embraced all three of the principal ecological zones of the Andes, and thus had only diplomatic reasons for allowing alien *kamayuqkuna* populations to strike roots within their territory.

This system, so ingenious in conception and practical in execution, was effectively destroyed within a few decades of the conquest, by dislocation, civil war, depopulation and the ethnographic obtuseness of the new Spanish rulers and administrators. It survived in a few areas, randomly and by chance.[11] The Incas adapted the concept in providing for numbers of artisans, producers of sumptuary goods, and possibly also retainer (*yana*) groups, who were settled within the city of Cuzco by the later Incas.[12] Thus a group of *indios yanyos* petitioned after the Spanish conquest for recognition of property rights to lands in distant provinces, whose produce they had been granted by Huayna Capac in recompense for their service as immigrant urban silversmiths. In 1712 this group was still claiming these lands, under the 'royalty' rights accorded them under the Incario.[13] So, too, other ethnic groups brought to the city of Cuzco by the Inca as hostages *cum* retainers were left without a role following the

delegated function of a political authority, cult, or community frequently resided extraterritorially in multi-ethnic enclaves of fellow kamayuqkuna while remaining politically subject to their home lords...'. For their relation to other groups, John Howland Rowe, 'Inca Policies and Institutions Relating to the Cultural Unification of the Empire', in George A. Collier, Renato I. Rosaldo and John D. Wirth (eds.), *The Inca and Aztec States 1400–1800* (New York, 1982), pp. 93–118.

[10] Salomon, *Native Lords*, chs. 3–4 is especially informative on the importance of sumptuary goods.

[11] There is a faint echo of it today in the Q'ero community of the Paucartambo province of southern Peru: Oscar Núñez del Prado, 'El hombre y la familia, su matrimonio y la organización político-social en Q'ero', *Revista Universitaria* (Cuzco), no. 114 (1957), pp. 9–31.

[12] Rowe, 'Inca Policies', pp. 96–102 for the *yana* category. See also Socrates Villar Cordova, *La institución del yanacona en el incanato* (Lima, 1966); Nathan Wachtel, *The Vision of the Vanquished: The Spanish Conquest of Peru through Indian Eyes* (trans. Ben and Siân Reynolds, 1977 [1971]), pp. 73–5, 131–6; Murra, *Formaciones*, pp. 225–42. The 'indios yauyos' were a distinct ethnic group, but the term was often deployed in a generic sense to refer to all those of coastal provenance.

[13] Archivo General de la Nación, Derecho Indígena Leg. 12, Cuaderno 199, 'Autos que don Juan Orosco, Cacique principal del Ayllo Herbay, Ismalluncas y Plateros... por sí y por los indios de su común, siguió ante el Marqués de Valdelirios, Juez y Visitador general de Tierras...', 1712.

conquest. Some, such as the Huancas and Chachapoyas, had been granted employment by the *panacas*, the increasingly wealthy lineage groups formed on the death of each Inca to care for the *momia* and to administer the estate that the Inca had accrued during his tenure.

A further source of increasing ethnic differentiation under the later Incas lay in the forced mass migrations commenced by Pachacutec and brought to their highest expression by Huayna Capac. This remarkable demonstration of Inca power witnessed the transplantation of whole populations from one end of Tahuantinsuyu to the other, so that the new migrants either nestled cheek-by-jowl with the original inhabitants, or supplanted them entirely, entailing an analogous transplant population moving in the opposite direction (as, for example, in the case of Cochabamba). These transplant populations (*mitmaqkuna*, *mitimas*) were, of course, ethnically distinct from their new neighbours for reasons of state security, and in at least some cases were under the aegis of nobles from other ethnic groups with close kinship ties to the Inca.[14]

Such ties of kinship were in part cross-ethnic alliances, for the Inca conquest of the Andes had commenced in the immediate environs of Cuzco itself, and conquest, whether local or far afield, was followed by alliances aimed at binding subject-populations more closely to Cuzco. These alliances were themselves variable in nature, and while some were long-standing, others were of recent genesis. The former tended to be the case the closer an ally was to Cuzco, despite or perhaps because some local allies were erstwhile martial foes. Distinct ethnic groups such as the Ayarmaca, the Maras, the Anahuarque, the Canas, the Canchis and the Lupaqa were all closely bound to the Inca's service through alliances and kinship ties. The Ayarmaca, long-standing allies of Cuzco, had won favoured status through martial valour.[15] The Anahuarque, similarly close neighbours of the Cuzqueños, obtained even more favoured status by virtue of the fact that they had supplied the Inca with a queen (*coya*).[16] Martial alliance with the Inca at this level was unusual – as distinct from having supplied royal concubines or wives of the second rank – for the

[14] There is an extensive, though piecemeal, literature on *mitimas*. The best place to begin is Rowe, 'Inca Policies', pp. 96–107. See also Nathan Wachtel, 'The *Mitimas* of the Cochabamba Valley: The Colonization Policy of Huayna Capac', in Collier et al., *The Inca and Aztec States*, pp. 199–235.

[15] María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, *Los Ayarmacas* (Valladolid, 1975). This monograph had earlier appeared in *Revista del Museo Nacional* (Lima), vol. 36 (1969–70), pp. 58–101.

