

## **Panaca Lands: Re-Invented Communities**

by

**Jeanette E. Sherbondy**  
*Washington College, Maryland*

One of the institutions of the Inca empire that has fascinated a number of scholars is the *panaca* (Q.).<sup>1</sup> The *panacas* were the ten royal lineages that held the prime lands in Cuzco, the Inca capital. They always appear at the core of discussions of the formation of the Inca empire and of its structure; however, the question of what became of the *panacas* after the Spanish conquest in 1532 has received almost no attention. Karen Spalding (1984:107-167) set the stage of this early period (1532-1560's):

... the dominance of the Europeans in the Andes was a surface phenomenon, not penetrating deeply into Andean culture or social relationships for decades. The Spanish invaders were at first content to ride the surface of Andean society, supported by the local communities whom they permitted—in fact encouraged—to maintain the social relationships of production and the political structures evolved over centuries. The Spaniards did not even, in most cases, seek to interfere much with the administrative structures established by the Inca rulers. They used those structures and profited by them, absorbing the flow of labor and the products of that labor that had once gone to the Inca state.

But within a few decades of the first Spaniards' arrival in the Andes, floods of their countrymen eager for a part in the spoils of conquest joined them, and the fundamental differences in the two societies—European and Andean—began to put a severe strain on the entire system of domination. For Andean society functioned according to a pattern of social relationships that organized both productive labor and political integration... But though the Europeans found much in Andean society that was externally similar to their own—the emphasis upon hierarchy and status, and their close link to the exercise of

authority on both the local and the state level, for example—the societies themselves were quite different.

.... For the sake of definition, I have dubbed this period 'the age of the plunder economy'—a period characterized by the outright expropriation of the products of the communities in which the Spaniards established themselves... The driving force of the rapid Spanish expansion in the Americas was the search for wealth—wealth that could be traded for rank and position in contemporary Spanish society...

Renamed 'Indians' by their conquerors, the native peoples were forced to provide their new masters with goods and labor... The structures and the institutions of Andean society itself, at first used by Spaniards who acted as if they could replace the defeated Inca rulers and receive the surplus appropriated by the Incas without conforming to the social institutions of Andean society, were gradually distorted, modified, and transformed (Spalding 1984:108-109).

It is important then, to examine closely what became of the Inca *panacas* in the early "plunder" and later colonial periods (1532-1590) in order to understand some of the dynamics of the dismantling of the Inca empire and the creation of a Spanish colony out of it. Ultimately, this analysis has a bearing on our understanding of what Cuzco is today, but that is not the focus of this article. Rather I propose to examine how these Inca *panacas* fared in the first years after the Spanish conquest as a way of probing how the Spanish colony took shape out of the remains of the Inca state. I am interested in what kinds of decisions with respect to land and water rights, ethnic identity and inter-ethnic relations and governmental control must have been made by Incas and Spaniards in those early years and why some strategies evidently were successful. In time, some of the *panacas* disappeared altogether, but a few have persisted until the present. What processes explain the disappearances, the transformations and the persistences of communities that had their origins in the Inca state?

On the one hand I would like to draw on Benedict Anderson's (1991:6) argument that "communities are to be distinguished... by the style in which they are imagined" and inquire into the cultural process by which the communities that had been known as *panacas* in the Inca period changed the styles in which they were imagined during the early colonial period. How did the Inca style of *panaca* become transformed into the colonial *panaca*? How did the colonial officials re-interpret the *panaca* so that it could be of use to them and yet not become a focus of Inca

insurrection? How did members of the colonial *panacas* redefine themselves under Spanish colonial domination?

On the other hand I would like to focus my discussion on Claire Farrer's (1991:101-127) dialectical concept of "chiasm", which I find particularly useful for explaining the process of change that always draws along with it recognizable structures from before. Her formulation is an effective, graphic way of communicating the idea of the holistic relationship between the concepts of the structural and the processual, the non-dichotomous relationships between the concepts of emergence and persistence (see Dover 1992:1-7). "Chiasms,... are at once symbolic of the ordering, and potential un-ordering, of the universe (Farrer 1991:120). What happens at those points in life when the comfortable patterns and structures of sociocultural life are thrown into chaos? What direction will the changes take? When no vision can predict the direction of change, how do people rely on some underlying principles of their life to keep their world intact during periods of violent and drastic changes?

