

■ VI. Conclusion

The focus of this study has been Fernando de Montesinos' chronicle, *Memorias Antiguas Historiales y Políticas del Perú*, written in the early part of the 17th century. It belongs to some three dozen better known Spanish chronicles (written in 1544–1653) dealing mostly with the Inca culture and history. All references to pre-Incaic traditions or cultures in these chronicles are fragmentary, except for Montesinos' work. He presents a lengthy tradition of pre-Incaic rulers, of which only brief references occur in other sources – in the chronicles of Anello Oliva and Anonymous Jesuit particularly. Montesinos refers to the existence of real writing skills in ancient Peru, which is another puzzling point in his account. A third strange feature has been Montesinos' thesis, that Peru was peopled by descendants of Ophir from Armenia. Taken together, these three 'theses' had made Montesinos' chronicle an oddity among the Andean written sources. Only a few times during a century and half, since this work has been known and published, have any Andeanists taken it seriously.

The aim of my study has been in reassessing the value of Fernando de Montesinos' chronicle as a source of historical information. Its ethnohistorical testimony has been reflected upon, evaluated, and correlated with current archaeological and other circumstantial evidence provided by modern research in the Andes. Correlation of dynastic traditions with absolute dating has been sought. What I found was encouraging and interesting; the new data made me convinced that a second look should be taken at Montesinos' testimony. Hence, the present study provides an attempt to correlate his dynasty lists with current prehistoric periodization in the Andes. Our knowledge of pre-Incaic archaeology has increased and the ethnohistorical account in Montesinos' chronicle has therefore found a more solid correlative basis. My reconstruction is no longer experimental, but a likely explanation to fill in the general outline and nature of the pre-Incaic past in the Andes. I have suggested several potential solutions to the equation. As the voluminous data base receives more analysis, a more elegant solution should not be long in coming.

Scholarly discussion of Montesinos' chronicle and its testimonial value has been practically nonexistent during the past four or five decades. We may summarize the Montesinos-'studies' in two major phases of research: works written until around 1946, and the writings since that date. This watershed is selected mainly because at that time some of the principal pro- and contra commentaries on Montesinos were given, and the old archaeological reconstruction of the Andean past was losing ground for new interpretations, based on accumulative archaeological and ethnohistorical data. Emergent attention on Montesinos can be noticed since the 1980's, and the present study will provide further potential for this redivivus.

The major problems and goals of this study have been concentrated around the three theses of Montesinos: the existence of pre-Incaic dynasties, Peruvian writing skills, and the Ophirian ‘theory’. The queries conducted from these primary problems have found adequate solutions. This means that Montesinos’ narrative apparently contains authentic ethnohistorical information from the pre-Incaic Andean past. There seems to exist a sound correlation between the Middle Horizon – Late Intermediate archaeological periodization and the Montesinos’ historical account. The extant historical tradition presumably was altered and manipulated in many phases of a lifetime of this narrative data. The surviving part went through Inca dynastic propaganda, Toledan reforms, and Montesinos’ own treatment, and should be treated as a tradition relic out of great antiquity. The unique nature of Montesinos’ account has much to do with the manipulative factors above: the interests of both Inca and Toledan political propaganda were to present a model of a relatively short dynastic history, where pre-Incaic traditions were minimized.

I have found corroborative circumstantial evidence that Don Fernando de Montesinos possibly was a Jesuit. Many of his sources are related with that Society. He was well educated and a scientifically oriented observer like the Jesuits often were. He was also a genuine child of his time, which was Baroque. Thus, far-fetched statements and fantastic stories found in his account should be bound up with this interpretative context. As a Scholastic cleric of the Reformation Era he narrated within the frame of the contemporary Judeo-Christian world view and history – where such ideas as Ophir peopling the Americas were a commonplace perception. Being an official of the Colonial government he had access to sources and places where only few other writers could go. Although Montesinos possibly did not master native languages, he seems to have possessed other abilities, which made him a more diligent historian and writer than many of his contemporaries. Last but not least, he might have had Jewish ancestry (*marrano*), which probably caused some problems in his association with the Society of Jesus. This may explain why his links with the Jesuit Order have not been clarified in historical sources, and also why he himself was so keen with Biblical interpretations in his account. We may suppose that he could have experienced the fate of Father Blas Valera, another Jesuit, who became disgraced by his fellow co-religionists as accused of unorthodox writings, and facing therefore difficulties in having his works published.