[16] Archivo Departamental del Cuzco (hereafter ADC), Real Audiencia: Ordinarias Leg. 42, 'Expte. en el que... solicita se le libre real provision ordinaria de Casicasgos de los ayllos del pueblo de Cancaguani (Chumbivilcas)...', 7 April 1802. This testimony is corroborated in part by Guamán Poma, *Nueva Corónica*, tomo I, fols. 136–7 [136–7], pp. 114–15.

later Incas took their own sisters as their principal *coyas*. In fact, there were three distinct levels of nobility in Inca Cuzco, depending upon purity of lineage: the principal 'collana' group maintained through endogamy, the inferior 'cayao', and the intermediate or mixed group, the 'payán', the product of exogamous relations between the hegemonic 'collana' and the non-Incan 'cayao'.[17]

These Inca distinctions of blood were in certain measure precursors of the caste system that the Spaniards established in the Indies: the similarity of the 'payán' to the colonial mestizo is difficult to overlook. At this point, though, it is worth underscoring the extent to which the Peru of 1532 was already a richly variegated and complex ethnic mosaic. The manifold ethnic divisions of pre-Columbian Peru, already in place prior to Inca hegemony, were further riven by the ethnic character of the Incan *suyus*, the four quarters into which the known world was divided. This ethnic and ritual space was both fragmented and enriched by the addition of the mass *mitmaq* migrations and the presence of ethnic archipelagos in the form of the 'outlier' settlements that allowed communities and larger chiefdoms access to the products of discrete ecological zones. To this kaleidoscope the Spaniards brought their own obsessions with *limpieza de sangre*, caste, and status, as well as introducing their own northern ethnic allies (e.g. the Cañaris and the Chachapoyas) to the already complex social fabric of Incaic Cuzco.

Colonial ethnicity

Up until 1532, then, ethnicity in Tahuantinsuyu may be defined as a subdivision of race, and it thus allowed for multiple ethnic identification.[18] Location within a particular quarter of the empire carried ethnic connotations, while polities such as the Lupaqa, often regarded as a single *etnía* by researchers, in fact contained two or more distinct ethnic groups. Again, community 'outliers' in distinct ecological zones pertaining to discrete ethnic groups constituted islands of ethnically distinct settlements, the whole comprising an 'archipelago' system. Stitched into this backcloth

[17] R. T. Zuidema, 'The Inca Kinship System: A New Theoretical View', in Ralph Bolton and Enrique Mayer (eds.), *Andean Kinship and Marriage* (Washington, 1977), pp. 240–81; Floyd G. Lounsbury, 'Some Aspects of the Inka Kinship System', in Murra et al., *Anthropological History*, pp. 121–36; María Concepción Bravo Guerreira, *El tiempo de los incas* (Madrid, 1986), pp. 92 ff. John Howland Rowe, 'Inca Culture at the Spanish Conquest', in Julian H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians* (Washington, 1944), vol. 2, pp. 249–51 remains a valuable introduction to Inca kinship terminology.

[18] Rowe, 'Inca Culture', pp. 186–92, provides a list of highland and coastal divisions – 48 and 38 respectively – most of which were wholly or partly ethnic in nature, and which provide a useful point of departure for an appreciation of the manifold ethnic divisions of the Incario.

were many, ethnically varied, populations of *mitmaqkuna*. All of these ethnic strands came together in the imperial capital of Cuzco, where they were further threaded with the kinship *cum* ethnic distinctions innate to the Incan aristocracy itself, and to its relations to ethnic groups long settled in the Cuzco region. However one conceives of ethnicity in the Incario – as a mosaic, tapestry, kaleidoscope, or some such metaphor – it was immensely complex, and its nuances were not readily apprehended by the early Spanish chroniclers who sought to portray an alien culture to a European audience.

The first thing to say about this variegated ethnic pattern is that it did not disappear during the dislocatory social ferment that attended the conquest. There were, it is true, considerable changes. *Mitmaqkuna* settlements, wholly or in part, returned whence they or their forebears had come; yet many stayed on, for in some regions (e.g. Cochabamba) they had inherited the earth. The carving out of *encomiendas*, formally having no territorial dimension yet giving control over the population of a distinct cacical sphere of influence, sundered the 'archipelago' outliers from one another and thereby diluted ethnic bonds to 'home' communities. The effect of the Toledan *reducciones*, nucleated settlements involving the uprooting of many hamlets and their subsequent consolidation into one pueblo, exacerbated the dislocation that had attended the conquest.[19] If Tahuantinsuyu initially disintegrated into fragments and splinters, of varying size and ethnic integrity, there were still occasional references in the late colonial period to indigenes of Antisuyu or Collasuyu provenance, so much so that one recent study of loyalties in the 'general uprising' of 1780 employs *suyu* affiliation as its essential heuristic marker.[20] So, too, during the same uprising, contemporary witnesses *au fait* with local lore referred to participation by Lupaqas and Collas,[21] for all that these traditional ethnic identifications were secondary to geographical provenance, racial phenotype or *cacicazgo* ascription as distinguishing features of groups and individuals in the surviving documentation. This documentation, however, frequently gives the impression that traditional

[19] Alejandro Málaga Medina, 'Las reducciones en el Perú, 1532–1600', *Historia y Cultura*, no. 8 (1974), pp. 141–72; Bernard Lavelle, 'Las doctrinas de indígenas como núcleos de explotación colonial (Lima 1600–1630)', *Allpanchis*, vol. 16, no. 19 (1982), pp. 151–72; Wightman, *Indigenous Migration*, *passim*.

[20] Magnus Mörner and Efraín Trelles, 'A Test of Causal Interpretations of the Túpac Amaru Rebellion', in Stern, *Resistance, Rebellion*, pp. 94–109. This is a much reduced version of *idem*, 'Un intento de calibrar las actitudes hacia rebelión en el Cuzco durante la acción de Túpac Amaru', Research Paper, Institute of Latin American Studies, Stockholm, 1985.

[21] See, for example, Archivo General de Indias (hereafter AGI), Audiencia de Lima, Leg. 1044, Claverán Rendón to Areche, 29 May 1781, which refers to 'los indios reveldes nombrados Lupacas (que así se denominan los de la Provincia de Chucuyto)'.

ethnic categories had been subsumed within the Hispanic categories of race, class and estate imported from the metropolis to the American colonies. The cities, it is true, were great levellers, crucibles of deracination.[22] But in the numerous pueblos and villas of the countryside, traditional gauges of ethnicity continued to flourish, despite official appearances. Thus fiscal and census records tended to group population according to phenotype, with due allowance for broad classifications such as 'mestizos' or 'mulattos', eliding entirely the richness of autochthonous ethnic diversity. Yet these persisted for the most part, submerged within the official categories.

