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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines ancient Andean performances from the early urban site of Caylán (800-10 cal. BCE) on the North-Central coast of Peru, Ancash. Spaces utilized for public events such as feasting, spectacles, and rituals have been a rich source of data for anthropologists looking to understand dynamics of community, power, and ideology. These spaces are also undervalued in terms of their potential multivocal qualities. During the Formative Period (1600-100 BCE), sunken plazas were the focus of a vast array of public activities and performances in ancient Peru. This thesis focuses on Formative Period public spaces as theaters of heightened interactions, and considers the shift from U-shaped temples to enclosure compounds at the end of the Formative.

Research was conducted at Caylán in the lower Nepeña Valley, a large archaeological complex interpreted as the center of an emerging urban polity during the first millennium BCE. The site epicenter was organized around a series of monumental enclosure compounds, each dominated by an elaborate benched plaza. One of these plazas, Plaza-A, occupied a central place within the settlement’s public landscape. Mapping and excavation operations conducted in 2009 and 2010 yielded spatial and material data to assess the essence of public landscapes as viewed through the use, organization, and perception of Plaza-A.

Results indicate a spatially controlled and exclusive plaza environment, which relied on movement and manipulation of the senses to create an extraordinary public experience. Public activities included episodic spectacles involving the December Solstice, music, processions, feasts, and architecture entombment, as well as other social interactions such as craft production. I interpret multivocal usage of Plaza-A, and argue that public interactions maintained
heterarchical sub-group identities in a new urban environment. My analyses highlight the role and significance of performance and public space in ancient complex societies.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I examine performances associated with the construction and use of monumental architecture in the Central Andes. In particular, I explore developments at the coastal center of Caylán (800-10 cal. BCE) at the end of the Formative Period (1600-1 BCE). I conducted excavations at one of Caylán’s monumental plazas under a project directed by Dr. David Chicoine and Lic. Hugo Ikehara, the Proyecto de Investigación Arqueológica Caylán (PIAC). Performance theory is chosen as a framework for understanding the role of public space in the context of complex societies. Performance theory is used to understand how communal identities and social order were manifested in an emergent urban context at Caylán.

The thesis organization goes as follows. In Chapter 2, I discuss performance theory and discuss its various components. I begin by providing a historical backdrop of performance theory, focusing on its history in anthropological thought. I then chart how performance theory has been utilized archaeologically, discussing the different fields of evidence and conclusions gleaned from past performative archaeological studies. I frame how I consider performance as extraordinary experience in heightened interactive realms. I conclude the chapter by addressing contemporary debates about performance in archaeology, and how these debates influenced my study.

In Chapter 3, I provide a regional and temporal background for the study of the Formative Period in the Central Andes. I describe the geography of the Central Andes, and how differing regional ecologies play into the physical and cultural landscapes of the area. I discuss Formative Period architectural and material traditions with regard to Andean theaters and spectacles in different Formative epochs. I consider how differing levels of social complexity and types of social order are reflected in these Andean theaters. To conclude the chapter, I
discuss how these broader Formative Period public space developments relate to Caylán and my research.

In Chapter 4, I describe the history of research in the Nepeña Valley where Caylán is located. Next, I provide a description of site layout and preliminary hypotheses of social organization at Caylán by PIAC. I discuss the role of my study within PIAC of excavating a monumental plaza (Plaza-A), and give hypotheses for excavation results. I also address the methods employed, including mapping, excavation, and laboratory techniques. Lastly, I provide excavation results from Plaza-A with regard to spatial layout, stratigraphy, construction techniques, and phases of occupation.

In Chapter 5, I explore the material expectations, results, and analyses of Plaza-A excavations in terms of performance framed as action and experience. I contrast the extraordinary and the mundane as a model for evaluating the context of plaza usage. I track the variability of these performances and how they interacted in both daily life and special occasions under different perceptual variables. I conclude with the function of performance and the role of the plaza in Caylán’s social fabric.

In Chapter 6, I review the goals, results, and analyses of the thesis, and return from site level analyses to broader discussions of performance and its place in the study of complex societies. I analyze how the project addresses debates about performance and archaeology, drawing from the themes discussed in Chapter 2. I conclude by exploring performance in anthropology, and how my interpretations at Caylán illustrate the broader arguments posited about the nature of performance and communal interaction in social life.
CHAPTER 2: THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PERFORMANCE

Scholars have begun to address complex questions of social action and experience by charting how public interactions and experiences relate to communal identities. These communal ideologies shape both the physical and cultural environments of particular social groups in diverse ways, depending in large part on degrees of social complexity and types of sociopolitical organization. Communal ideologies are most salient in the way people in a society perform and utilize public space. In this chapter, I define performance and consider its role in archaeology and the study of complex societies.

2.1 Performance as Action and Experience

The term “performance” is malleable in its definition and usage, from referencing aptitude toward a particular task, to an act of presentation. However, performance’s varied applications all stem from a root focusing on action. Performance does not entail general action, but an action with particular social expectations. Deborah Kapchan (1995: 479) defines performance in a frame of anthropological action, as “aesthetic practices-patterns of behavior, ways of speaking, manners of bodily comportment-whose repetitions situate actors in time and space, structuring individual and group identities”. From such a definition, performance can be seen as an integral component of society which maintains social cohesion, promotes and displays power, and solidifies a collective ideology accomplished through shared experiences in a culturally specific context (Inomata and Coben 2002: 11; Turner 1982). Richard Schechner (1988: 327) goes further, stating that performance is an “extension across cultural boundaries and penetration to the deepest strata of historical, personal, and neurological experience” and that “the survival of our species depends on how people’s and their leaders “act”.
A key concept in the perception of performance is not just action, but experience, and the connection between the two. Yi-Fu Tuan (1975: 10) sees experience as a continuum located between feeling and thought, and experiences are mediated through actions. Culturally specific contexts of performance are not set solely in the realm of social action between human agents, but also within the constructed environment. Spaces for communal performances are bestowed with value through the creation of public place. The construction of place for communal activities requires a specific intentionality which goes beyond pragmatics in order to illicit a particular shared experience (Tuan 1977: 165-166; see also Giddens 1984). In such a way, places become inseparable from experiences, and place becomes experience. Within the context of performance, understanding the experience of place becomes equally as important as the actions performed within them. Action and experience are recurring frames of reference throughout this thesis as media for understanding social complexity.