Farrer postulated the concept of chiasm as a mechanism of cultural change that she envisioned "... as being a series of chis, Xs, suspended and intertwined in metaphysical space" (1991:102). She uses "... the concept chi to indicate the complex interplay of cultural life, whether it is the culturally proper way to dress, eat, behave, think or act. The nexus, or crossing points of the chis, provide entry into potentialities for culture change; it is the potentialities for change or affirmation of cultural norms that are the most prominent features of chiasms. Certain events and individuals function as chiasms, opening the way to the underlying behavior symbolized by the chi figures. Once opened, the figures themselves—the culturally appropriate ways to be—are subject to change, affirmation, redefinition or validation" (Farrer 1991:102-103). Farrer (1991:103) rejected a model of successive Xs for a model of interconnected chis because "... [t]he cursive and hooked aspects of the interconnected chis were structures for thinking, since it seemed... that when a chiasm was in existence,... there were all kinds of behavior and thought patterns that were catching hold of each other and influencing each other, rather than there being separate and singular instances of behavior or thought." However, she rejected the linearity of this concept and other related ones and instead visualized chiasm as chis whirling and moving around each other in several planes simultaneously, sometimes intersecting, crossing each other in every possible plane, "incorporating not just space and time or height and depth, but also thought

and action." Wherever a crossing or intersection occurs—whether of an entire chi or a segment of it—there is a chiasm and the potential for creativity and reordering. "... a chiasm does not sit on a boundary; it melts boundaries, so that each melds into the other such that there is union between the extensions of the arms of the chis at unpredictable places" (Farrer 1991:104). Her concept has much in common with contemporary chaos theorists (Farrer 1991:107).

Like all cultures, the Inca world went through several such periods of chaos and change. I have identified several major points of chiasm, extrapolated from Inca myth/history; but the most critical chiasm was the point when European culture threatened to completely overwhelm Andean culture putting the persistence of any Andean patterns in question. I will proceed by giving as background an overview of how the Inca *panaca* developed within the context of Inca myth/history. I see this as a dynamic process of successive chiasms that created strategic socio-political units for the initial consolidation of Inca power and then remolded them as essential administrative units.

Then I will turn to an analysis of some of the documentary evidence for *panacas* in the first years of the Spanish colonial period when the Europeans who had just barely won the war of conquest (1532-1590) and were inventing and putting in place governing principles for their rule over the vanquished Andeans. This was the biggest challenge to the *panacas*. When the Inca empire was destroyed the formal reason for the Incaic existence of the *panacas* as administrative units of the empire collapsed. However, the surviving Inca nobles and their landless *yanaconas* (Q. serfs, personal servants) who belonged to the *panacas* needed to maintain control over the only lands that they worked and lived on and that gave them their identity and a position in the social hierarchy. So they re-invented the *panaca* as a colonial *ayllu* (Q. Andean community based on common ancestry and land). The success of the strategy was partly due to the usefulness of the Spanish colonial *ayllu* to promote the interests of the colonial government. However, each group imagined this community as something quite different from the other. The Spanish and Inca elites thought they understood each other's systems and tried to manipulate them for their own purposes. While they did not fully understand each other's system, their actions were informed by their perceptions of what the other system was (Spalding 1984).

The documentary basis for my discussion of the colonial *panaca* is three manuscripts that shed light on what was happening to the *panacas* from 1540-1590, as well as some other documents from the later colonial period.

I will anticipate my conclusions: It is apparent from data on land claims in the colonial period that the Inca *panaca* did not survive intact, because it was primarily a political, administrative and land based institution for the Inca state that had been defeated. When the Inca state was defeated, the *mitimaes* (Q. colonists) and *mita* (Q. tribute by turns) laborers on most state and personal lands of the Inca abandoned those lands and went back to their own home territories [ed.: see Kolata, this volume]. However, since *panacas* were worked by *yanacunas* (serfs), who had nowhere else to go, the *yanacunas* stayed on the lands. The former Inca administrators of the *panacas*, their families and the *yanacunas* that worked for them, thus formed social and territorial units that were the basis for the colonial *ayllus* that kept the names of the *panacas*. It seems most likely that the former *yanacunas* who continued to work the lands of the *panacas*, assumed a colonial identity based on the *panaca* because their only identity came from the names of the *panacas* they had formerly worked for. Noble members of the Inca *panacas* maintained the political leadership of the colonial groups as long as they could, and then the leadership must have passed to former managers of the *panacas* and assertive former *yanacunas* and their descendants. Since political and social relationships were defined in the kinship idiom in Inca thought, ambiguous claims of kinship and disputes over relative social rank are found in the claims to the lands of *panacas* and *ayllus* as well as to membership in the same. The Spanish administrators called these colonial communities *ayllus* rather than *panacas*, probably because the *panaca* designation was too loaded with implications of Inca authority whereas the word *ayllu*, does not necessarily imply Inca imperial privilege and so it was more easily incorporated into the Spanish colonial idiom.