How did the ethnic distinctions of the Incario survive throughout the colonial period? They endured, in the first place, through *ayllu* nomenclature and ascription. The traditional *ayllu* was, then and even now, in a process of long metamorphosis from a kin-based social unit to one comprising a number of unrelated extended families with access to corporative land.[23] Many of the colonial *ayllus* bore ethnic names, most or all of which derive either from erstwhile *mitmaq* settlements or even earlier 'outlier' groups.[24] Still other evidence – ritual, iconographic and semiological – underscores the thesis of subterranean survival of traditional ethnic classifications otherwise obscured by Hispanic fiscal and census categories. First, ceremonial and carnivalistic dance, costume, and pageantry reproduce original ethnic distinctions down to the present day, though it is true that much of this evidence has acquired syncretic traits along the way, and some dances attested in early colonial times have disappeared, either entirely or partly.[25] Second, languages and dialects

[22] Influential in this regard has been John K. Chance, *Race and Class in Colonial Oaxaca* (Stanford, 1978), concerning the gradual dissolution of urban ethnic distinctions in Antequera de Oaxaca.

[23] There is an extensive literature on the *ayllu*. A workshop on the institution produced *Etnohistoria y antropología andina: segunda jornada del Museo Nacional de Historia* (comp. A. Castelli, M. Koth de Paredes and M. Mould de Pease, Lima, 1981). Antoinette Molinié-Fioravanti, 'The Andean Community Today', in Murra et al., *Anthropological History*, pp. 342–58, provides a rudimentary typology of present-day communities.

[24] Thus, for example, ayllu Cañari and ayllu Ccosceo in the doctrina of Andahuaylillas; ayllu Lupaca in the doctrina of Ocongate (both in the province of Quispicanchis); ayllu Mitmac in the town and province of Calca; and ayllu Canas in the doctrina of Guarocondo, province of Abancay – all such names appear to indicate the earlier presence of *mitmaqkuna* populations.

[25] María Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, 'El baile en los ritos agrarios andinos (sierra nor-central, siglo XVII)', *Historia y Cultura*, no. 17 (1984), pp. 51–60; Berta Ares Queija, 'Las danzas de los indios: un camino para la evangelización del virreinato del Perú', *Revista de Indias*, vol. 44, no. 174 (1984), 445–63. David Cahill, 'Etnología e historia: los danzantes rituales del Cuzco a fines de la colonia', *Boletín del Archivo Departamental del Cuzco*, no. 2 (1986), pp. 48–54, for evidence that the famous 'scissors' dance of the Ayacucho region was also performed in the Cuzco region in late colonial times.

have also been important indicators of ethnicity. In the late colonial period there were four languages spoken in the southern Sierra: Quechua, Aymara, Uru and/or the extinct Puquina. Then as now, there was much variety in Quechua dialects – 37 distinct dialects have been recorded – with that of Cuzco vastly different from that of, say Ancash or Quito.[26] Third, headwear, clothing and textiles generally were similarly important markers, a function that they still retain in many provinces, especially away from the larger towns. Under the Inca, as John Rowe long ago noted, 'the inhabitants of each province wore a distinctive headdress, usually a cord binding the hair or a woollen cap'.[27] Members of the nobility, for their part, wore a whole array of distinctive insignias and clothing, connoting ethnicity as well as rank. Ethnology is familiar with the system of signs incorporated in present-day native Andean apparel, and the fact that other groups such as mestizos are readily recognisable by their distinctive clothing.[28] Modern attempts to capture or even schematise such colonial cultural differences,[29] however, are complicated by the problem of ethnic cross-dressing, which in part derives from Indian avoidance of tribute, and partly from the phenomenon of transculturalism, whereby an individual, rather than merely acting as a cultural broker, may pass wholly over to the alien culture, adopting its speech, clothing and lifeways entirely.[30] More commonly, perhaps, many in colonial society

[26] AGI Cuzco leg. 29, Moscoso y Peralta to Areche, 13 April 1781, remarks upon the tenacity of Amerindian languages, barely changed since the conquest, and that in one settlement (probably Puno) three 'distinct, totally opposed' idioms – Quechua, Aymara, and Puquina – are spoken, frustrating all attempts to introduce *castellano*. 'Puquina', a distinct idiom known from early conquest days and thought to have disappeared midway through the colonial period, may here be a synonym for Uru, still spoken in the Titicaca region. See also Alfredo Torero, 'Lingüística e historia de los Andes del Perú y Bolivia', in Alberto Escobar (ed.), *El reto del multilingüismo en el Perú* (Lima, 1972), pp. 51–106, and Ibico Rojas Rojas, *Expansión del Quechua: primeros contactos con el castellano* (Lima, 1978). The *altiplano* languages remain the subject of vigorous debate: see Alfredo Torero, 'Lenguas y pueblos altiplánicos en torno al siglo XVI', *Revista Andina*, año 5, no. 2 (1987), pp. 329–72, and the related commentaries at pp. 373–405.

[27] Rowe, 'Inca Culture', p. 262.

[28] Mary Money, *Los obrajes, el traje y el comercio de ropa en la Audiencia de Charcas* (La Paz, 1981), pp. 115–208 for eighteenth-century dress distinctions. For the nature of textile codes, see the remarkable essay of Verónica Cereceda, 'The Semiology of Andean Textiles: the *talegas* of Isluga', in Murra et al., *Anthropological History*, pp. 149–73.

[29] In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the peculiarities of ethnic dress were represented by *costumbrista* paintings and drawings, for the most part too fanciful to employ as evidence for historical ethnic demarcation. A selection of these is reproduced in Dawn Ades et al., *Art in Latin America: The Modern Era, 1820–1980* (New Haven, 1989), pp. 41–63.

[30] For an example, David Cahill and Scarlett O'Phelan Godoy, 'Forging their Own History: Indian Insurgency in the Southern Peruvian Sierra, 1815', *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol. 11, no. 2 (1992), p. 146, for the case of Pedro Mateus. A vivid

moved readily and easily between the European 'derived' and native Andean 'autochthonous' cultures, for the principal poles of colonial ethnicity were determined for practical purposes by the royal exchequer; colonial social reality was at once more fluid and seamless than racial *cum* fiscal classifications allowed.