My study have indicated, that Montesinos indeed manipulated documentary information. There is no question of falsification, but rather of a certain tendency and zeal to make the text conform to particular predestined ideas. This has been found previously of course, but in this analysis I have shown that he did not do so frivolously. A certain systematization is found in his working and methodology, and this has helped me to edit parts from his work which

indicate fictional bias for this manipulation.¹ After the reduction, editing and critical examination, a certain stratified residue was left; a restoring part, which has been the major focus of my study. It contributes interesting ethnohistorical information from a remote Andean past: survival of pre-Incaic dynastic tradition, which appears to find a sound concordance in current archaeological perception on the Andean past. It also denies the canonical dynasty of having no antecedents worthy of the name 'dynasty'. As has been noted, Montesinos was not a romantic falsifier or an outright fabulist. He used interpolation and deletion as primary methods of reflecting what he considered an insufficiently remembered text. His way of investigative and interpretative procedures must also be viewed through his exposure to the clerical background of Jesuit and Scholastic education. From this perspective he appears to be a serene cleric and conscientious historian. He did not invent the pre-Incaic dynasties however much he rearranged them. This information he acquired from various early sources, e.g. Jesuit and other libraries and archives, where he had access. Moreover, a disqualification of Montesinos' testimony on the basis of his injection of the Ophir-story should have nothing to do with his reporting skills and reliability. And the claim of the existence of some form of writing in ancient Peru is based on a reasonable conjecture yet to be deciphered.

The world views (including notions of history and time reckoning) of European (early Modern age) and ancient Andean have been compared in the present study. According to a commonplace idea, the Amerindians and Europeans profoundly differ in this respect. However, a growing universal database indicate that these distinctions have been exaggerated. The polarizing idea between the coexistence of the cyclical and linear thinking needs a profound revision. I have argued on behalf of the idea that the cosmology of Andean elites (as among most ancient societies) cannot be categorized explicitly cyclical. Instead, a co-existent view, which encompasses both cyclical and linear elements, seems to have been more common, especially among the late pre- or protohistoric dynastic elites. Besides, all the available evidence seems to indicate, that the ancient Peruvians did have a real sense of history and means of transmitting it.

The factor of dynastic propaganda has everywhere been a major 'conductor' to build-up similar kinds of canonic histories; to fulfil needs of ambitious individuals and oligarchic circles. I have paid special attention to effects of sovereign rulership and dynastic usurpation in this respect. The Incas practised this propaganda as much as imperial rulers anywhere. In order to legitimize and justify their historical setting and status in the Andean universe, they formulated their dynastic history into an official Canon, which was written down into *quipu* records. The major architect of canonic Incan historiography

1 Several writers have accused Montesinos of documentary manipulation (e.g. RIVA-AGÜERO 1910; ROWE 1945; METRAUX 1961). Also MARKHAM and MEANS (1920) in their analysis of Montesinos' king list referred to certain parts in his work which were manipulated information.

was Inca Yupanqui Pachacuti. He was possibly responsible for deleting any pre-Incaic dynastic lore from the official Canon. What was left is a truncated version, which most sources have repeated to us so consistently, that conventional chronology established by J.H. ROWE (1946) set the dynasty beginnings at A.D. 1200.

Inca Pachacuti was not the only “reformer” in Andean history who did this kind of manipulation. Inca Atahualpa committed dramatic, iconoclastic acts against his predecessors’ royal heritage, and the Spanish viceroy Francisco de Toledo used stern methods to destroy the last Incas and secure Spanish order in Peru.² This means, that both the history of the Incas and particularly what is left of their predecessors, has to be perceived through multilevel ‘filters’ of dynastic propaganda and manipulation of testimonial evidence. In spite of these difficulties, the present study has been an attempt of plumbing at the time depths through the distinct historical phases of tradition’s lifetime. This ‘upstreaming’ has not been an experimental adventure, but was carried through with good maps and compasses in a prepared, serious voyage.

In spite of apparent effectivity of Incaic propaganda, all over the Andes occasional pre-Incaic traditions persisted. Legends and oral narratives told about past kings and dynasties, who reigned immediately and in the case of Waris (Huaris), long before the times of the Incas. This substantial pre-Incaic heritage survived mostly in peripheral provinces, and fragmentarily in central regions too.³ By chance, the Jesuits were active in collecting this kind of data. The primary extant sources relating to the pre-Incas are at any rate scanty. The unique information related in Montesinos’ chronicle may be reckoned as an important part of this tradition.