The possibility that Inca nobles could make effective land claims and get Spanish titles to their lands provided a legal basis for some of these *ayllus*. These nobles were useful to the Spaniards as allies in the early "plunder period" but later the Crown recognized the necessity of putting them more directly under its own political control and so the nobles and their *ayllus* were organized into parishes in 1559 and again in 1570. The chaos of the plunder period gradually took on an appearance of order

throughout the 1560's, which the viceroy Toledo formalized in the 1570's. The colonial *ayllus* were created out of the former *panaca* lands by the *yanaconas* that had belonged to the *panacas* and by the descendants of some of their administrators in an attempt to defend their claims to land, but also by the Spanish strategy of lumping together remnants of pre-Hispanic populations into communities (i.e., *reducciones*) that could be called upon for labor, converted to Christianity, and whose movements could be more closely controlled.

It was an efficient legal strategy for the *panacas* to maintain their claim that these were lands of descendants of royal Incas in order to avoid paying tribute as the other non-royal *ayllus* of Cuzco had to do after 1570. Interestingly, it is at this time that the concept of the *panaca* as a royal lineage with land holdings appears in the colonial record. Once the native population of Cuzco was recognized as vital providers of basic foodstuffs, labor and as tribute payers, their corporate existence (as *ayllus* of native parishes) was politically organized for the benefit of the Spanish Crown in 1559 and again in 1570, when the Cuzco parishes were formally established (Sherbondy 1993).

I argue that the colonial *ayllus* with *panaca* names were attempts on the part of Incas and *yanaconas* to retain control over at least some of the earlier *panaca* lands. We cannot assume however that their persistence into the colonial period is simply the survival of Inca *panacas*; rather the colonial *ayllus* that emerged in the sixteenth century successfully responded to the political and economic pressures that the Spanish parish organization imposed on the native population by creating (or re-inventing) a corporate community that provided for its subsistence and legally defended its lands.

### **The Inca *Panaca***

The *panacas* were corporate groups of Incas that were like *ayllus* in many respects. An *ayllu* was a type of corporate group that was found all over the central Andean region and seems to have ancient origins although neither the exact age nor the territorial extent of *ayllus* in the Andes have been determined<sup>2</sup> [ed.: see Isbell and Earls, this volume]. At the time of the Spanish conquest of the Inca empire in the sixteenth century, each *ayllu* carried a name, had a head or founder to whom the people of the *ayllu* considered that they were related or descended and had exclusive rituals to care for and honor their ancestors. The ancestors were often visible as rock formations or mountain peaks and the water sources (the springs, lakes and

rivers) were revered as the places where the original ancestors had emerged from the earth to found their settlements [ed.: see Molinié, this volume]. These ancestors had given the members of an *ayllu* rights to specific lands, which were believed to be the source of their life as well as their resting place at death.

The *ayllu's* internal affairs were governed by a kinship based social organization led by an elder. Ritual specialists played a number of roles such as guarding the agricultural fields from danger or regulating the distribution of irrigation water. The *ayllu* also functioned as the fundamental organizational unit in larger polities. Several *ayllus* could recognize a common territory with a common ancestor in such a way that extensive political units could be built up by nested groups of *ayllus*. Thus the *ayllus* were communities of related peoples who lived, worked, worshipped and, ideally, died, on their communally held land.

The Incaic *panacas* were all that the *ayllus* were, and more. Both Andean institutions were organized by an idiom of descent, held corporate ownership of their means of production and formed a spiritual community with each other and the earth that gave them their living [ed.: see Turner, this volume]. However, the *panacas* differed from the *ayllus* in significant ways: (1) They were not dispersed throughout the far-flung empire of the Incas, but rather were concentrated on the best lands at the very core of the Inca empire, in Cuzco. (2) The founders of the *panacas* were all former kings of Cuzco and so these groups enjoyed the highest social rank. (3) The lands were worked by *yanaconas*, personal servants or serfs of the Inca nobility. We will look at each of these three distinguishing aspects.

(1) The *panacas* were unique Inca institutions found only in the area of the Inca capital city. Ten of them had lands that were located in the Huatanay valley near Cuzco and one had lands in the nearby Vilcanota valley. There are no data that indicate that any *panaca* lands in the preHispanic era were located beyond this zone.