Throughout the colonial period, there was a perennial struggle to whiten one's social status, not least because to be classified officially as indigenous rendered one liable for tribute, the capitation tax paid only by that sector of society. This official 'whitening' was never easy to attain, but once the mandatory bureaucratic hurdles had been surmounted, a petitioner would be awarded the coveted *cedúla de gracias al sacar* on payment of a legally prescribed fee. On the other hand, classification as non-indigenous rendered one liable for a range of other taxes. To confuse the picture even more, the fees for sacraments within the Church varied, sometimes widely, according to a parishioner's ethnic or racial ascription.[31] The colonial Church operated as a business, and there was a tariff schedule for each sacrament; parishioners who could not pay were often denied the sacrament, with perhaps only that of extreme unction being the exception to the rule. A change in racial status thus denoted a change in fiscal status, and *vice versa*.

Fiscal status in the Viceroyalty of Peru turned largely on one's liability for, or exemption from, tribute.[32] All Indian heads of households were liable, at rates that varied according to province (and even pueblo and *ayllu*), as to whether one was an *indio originario* or an *indio forastero*, as well as to the degree of access to community lands enjoyed by a tributary. There were a number of individuals (caciques, the eldest son of the cacique, collectors ('segundas'), nobles, church servants) who were ostensibly exempt, while still others escaped the net through graft, which typically involved collusion between two or more local notables. Yet even successful graft, as distinct from formal exemption, carried with it possible

illustration of the colonial politics of dress is registered by the Viceroy Agustín de Jáuregui y Aldecoa: in his *Relación de Gobierno* (ed. Remedios Contreras, Madrid, 1982), cap. 100, p. 179, he noted that 'indias' who wore 'traje de español' were not spared in the massacre that accompanied the rebel capture of Chucuito in 1781.

[31] That this confusion was more than hypothetical may be seen in David Cahill, 'Taxonomy of a Colonial "Riot": the Arequipa Disturbances of 1780', in John R. Fisher, Allan J. Kuethe and Anthony McFarlane (eds.), *Reform and Insurrection in Bourbon New Granada and Peru* (Baton Rouge, 1990), pp. 266–7.

[32] Javier Tord, 'Sociedad colonial y fiscalidad', *Apuntes* (Lima), no. VII, pp. 3–28; David Cahill, 'Curas and Social Conflict in the Doctrinas of Cuzco, 1780–1814', *Journal of Latin American Studies*, vol. 16 (1984), pp. 248–53; Scarlett O'Phelan Godoy, *Rebellions and Revolts in Eighteenth-century Peru and Upper Peru* (Köln, 1985), pp. 46–51.

disadvantages for a tributary, for access to community land was predicated upon an individual's name appearing on the official tribute list. This list was revised (the '*revisita*') at periodic intervals, especially in the late colonial period, and was often followed by a reallocation of communal plots among tributaries; in some provinces these lands were scarce, and many missed out. Indeed, it is usually overlooked that *indios* were not always the poorest segment of society: communal plots served as a kind of social 'safety net', whereas non-indigenous groups often had no access to land, and eked out a meagre living as best they could. There are emphatic statements by district governors in both colonial and republican Peru to the effect that the poorest inhabitants within their remit were *mestizos*, precisely because they lacked even the smallest plot of subsistence land.[33]

It is perhaps due to this increasing pressure on finite arable lands that, towards the end of the colonial period, the designation of 'cholos' begins to appear on tribute lists as integral members of communities.[34] Quite who comprised this new group is not clear, especially when contemporary documentation labels one individual as a 'famoso cholo viejo' and 'indio rico' in the same breath.[35] Scholars are familiar with attempts to correlate

[33] David Cahill, 'Repartos ilícitos y familias principales en el sur andino, 1780–1824', *Revista de Indias*, vol. 48, nos. 182–3 (1988), pp. 449–73; María Isabel Remy, 'La sociedad local al inicio de la República. Cuzco 1824–1850', *Revista Andina*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1988), pp. 451–84; Nils Jacobsen, 'Campesinos y tenencia de la tierra en el altiplano peruano en la transición de la Colonia a la República', *Allpanchis*, vol. 23, no. 37 (1991), pp. 25–92. Alonso Carrio de la Vandera, *Reforma del Perú* (trans. Pablo Macera, Lima, 1966 [1782]), pp. 59–60, argued for an abolition of the distinction between 'mestizos' and 'españoles', and that either all or none were mestizos. See, too, the remarks of the Intendant of Puno inferring that a group of *español* complainants were 'españoles supuestos y figurados': ADC, Real Audiencia: Asuntos Administrativos Leg. 155, 'Expte. de apelación hecha ... en orden a elección ... de Alcalde de Españoles ...', 8 April 1794.

[34] ADC, Intendencia: Real Hacienda Leg. 207, 'Lista de los Yndios contribuientes del Pueblo de Poroy Parroquia de Santa Ana ...', 1791; ADC, Real Audiencia: Ordinarias Leg. 55, 'Expediente promovido por Sebastian Tintaya ... y Yndios originarios del Pueblo de Moxo ...', 15 Nov. 1805. The former lists a separate category of 'cholos sin tierras' in the community, the latter lists 'cholitos' who pay tribute at the rate appropriate to 'indios forasteros'. Note, too, the all-embracing use of the term in AGI, Audiencia del Cuzco, Leg. 12, 'Testimonio del Expedte. de la Vicita hecha en el Hospital de Naturales de la Ciudad del Cuzco', 3 June 1816, referring to the disorder occasioned by 'los Cholos Insurgentes'. The term was concurrently in use in neighbouring Charcas: AGI, Estado Leg. 77, 'Extracto sustancial de la sumaria recivida sobre el tumulto acaecido en la Villa de Oruro ...', 1781, notes that 'se juntaron ... muchos cholos' in the unfurling of the uprising, naming five of them, all of whom bore Spanish surnames.