The principal discussion, evaluation, and methodological approach in this study has been concentrated around two main types of diachronic evidence: testimonial and circumstantial. Ethnohistory and oral tradition (memory) are testimonial evidence from prehistory. One major focus of the present study is to exploit this special source and evaluate its testimonial veracity. I have used comparative and cross-cultural data quantitatively to derive indices and test their applicability to Andean data. The emergence of ethnohistorical research from the 1960s until today has brought means and methods to evaluate better the testimonial data of oral tradition. A number of cases have indicated, that oral tradition could contain more credibility than has generally been thought. Circumstantial evidence that can be derived from other fields, like, historical linguistics and archaeoastronomy, has come off fairly well too. By using

2 Atahualpa in proclaiming himself a new ‘Pachacuti’ (after usurping the throne), ordered historical *quipu*-information concerning the reign of Huascar to be destroyed (besides a persecution of his lineage). Consult e.g. Quipocamayos (1542–44) 1920:3–5. For more, see chapter II:3.2.

3 It is worth noting, that the longest pre-Inca lists are from Northern Peru (Muchik territory) and Ecuador. In the North-Central Highlands also a long list of the Yarovilca rulers (as presented by Guaman Poma) was derived.

advances in archaeology and other techniques, reliable circumstantial evidence can now be deduced on a more firm footing than before.

The problem of oral tradition's veracity especially concerns Andean context and studies. Andeanists cannot use hieroglyphic texts as supportive data, like the Mesoamericanists, but have to rely on Colonial documents, which are based on orally transmitted information from the native past. The Andeans possessed a systematized oral tradition, which used a special mnemonic device, *quipu*, which seems to have been a more sophisticated container of historical information than has been thought. Other mnemotechnics like *tocapu*-writing were obviously used too. Contrary to common expectations, the available present data strongly supports the re-assessed idea, that the ancient Peruvians truly possessed sophisticated means for cognitive communication. They had a variety of methods, and more evidence has emerged that they exploited even phoneticism to a certain extent. It seems that Colonial writing has exaggerated teleologically or unintentionally the novelty nature of European writing for the Andean people.⁴ In all likelihood the Andeans were fully capable of transmitting complicated historical information for posterity. Montesinos, who has laid emphasis on these skills of the natives, appears to have been more on the right track than most other chroniclers. The present study has indicated, that ethnic historiography and oral tradition data is capable of maintaining historical accounts in a relatively unaltered form through centuries, even up to millenia. The temporal depth of 'Montesian' tradition can be estimated to have extended up to 300–700 years, which is not unrealistic in view of the comparative, cross-cultural data.

In my comparative analysis the dynasty lists are treated as a special phenomenon in universal history. A broad cross-cultural analysis has provided data, which clearly indicates that the regnal span averages, which are commonly used in building up chronologies in non-historical societies, are significantly exaggerated. These chronologies have usually been based on European data, which could provide distorted results. To avoid this chronological twisting, I have used solely non-European comparative data. The present study provides new tools and chronological parameters to validate dynasty lists on a comparative basis. These can better be extrapolated and applied to non-European ancient dynastic traditions than most previous attempts. Montesinos' king list has proved to be most ideal for this kind of testing.

More than any other accounts, the chronicles of Sarmiento de Gamboa and Garcilaso de la Vega have saturated and manipulated our perception of the Inca

.
4 See for instance Patricia SEED's article "Failing to Marvel": Atahualpa's Encounter with the Word' in *Latin American Research Review* (Vol. 26, Nr. 1) 1991:7–32. For example Titu Cusi Yupanqui ([1570] 1916:8) has reported that the Spaniards "speak by means of white cloths" (hablar a solas en unos paños blancos) [i.e. books}, which might have been a reminiscent of native Andean practise to read *quillca*- and *tocapu*-markings from the textiles. For Atahualpa showing no astonishment at the letters and paper, consult Xerez (1534) 1985:111, 1872:54.

history and culture. The account of the first was an anti- Inca, propagandist colonial tool in justifying the Spanish Conquest. Garcilaso's work was partly a counterattack for Sarmiento's abuses, but more so an utterly polished view of Inca civilization, which had a marked influence on perceptions of the Incas for centuries to come. Both writers, however, dismerited the pre-Incas, albeit for distinct political reasons.

The present study has situated Montesinos' narrative within these two major interpretative 'schools' of Andean Colonial historiography ('the Garcilasan' and 'the Toledan'). The account of Montesinos seems to fit far better within the current perception of Andean prehistoric periodization than either of these chronicles.