(2) Each *panaca* was dedicated to the ritual care of a founder who was a former Inca ruler. They were as follows, listed in ascending order:

<u>Panaca</u>	<u>Founder (ruler)</u>
1. Chima panaca	Manco Capac
2. Rauraua panaca	Sinchi Roca
3. Ahuayni panaca	Lloqui Yupanqui
4. Uscamayta panaca	Mayta Capac

Sarmiento was the first to interpret the *panacas* as side branches of the Inca ruler's lineage. Sarmiento described them as the descendants of a deceased Inca king with the exclusion of the king's successor who formed his own *panaca*. The logic of the successive formation of *panacas* with the death of each king led to the establishment of an hypothetical chronology for the succession of Inca rulers (Rowe 1945) and to theories of competition and co-option of land by new kings that might, in part, explain Inca territorial expansion (Rostworowski 1960; Conrad 1981).

However, two accounts that predate Sarmiento's history, one by Gutierrez de Santa Clara (1905[1544-1548]) and another by Juan de Betanzos (1987[1551]), indicate that the *panacas* were created simultaneously, not successively, and that as a group they formed a significant part of the socio-political organization of Inca Cuzco (Zuidema 1964, 1977, 1986, 1990). This organization was attributed to the king Pachacuti Inca. He is said to have divided the Inca population into ranked groups. The highest nobility formed Capac ayllu;<sup>5</sup> these defined themselves as the descendants of Tupac Inca Yupanqui, Pachacuti Inca's successor and son. The members of Capac ayllu were probably the descendants of Pachacuti Inca's first wife (Zuidema 1986). This was the highest ranking *panaca*. All the other nobility were called "Hatun ayllu Iñaca panaca" and were the descendants of Pachacuti Inca by his other wives. The latter *panaca* was the second highest rank of *panacas*. The descendants of four of Pachacuti's wives from the upper moiety of Cuzco formed Hatun ayllu and the descendants of five of his wives from the lower moiety formed Iñaca panaca. Zuidema suggests that these people took other surnames, that is the names of the other *panacas*. The relative rank of these ten groups was expressed in terms of the genealogical relationships of the Incas who were considered the official founders of the *panacas*. Zuidema argues that in reality the Incas before Pachacuti Inca were non-historical ancestors of the royal dynasty whose names are the—actually mythical—"kings" recorded as the founders of the *panacas* that have been listed above. These ten *panacas* of Inca nobility are identified in their moiety grouping in Table 1.

In addition to the Inca nobility, there was a division of the pre-Inca population that had remained in Cuzco after the Inca conquest of the valley into two groups of five *ayllus* each; there was one Hanan Cuzco group and one Hurin Cuzco group. These groups (i.e., ten in all) were called *ayllus* and never *panacas* (see Table 2). A thirteenth group (i.e., another *ayllu*)

that played an important role in Inca Cuzco represented the non-Inca outsiders who were not permanent residents of Cuzco (Zuidema 1986).

The *panacas* functioned as administrative units of the Inca state; the Inca ruler appointed his chief administrators from among the members of these units, who were his relatives. These administrators were the living heads of the *panacas* who were in charge of collecting the tribute brought by subject lords to Cuzco from the provinces. The four administrators of the Hanan Cuzco *panacas*, together with the king, ruled the Hanan moiety portion of the Cuzco valley (Capac ayllu, Hatun ayllu). The five administrators who ruled the Hurin moiety were known collectively as Iñaca panaca (Zuidema 1986).<sup>6</sup>

### ***Panacas*: Distributions**

Aside from collecting and storing tribute, the most important function of the *panacas* was to formalize the distribution of rights and obligations to the core lands of the Inca empire in Cuzco. These rights and obligations were intrinsically sacred and secular because they established temporal and spatial order. This was accomplished by controlling the calendar and the irrigation waters and lands. Each redistribution, which came about with the accession of each new Inca, changed the political order of things spatial and temporal and material, but kept constant the principle of taking care of that central core of time and space and wealth of the empire. These periodic reorganizations produced several points of chiasm during the centuries of Inca rule in pre-Conquest times.

The Inca ruler assigned the *panacas* the important ritual obligation to care for the sacred sites, (*huacas* Q.) within the valley of Cuzco. The *huacas* were organized along ceremonial lines, known as *ceques* (Q. line) (Cobo 1956[1653]:169-186; Zuidema 1964) that radiated from the center of Cuzco. The *panacas* were obliged to perform the rituals of the official calendar [ed.: see Aveni, this volume]. The ten *panacas*, as well as the two pre-Inca groups of *ayllus* and one group of non-resident *ayllus*, were each charged with the ritual care of the *huacas* of one month in the year. In general, a different *huaca* was honored on each successive day of that month.

Over one third of these *huacas* were springs or fountains of water; many of them were sources for irrigation canals in the Cuzco valley that irrigated primarily the maize crops. The distribution of these water sources to the *panacas* and non-Inca *ayllus* reveals a definite hierarchy. The highest ranking *panacas* (Capac ayllu and Hatun ayllu) were responsible for the