[35] Cahill and O'Phelan, 'Forging their Own History', pp. 147–54, analyses participation and leadership by a group of 'cholos principales' in an uprising; a *cholada* existed alongside, and perhaps merged with, an *indiada*. An even looser contemporary definition is offered at AGI, Indiferente General, Leg. 1525, 'Contestación que dirige

class and ethnicity, but perhaps in this case notions of class are entering into the very definition of ethnic categories, for all that the colonial 'cholo' is in the first instance the offspring of a union between a 'mestizo' and an 'indio'. The elaboration of such castes – genealogies of breeding in the strict sense – was a characteristic of the colonial period, and seems to have been especially prevalent during the eighteenth century. We are warned, however, not to invest such efforts with too much importance. Penelope Corfield refers to 'the eighteenth-century ferment in social terminology' with regard to Britain, arguing that it was 'a period of expanding vocabulary, experimentation in usage, and fluidity of style and expression'.[36] A cognate study of social classifications in early modern Spain advances the similar view that 'a realignment of social relationships' appears to have occurred in the eighteenth century, while also noting a coeval tendency to render the traditional polarisation of society into 'rich' and 'poor' more starkly than previously.[37]

In a sense, though, Magnus Mörner anticipated these recent views twenty-five years ago in his pioneering study of race mixture in Latin American history. He noted 'the almost pathological interest in genealogy that is characteristic of the age', pointing out that associated socio-racial terminology was 'more precisely elaborated in the eighteenth century'.[38] Mörner drew attention to a series of paintings illustrative of race mixture, as well as to related lists or genealogies. These comprised, in effect, a series of almost mathematical permutations and combinations that sought to exhaust all possible racial couplings, taking into account the offspring of each union so as to complete the equation (which, according to such logic, was almost infinite). This is, for Mörner, redolent of eighteenth-century exoticism and rococo',[39] and there is assuredly much to be said for this view, especially given the romantic ethnological dimension to the Enlightenment. Mörner records two lists, one of sixteen couplings for Mexico, and one of fourteen similar unions in the Viceroyalty of Peru. Devising such genealogies was perhaps something of a parlour game for the wits of the age, but at this remove it is difficult to view it as other than an unhealthy obsession with caste. Character and quality were held to vary

el Doctor Don Mariano de la Torre y Vera ...', 6 April 1814, fol. 1v: '... son llamados Cholos ... los q. teniendo mezcla de indio, o de negro están ya entreverados con españoles por sucesivas generaciones. A esta clase de gentes llaman Guaylaychos en Chuqisaca, Guarangos en Buenos Ayres, Caayari en el Paraguay.'

[36] Penelope J. Corfield, 'Class by Name and Number in Eighteenth-century Britain', in *idem* (ed.), *Language, History and Class* (Oxford, 1991), p. 102.

[37] I. A. A. Thompson, '*Hidalgo* and *pechero*: the language of "estates" and "classes" in early-modern Castile', in *ibid.* pp. 73–4.

[38] Magnus Mörner, *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America* (Boston, 1967), pp. 58–9.

[39] *Ibid.*

according to the colour and origins of the 'ethnic types' who comprised these genealogies, known generically as 'castas' or 'genízaros'.[40] Here is one such list, a 'geneàlogía de la Plebeya gente',[41] differing from both those proferred by Mörner in important respects:

1. español + negra = mulato
2. mulato + española = testerón or tercerón
3. testerón + española = quarterón
4. quarterón + española = quinterón
5. quinterón + española = blanco or español común
6. negro + mulata = sambo
7. sambo + mulata = sambohigo
8. sambohigo + mulata = tente en el aire
9. tente en el aire + mulata = salta atrás
10. español + india = mestizo real
11. mestizo + india = cholo
12. cholo + india = tente en el aire
13. tente en el aire + india = salta atrás
14. india + negra = chino
15. chino + negra = rechino or criollo
16. criollo + negra = torna atrás

The text accompanying this breeding calculus indicates that there were also categories of 'requinterón' and 'torna a español' in eighteenth-century Peru. The addition of these two items plus the three original categories of 'indio, español, negro' provides a grand total of twenty-one socio-racial categories – 'las ramas de los precitados troncos'.[42] Nor does

[40] AGI, Indiferente General Leg. 1528, 'Descripción de todos los pueblos del Virreinato del Perú', fols. 41–4 (n.d. but paleography indicates second half of the eighteenth century); fol. 41, noting that foreigners in the Consulado of Cadiz were thus denoted, and that socio-racial groups in Peru, 'aunque de la misma Patria oriundos, se les puede distinguir con el nombre de Genízaros'. The *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* (Madrid, 1970) notes that 'jenízaro' refers to the offspring of mixed parentage in Spain (e.g. Spanish and French), of *cambujo* and *chino* in Mexico, and derives from the term for an infantry soldier (janissary) of the Turkish emperor's guard. Other dictionaries concur with this definition and etymology, while retaining the spelling of 'genízaro'.

[41] AGI, Indiferente General 1528, 'Descripción', fol. 42.

[42] *Ibid.*, fol. 41v. These 21 categories differ markedly from what colonial administrators deemed appropriate for census purposes, from the five (españoles, indios, mestizos, negros libres, esclavos) of the 1795 viceregal census, to the nine (españoles, indios, mestizos, negros, mulatos, quarterones, quinterones, zambos, chinos) of the 1790 Lima census: see J. R. Fisher, *Government and Society in Colonial Peru: the Intendant System 1784–1814* (London, 1970), pp. 251–3, and British Museum Add.MS. 17580, fol. 28v–29, 'Plan demostrativo de la población ... de la ciudad de Lima ...', 5 Dec. 1790, respectively. In the aborted 1778 *Instrucción* of Visitor-General José Antonio de Areche, and the 1784 *Instrucción* of his successor, superintendant Jorge Escobedo, the tributary distinctions are 'indios', 'cholos' and 'zambaigos': both these documents are reproduced in Carlos J. Díaz Rementería, 'En torno a un aspecto de la política reformista de Carlos III: Las matrículas de tributarios en los Virreinatos de Perú y Río de la Plata', *Revista de Indias* vol. 37, no. 147–8 (1977), pp. 51–139.

this list exhaust all possibilities, for Mörner's Peruvian and especially Mexican lists contain more novelties, while he has an addendum of nine further such terms. We are thus in the presence of something approaching fifty different socio-racial terms for the two viceroyalties, even without taking into account kindred terminology in Central America, the Southern Cone, Venezuela, the Audiencias of Quito and Charcas, much less the Spanish Caribbean, Amazonia, and the borderlands of the north. Clearly, a socio-racial glossary for all Spanish-American territories would be enormous.[43] Whether it would be of much use to historians attempting a reconstruction of the colonial past is, however, open to doubt on several grounds.