Besides these interpretations, my study has also challenged the modern conventional and structuralist reconstructions of Inca history. In relation with them and Montesinos' account I have found a historicist viewpoint a most appropriate approach to a subject matter which concentrates on elite dynastic tradition, re-evaluates ethnohistorical information, uses comparative quantitative analyses, seeks correlation in archaeological periodization, and discusses the dichotomy between cyclical and linear thinking. In fact, the present study recalls the historicist strategy to be revisited. This viewpoint rejects the structural hypothesis of Inca dynastic organization and highlights the intercalation of archaeological and ethnohistorical testimonies instead. In this respect there are no good grounds for invalidating the idea that the unilinear dynastic structure, as recorded by most chroniclers of consequence, was in all probability a working practise among the Incas.

Most allegations provided by either structuralist or traditional historicist interpretation of Inca history do not correspond well with the emerging new ethnohistorically influenced interpretations of the Incaic or/and pre-Incaic past. Therefore I have issued forth arguments and proposed better answers and new solutions. Most of my commentary sources belong to a 'divergent' maximalist tradition, which have preserved some pre-Incaic information. As far as the Incas proper are concerned, the 'divergent' minimalist tradition (short dynasty) may offer better fitting models to be used. The best available source for the maximalist tradition is Fernando de Montesinos' chronicle. Its correlation with on-going archaeological and other circumstantial evidence allows it to be hypothesized within the absolute chronology. As a matter of fact, Montesinos' chronicle is the only extant Andean source into which this correlation model can fit.

Modern research has also revealed interesting loopholes in Montesinos' likely sources. New documentary data seems to support the idea that Anonymous Jesuit was indeed Blas Valera. This is a positive proof that Father Valera's history belongs to the maximalist tradition, which Montesinos adopted and used in his account. The reason why Garcilaso, who used Valera as his source, did not give any references to pre-Incaic kings, was probably political and propagandistic. Valera was a partisan in favor of Atahualpa, while for Garcilaso this ruler represented tyranny and destruction. Therefore, in historical matters, Garcilaso possibly did not concert the ideas with Valera too much.

The general outline and structure of Montesinos' king list reflects marked features of authenticity. The reasonable regnal spans, distribution of titles and other aspects indicate its apparent genuine origins. There are a significant mixing of Quechua and Aymara (perhaps even Puquina) languages in the variety of names, even archaic forms as one can expect to find in accounts which make claims to remote antiquity.

My study and analysis of Montesinos' dynasty list have provided further confirmation for its proposed tripartition into Piruas, Amautas and Tampu-Tocco-dynasties. This could point to three distinct ethnohistorical sources and reference groups. In one possible scenario two of these dynasties perhaps were contemporaneous. In this view the so-called Piruas in the beginning of Montesinos' list should possibly be placed in much later times and co-existing with the dynasty of Tampu-Tocco rulers. Their identity in my interpretation is proposed to be the Hurin-Cuzco "Incas", which the later tradition may have truncated (telescoped) into a much shorter "official" dynasty. Correspondingly the Hanan-Cuzcos were a related but distinct group, which "usurped" the throne of Cuzco. The first ruler in this lineage, Roca, adopted the title Inca from local tradition to designate his status as overlord.

Montesinos interpolated many events belonging to later Inca history into Pirua dynasty. This and other evidence seem to indicate, that he construed his master king list by cutting the "Inca-related" tradition in two, and setting Amauta and Tampu-Tocco-tradition in between them.

The proper setting of the Piruas is more problematic than the rest of Montesinian dynasties. I have proposed a scenario, in which they belong to the Late Intermediate Period and had dynastic affiliation with the Hurin-Cuzco Incas. In another scenario instead, the Piruas might have been an emigrant Puquina-speaking elite group from Tiahuanaco, which probably settled at Ayacucho somewhere between A.D. 300 and 500. There their lineage possibly co-existed a while with the emergent Amautas, who were the Waris proper. One could presume also, that this collateral socio-political development caused tension and rivalry – in which the latter lineage finally gained supremacy. Be that as it may, the Pirua question awaits answers in future.

As the matters stand, I believe that the latest dynastic section, the Tampu-Toccans, can be connected with the archaeological Chokepukio, where interesting excavations have currently been made by Gordon McEWAN. According to my perception, Chokepukio may have been a dynastic seat of a Neo-Wari polity until around A.D. 1100, when it was possessed by a migrant Puquina or Aymara-speaking group from Altiplano. Tampu-Tocco and Muyna may also have had an ethnohistorical connection. Moreover, I believe that Chokepukio/Tampu-Tocco was replaced by the Pinahua/Muyna chiefdom about A.D.1300. The latter held hegemony on Lucre Basin and the Cuzco area until A.D. 1350, when Inca Roca and Hanan-Cuzcos entered on the political scene. When the Incas started to gain ground in Cuzco valley and its vicinity, the power of Muyna was on its way out. It was only at the time of Inca Viracocha when Muyna was finally destroyed. When the Incas arose in

imperial overlordship, the dynastic history was re-written and in that canon the illustrious past of Hurin Cuzcos apparently did not fit, and less so histories of the enemies at Muyna.⁵