In the first place, this hydra-like caste classification system obscures the obvious point that 'only a few distinctions could be made on the basis of the phenotype or appearance alone', thereby rendering 'the genealogical criterion of ethnic classification ... absurd'.[44] However, this statement needs to be qualified. That such a system is highly impractical for the social historian is manifest; yet in a society (such as colonial Peru) characterised by low levels of literacy, other visual and mnemonic skills tend to be highly developed, not least at the lower end of the social pecking order. An alternative system of signs evolves, in which items of clothing and, literally, the warp and woof of materials signifies a social message, a notation of rank, provenance and even occupation to those privy to the encoded message. This was so in Incaic Peru, was preserved throughout the colonial period, and persists in places even today – but only to the legatees of this alternative alphabet of 'the woven word'.[45]

Yet by their nature such codes are rarely reflected, even obliquely, in the surviving written record, and thus can be registered as nothing more than a general caveat to any social history. Although the historian is occasionally vouchsafed a chink of light, for the most part social analysis sorts according to the crude categories originally devised by ethnographically-obtuse colonial bureaucrats, simply because it was the language of fiscal and demographic records on which much of our knowledge of the colonial past rests. Even where alternative terminology was used in colonial discourse, it tended to be subsumed within the more encompassing official terminology, while in the bulk of the surviving legal documentation – a rubric that encompasses most extant historical evidence – plaintiffs, defendants, appellants and petitioners were either

[43] These numbers reflect the crudeness of fiscal lists based on just a few racial categories: cf. Rowe's 86 pre-Columbian categories (see note 18), all or most of which bore ethnic connotations; so, too, there are 37 Quechua dialects, apart from other languages, which again are ethnic markers. [44] Mörner, *Race Mixture*, p. 59.

[45] Cereceda, 'Semiology of Andean Textiles', in Murra et al., *Anthropological History*, pp. 149–50.

encouraged or constrained to represent themselves as affiliated to one of the official ethnic categories. Thus, by way of example, a 'quinterón' might be classified for the duration of litigation as either 'español' or 'mestizo'. Perhaps more importantly, on the long view, class became an increasingly important indicator of social status as the colonial period wore on. While there exists but equivocal evidence for this contention across space and time, there is in late colonial Peru a body of qualitative evidence that supports the enhanced importance of economic class as the principal determinant of social stratification. In particular, in an important Indian uprising in 1815, the leadership is seen to comprise the wealthier sectors of indigenous society, rather than the traditional office-holders (including the *parvenu 'caciques intrusos'*) who had hitherto exercised political authority over native Andean town-dwellers and peasantry alike.[46]

A further obstacle to employing such a nebulous socio-racial calculus for heuristic purposes – even were it desirable to do so – is that the content of such terminology changes over time, indeed from region to region, and from one academic discipline to another. None of the terms discussed was in any way a value-free, objective description of phenotype, and all were historically conditioned. The point is a crucial one, for the content of terminology well understood in one way during the colonial period is often brought forward to the present, without taking on board the cultural baggage that such labels have acquired over the succeeding two hundred years. Conversely, and perhaps more damagingly, current usage of terms such as 'mestizo' and 'creole' is all too often anachronistically projected back onto earlier centuries, thereby distorting social-scientific and historical analysis of questions of power, authority, stratification, culture, religion and political participation.

Some social scientists are similarly well aware of the evolving content of ethnic and racial terminology, and of the complexity of the interplay of class and ethnicity, not least because researchers, their informants and historical source material each employ the same terms in different ways. Questions of place, culture, linguistic difference, race and relative wealth intercede in the resolution of this semantic confusion, so much so that Pierre van den Berghe has written that 'the relative salience of class and ethnicity as explanatory concepts in the understanding of social structure is an empirical question';[47] and, he might have added, at all times and everywhere. Put another way, the kinds of socio-racial and ethnic terms

[46] Cahill and O'Phelan, 'Forging their Own History', pp. 125–67.

[47] Pierre L. Van Den Berghe, 'Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *Class and Ethnicity in Peru* (Leiden, 1974), p. 9. See also his 'The Use of Ethnic Terms in the Peruvian Social Science Literature', pp. 12–22.

presently under discussion have no objective meaning outside the immediate historical and social context in which they were used.

Here the context is late colonial Peru, in which notions of class, estate, race, and ethnicity were constantly transforming one another, while particular weight will be accorded usage in the provinces of the southern sierra. The term that has caused most confusion is that of 'español'. In colonial documentation, it rarely denoted a peninsular Spaniard, but rather an American of Spanish ancestry. Unfortunately, translation of 'español' as 'Spaniard' has led to peninsular Spaniards being vested with more than their fair share of historical sins. The term 'español' embraced, in the eighteenth century, some 13% (140, 890) of the colonial population, from creole aristocrats bearing Spanish titles of nobility to the 'poor white' lower orders scattered throughout cities and the villages of the countryside.[48] The 'españoles' liked to consider themselves as being of Spanish extraction *de pura cepa*, but there was considerable miscegenation amongst this group, in the upper tiers as among the lower orders.