The glorious kings of the imperial era have been called Amautas in Montesinos' chronicle. I have presented the hypothesis, that the account of these kings in fact should be bound up with the rulers of the Middle- Horizon Wari polity. Some scholars have earlier drawn a parallel between the Amautas and a pan-Andean Tiahuanaco ('megalithic') empire, but this hypothesis started to fail when Wari was re-discovered some fifty years ago. It is somewhat surprising, that this ethnohistorical data has not been tested and correlated with the case of Wari after that. The present study has shown that this data could be better tied in with Wari than Tiahuanaco or any model of a pre-Incaic pan-Andean empire. Still, more research and collateral evidence is needed, until we can affirm on a more secure basis that a good number of kings recorded in Montesinos' chronicle and referred to in few other documents, could have been historical individuals from the Andean antiquity. Thus far it seems reasonably likely that there was a dynasty of mighty kings, who ruled the Wari state and called themselves *Amautas*.

The Incaic connection in Montesinos' narrative is most interesting. In the following scenario I have initially relied on Montesinos' account, in which the Incas proper were historically tied in with their dynastic predecessors. The Incas proper were led by Inca Roca (a descendant of the previous Tampu Tocco dynasty), who presumably usurped the Hurin Cuzco throne at Cuzco. He may have liberated the city from the Muyna yoke. During the subsequent reigns a tensed relationship between the subordinant Hurin Cuzcos and the usurpant Hanan Cuzcos prevailed. The situation was changed after the Chanca war. Inca Pachacuti resolved the dispute in giving certain privileges to Hurin Cuzcos and a more permanent status in Cuzco's socio-political organization. The traditions of both sects were merged and a restructured historical Canon was established. The dynastic traditions were truncated and structuralized. According to the political interests of Inca Pachacuti and his junta, the records of precedent dynasties were deliberately forgotten.

All things considered and following the proposed scenario, we may postulate certain critical points in the lifetime of Montesinos' dynastic narrative (as correlated with absolute dating), which are:

1. The collapse of Wari ca. 850–900 AD
2. The collapse of Tampu-Tocco ca. 1100 (Neo-Waris)
3. The collapse of Tampu-Tocco ca. 1300 (Aymara dynasty)
4. The usurpation of Inca Roca ca. 1350

.
5 Gordon McEWAN (25 November 1998, personal communication) is convinced, "that the Inca are the result of a merging of the Killke and Lucre peoples and that the Lucre contributed a lot of what they inherited from the Wari. I therefore see rather direct Wari influence on the formation of the Inca state."

5. The usurpation of Inca Pachacuti ca. 1438
6. The usurpation of Inca Atahuallpa 1532
7. Toledan reforms and destruction of *quipus* 1570–83
8. Montesinos' own treatment of the tradition 1638–42

The previous attempt to correlate the Montesian dynasty lists with absolute dating and archaeological periodization in the Andes originates from 1920, in the study of C. MARKHAM and P.A. MEANS. Since that date archaeological and other research has revealed abundant new information (the most important of which is the Wari cultural sphere). Modern research has also given more confirmation on alleged cultural (and perhaps political) relationship between the Wari, Chokepukio and Inca spheres. Accordingly, a complete reappraisal and redivivus of Montesinos and his work is a long-felt need in Andean studies. The present study is the first volume on Montesinos, his works and historiography, to appear in a book form during the entire 150-year period of Montesian-research.

This study has demonstrated, that a notable part of the historical content of Fernando de Montesinos' chronicle seems to rest on a more firm and reliable footing than has hitherto been thought. In standing for as one of the Spanish-Andean primary sources of consequence, it is worth to be taken into account more well and truly than before. There are reasonable grounds for drawing a parallel between its historical context and modern archaeological implications, as well as interpretative themes presented above. As a man of letters Montesinos ascends as a skilled author of early Modern Era, who worked in the best scholarly fashion of his times, during which trends like Scholasticism, Jesuitism, Baroque modes and so forth, dominated. He deserves to be given anew his due and respect as his own times did. I should like to share the opinion of Juan Eusebio Nieremberg, a renowned 17th-century Jesuit authority, who has characterized Montesinos as a "*historiador diligentísimo*".⁶

.
 6 Consult, Manuel Rodríguez ([1684] 1990:111) who has quoted Nieremberg.

TABLE 8. A composite graph showing the dynamics of verification around Montesinos' chronicle