How, then, were peninsular Spaniards resident in colonial Peru denoted? There were a number of terms, employed variously in popular parlance and official documentation. In the former case, the terms 'chapetón' (cf. the Mexican usage of '*gachupín*'), 'cotenses',[49] 'europeo', and the mordant Quechua 'pucacunca' (lit. 'rednecks') were the rule.[50] In official and legal documentation, which also spilled over into common usage, the phrase '*de los reinos de España*' was employed, or the more direct '*de Galicia*', '*de Andalucía*' etc., tended to be the norm. Shorter abbreviations such as '*europeo*', '*gallego*', '*catalán*' were officially acceptable.

The 'españoles' were, nevertheless, distinct from the 'mestizos' who comprised a separate census category. Quite what separated the 'mestizos' from the lower levels of the 'español' group is not at all clear, for the latter evidently contained many mixed-race persons. It was thus not a question of race – or even of class in the first instance – but rather of 'culture', though the possible determinants of this last (costume, argot etc.) are similarly unclear. A better translation of 'español' is 'criollo', though this word, in its turn, is loaded with historically-conditioned conflicting signals. The native Andean chronicler Guamán Poma occasionally

[48] The figures are from the 1795 census, a summary of which is in J. R. Fisher, *Government and Society in Colonial Peru*, pp. 251–3.

[49] AGI, Audiencia del Cuzco, Leg. 7, *informe* of Real Audiencia, 11 December 1813, notes that a crowd shouted the slogan 'viva la Patria ... mueren los Cotenses' following the arrest of separatist conspirators.

[50] 'Pucacunca' was widely used, and recurs in testimonies of the 1780 and 1814 uprisings; for the former, Rafael José Sahuaraura Titu Atauchi, 'Estado del Perú' (1784) in *Colección Documental de la Independencia del Perú* (Lima, 1971) tomo II, vol. 1, p. 343: 'Los criollos, o indianos, llaman a los europeos "chapetones", los indios [les llaman] "pucacuncas"', which term Sahuaraura translates as 'pescuezo colorado'.

employs 'criollo' as a synonym for 'mestizo',[51] whereas in present-day Peru it refers to inhabitants of the coast and aspects of coastal and especially *limeño* culture.[52] 'Criollo' was for the most part co-terminus with 'español' in the eighteenth century,[53] but its widespread use came in the wake of political separation and independence from Spain in the early nineteenth century, an event that came to represent something of a watershed in ethnic and socio-racial terminology. 'Español' became redundant, being simply replaced by 'blancos', 'no-indígenas', and even 'castas' or 'prietos' for fiscal purposes, while 'criollo' came into its own as the most widely-used synonym for 'español'. Indigenous groups continued to call outsiders (including creoles) 'viracocha',[54] 'pucacunca' and 'misti'. Similarly, the colonial 'indio', which even today carries pejorative connotations, became 'indígena', though the former is still favoured by historians of the colonial period, being an indispensable building block for colonial demographic, fiscal and social history.[55]

Yet these are starkly-contrasted racial terms, albeit with important ramifications for political alliances. The older ethnic distinctions,

[51] Guamán Poma, *Nueva Corónica*, tomo II, fol. 857 [871], p. 803.

[52] Van Den Berghe, 'The Use of Ethnic Terms', in *idem*, *Class and Ethnicity*, *passim*. Yet even here ethnic distinctions have crept in: 'música criolla' is counterposed not only to 'música andina" but also to the fundamentally urban 'chicha música', strongly identified with 'cholo culture'.

[53] Though an alternative generic usage was certainly in evidence. Thus the crier (*pregonero*) in a land transaction in Aymaraes in 1716 was described as a 'negro criollo': Archivo General de la Nación (Lima), Sección 'Composición de Tierra Indígena', Leg. 5, 'Composición a Dr. Dn. Juan Nuñez Ladron de Guevara', Aymaraes, 1715–16. Frederick P. Bowser, *The African Slave in Colonial Peru 1524–1650* (Stanford, 1974), pp. 78–80, 342–5, notes that slaves called 'criollos' were those 'born in the power of Spaniards and Portuguese'.

[54] For 'viracocha', which in the eighteenth century appears to have been largely confined to the *altiplano* provinces of southern Peru, see Guaman Poma, *Nueva Corónica*, tomo II, fol. 378 [380], p. 351: 'en este tiempo salieron los hombres *uira cochas* cristianos', and fol. 76 [76], p. 60: '*Uira Cocha* cristiano*pi runa* [los señores (españoles) durante la era cristiana]'; also Garcilaso de la Vega, *Royal Commentaries of the Incas* (trans. Harold V. Livermore, Austin, 1966), vol. 1, Book 5, ch. 21, 'On the name Viracocha, and why it was applied to the Spaniards'. For 'misti', see especially Jorge A. Flores Ochoa, 'Mistis and Indians: their Relations in a Micro-region of Cuzco', in Van Den Berge, *Class and Ethnicity*, pp. 62–72. It was in the eighteenth century in pejorative use to describe non-indigenes: 'porque el era Indio y que en brebe acabarian con los Mistis': ADC, Real Audiencia: Asuntos Administrativos Leg. 170. 'Expediente para dar cuenta a la Real Audiencia ...', 8 August 1809.

[55] Republican demography is dealt with in George Kubler, *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795–1940* (Washington, 1952); Luis Miguel Glave, *Demografía y conflicto social* (Documento de Trabajo no. 23, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima, 1988); Nils Jacobsen, 'Taxation in early Republican Peru, 1821–1851: policy making between reform and tradition', in Reinhard Liehr (ed.), *América Latina en la época de Simón Bolívar* (Berlin, 1989), pp. 311–40; Paul Gootenberg, 'Population and Ethnicity in Early Republican Peru: Some Revisions', *Latin American Research Review*, vol. 26, no. 3 (1991), pp. 109–57.

intermittently visible during the great uprising of 1780–3, are yet again lost to view. It may be that the period after 1760, a date which in southern Peru marks the beginning of the full Bourbon fiscal onslaught, represented another watershed in the long dissolution of indigenous ethnic affiliations. From around that date, the state's fiscal imperative inexorably drew more indigenes into the tribute net, while at the same time removing indigenous exemptions from a range of taxes borne by the non-indigenous social groups. The only benefit in being 'indio' at this time was the access this gave to corporative land, yet this was inadequate to meet indigenous demand, was from 1783 subject to quinquennial reviews, and was (like indigenous manpower) increasingly coveted and usurped by the burgeoning numbers of non-indigenous 'caciques intrusos' who swarmed into the cacicazgos after 1780. Yet a widening of the tribute net threatened to capture 'españoles' and 'mestizos' who had hitherto escaped registration as tributaries, as well as indigenes (especially nobles) who had formally or illicitly evaded the capitation tax. It became more difficult to pass as 'español' after 1765, especially after 1783, largely because of increasing state fiscal efficiency, while the opening up of the *cacicazgos* to non-indigenous incumbents during the same period markedly sharpened inter-racial tensions. A simultaneous assault by the Crown on the ethnic, especially Incan, dimension to popular cultural and religious customs and praxis, rendered ethnic markers even less visible, though they are not entirely extinct even today. What seems clear is that, on the eve of independence, economic class has emerged as the principal determinant of social stratification, within as outside of indigenous society. Such processes are most visible to the historian in the provinces of southern Peru,[56] but whether they were paralleled by developments elsewhere in the viceroyalty is a question for future research.

Such racial terms refer variously and variably to race, class, ethnicity and culture. The use of 'mestizo' as a vague cultural marker to describe the upper levels of (especially provincial) urban and rural society has been a major cause of obfuscation and anachronism when projected onto past societies. That there has been some cultural integration and social levelling in Peru since independence seems clear, yet there remain influential pockets of elites who look elsewhere for their primary cultural sustenance. Ethnographers tend to divide rural society into 'indigenous' and either 'mestizo' or 'misti' elements,[57] overlooking the strong Hispanic tradition by no means wholly extinct today. When projected back onto the colonial period, we find the city of Cuzco governed by

[56] These processes are addressed in Cahill, 'Curas and Social Control', pp. 241–59; Cahill and O'Phelan, 'Forging their own History', pp. 132.

[57] See, e.g., Flores Ochoa, 'Mistis and Indians'.

'Mestizo authorities',[58] whereas many of those who did govern Cuzco in the colonial period bore Spanish noble titles, some were descended from the original conquistadores of Peru, and all were obsessed with notions of *limpieza de sangre*. Similarly, for such elites, the notion of 'mestizo culture would have been viewed as an oxymoron, for those then considered as 'mestizo' were placed low on the social ladder, perhaps just above 'cholos', though this latter term appears to have lacked, in the colonial period, the pejorative associations that it so often bears in modern Peru.

The formulation of a socio-racial breeding calculus to describe the complexity of colonial society in Peru was, even in the eighteenth century, at once baroque and simplistic, not to mention racist. It included categories rarely, if ever, encountered in workaday life. Paradoxically, however, it overlooked many of the determinants of social differentiation that Peruvians themselves acknowledged. The many-layered pre-Columbian ethnic tradition, which persisted into and throughout the colonial period, was entirely lost to view. The type of brutish breeding calculus compiled by the literary elites of the 'Age of Enlightenment' was first and foremost ethnographically ignorant. Yet the ethnic distinctions of Tahuantinsuyu that merged with colonial ways of seeing were fragmented and refracted through the imposed categories derived from early modern Spain. While the ethnic identities of the Incario survived, they had lost much of their *raison d'être* in the turmoil attending the conquest; that is to say, they were subject to 'destructuration', to a degree cut adrift from the social and political moorings that had lent them much of their meaning. Thus some *mitmaqkuna* populations continued much as they were, to become ethnic oddities stripped of their control function, and thus of power, authority and prestige over other ethnic groups. Demographic devastation, the resettlement of dispersed communities into nucleated towns, the corporative land *reparticiones* of the 1590s, the sundering of ethnic ascription though the distribution of *encomiendas*, and the fragmentation of the large political divisions (*kurakazgos*, *etnias*, *señoríos*) into smaller administrative units - all contributed to the process of 'destructuration' of the ethnic distinctions of the Incario.[59]

Even without considerations of autochthonous ethnicity, however, the protean nature of socio-racial categories throughout the colonial period and through to the present is striking. The subtle permutations and

[58] Carol Ann Fiedler, 'Corpus Christi in Cuzco: Festival and Ethnic Identity in the Peruvian Andes' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tulane University, 1985), p. 284. Most anthropological studies of Andean societies perpetuate this false mestizo/Indian opposition.

[59] Wachtel, *Vision of the Vanquished*, pp. 85 ff. The term signifies 'the survival of ancient structures, or parts of them, no longer contained within the relatively coherent context in which they had previously existed'.

combinations of race, ethnicity, class, estate – and even occupation, the division of labour, and cultural traits – complicate the picture immeasurably. Above all, 'ethnic' can never be pared down to a reference solely to racial phenotype. There remains much regional difference in terminology, because usage is always and everywhere historically conditioned. For all that ethnicity is protean, there was no smooth evolution of terminology. A certain rupture may be observed between colonial and republican formulations, yet the two are often conflated in social science literature. Here the difficulty is that historians imbue terminology with one meaning, social scientists with another. It perhaps requires the latter to become more historically informed, and the former to become more attuned to present social realities. It is worth recalling in this context Maitland's celebrated dictum that anthropology will be history, or it will be nothing at all. Finally, to point out the myriad difficulties in the historical use of ethnic and socio-racial terminology does not mean that we must divest ourselves of the social stratification models that have served social-historical analysis thus far, but rather that these are capable of further refinement, and that their users need to be aware of the social nuances that prevail in any given era. Historical reality and the dynamics of social relations are always threatening to surpass the bounds of imposed heuristic categories. As Mörner has put it, 'social reality, especially in its more subtle nuances, always appears to be wriggling its way out of our hands'.[60]

[60] Mörner, 'Class, Strata and Elites', p. 39.