2.2 History of Performance Studies

Performance and theater are significant markers of culture, which are readily recognizable. Despite their saliency with regard to culture identification, performance studies only began to develop during the past 30 to 40 years (e.g., Gofmann 1967; Hymes 1975; Schechner 1985; Turner 1980). Perhaps this conundrum is due to the fact that performance is addressed in passing by researchers in a number of social science disciplines, who until recently have yet to intersect and build upon ideas from one another (Schechner 1985).

Performance theories in anthropology were first put forth by anthropologists such as Victor Turner (1980), who collaborated with performance theorist Richard Schechner (1985). Turner sees performance as being extant throughout all levels of society, from family to state. For him, performances, termed social dramas, are necessary vehicles for action that occur
outside of “normal” activity to deal with breaches in social norms (Turner 1980, 1982). In addition to dealing with breaches in social norms, social dramas solidify the collective communal whole through a concept referred to as communitas in liminal contexts and rites of passage (Turner 1980: 83).

From this viewpoint, performance studies are central to understand how communities negotiate power relations and maintain a cohesive whole. For instance, Simon Ottenburg (1982) uses Turner’s framework in an analysis of West African masquerades. Ottenburg applies a social drama theory to his study of masquerades, where social norms which form boundaries between genders are allowed to be temporarily subverted by masked men caricaturing women of the community and vice versa. Ottenburg (1982: 179-182) remarks that such a performance solidifies gendered bonds and identities through parody.

Taking a more abstract approach, Clifford Geertz (1973) discusses symbolic meanings and undertones of rituals and performances. In his classic essay regarding Balinese cock fights, Geertz sees the theater of these cock fights as a symbolic realm of meaning which reflects Balinese social networks and sentiments. As Geertz (1973: 9) notes, “the cockfight’s function…is interpretive: it is a Balinese reading of Balinese experience; a story they tell themselves about themselves”. From this perspective, the power of performance lies in its ability to symbolically play out social structures and meanings, where performances read like texts.

Looking further at symbolism and performance, folklorist Deborah Kapchan (1995) followed the footsteps of Dell Hymes (1975) by applying a lens of performance to linguistic analysis. Kapchan (1995: 498-499) studied women’s performative discourse in ritual, where language takes a role in symbolically subverting power structures through women asserting power and mocking male dominated realms in theatrical speech. Based on her observations,
Kapchan concludes that performance “is a chain of relationships linking genre, gender, history, ethnography, and social practice” (Kapchan 1995: 499). Kapchan’s approach differs from Geertz by considering symbolism not in terms of textual meaning, but rather in terms of context and action.

Recurrent throughout performance-related literature is this dichotomy between an emphasis on static textual meaning and situational social context. As a reaction to symbol focused performative frameworks such as Geertz’s, Edward Schieffelin (1985) argues that the social context of performance, rather than symbolic meaning, should be of primary concern for anthropologists. In Schieffelin’s (1985: 710) view, performance is socially, rather than symbolically constructed. Schieffelin uses a case study of the Kaluli in Papua New Guinea to illustrate this, remarking that in Kaluli performances, ideological belief systems are in constant flux, and are continually reinterpreted through socially enacted performances. As such, Schieffelin sees the importance of Kaluli performance as “not primarily the meanings embodied in symbolic materials themselves…but the way the symbolic material emerges in the interaction” (Schieffelin 1985: 720). In this way, symbolic “meaning” may be seen as forever elusive because it is constantly being reinterpreted in the social drama. Turner (1986: 72-73) also cautions against an over emphasis of performance as text, and the pursuit of social meaning’s tendency to view society in functional, static terms.

Erving Goffman (1967) has also made a significant contribution to performance studies from a sociologocial perspective. Rather than focusing on performance as theater and spectacle, Goffman (1967: 5) emphasizes the intimacy of interpersonal performance in everyday settings termed as interaction rituals. Goffman’s interpretations demonstrate a difference between every day interactions and larger scale public performances, which could each entail different aspects
of the same society. In opposition to Goffman, Dell Hymes (1975) expresses that saliency in performance is derived precisely from its context beyond everyday interaction and experience, thus becoming a defining entity outside of normal life.

Performance studies have progressed in recent years, and as a result there is now a performance studies discipline. Building on the previous works of earlier performance theorists, Judith Butler (1993) focuses on social and cultural constraints imposed on expression in performance. Butler does not how performance is generated in space, but rather how it is materialized in the body. For Butler, individuals in performative contexts are bound by repetitive cultural norms, which dictate and confine an individual’s interactive behavior. Butler (1993: xi) sees social confinement of performance as being manifest in imagined cultural “masks” of identity, where individuals behave and perform differently in varying contexts. These masks depend on the social norms and constraints bestowed upon the respective context. As an example, Butler cites her perception of her own multiple performative bodies, such as the more formalized “Judith” versus the more informal and intimate “Judy”.

Butler’s analysis reminds us of the influence culture has over the control of all interactions, as well as the role experience plays in engendering our actions. Therefore, social control through feedback and reflexivity becomes a crucial component when analyzing various interactive contexts, from public theater to everyday interaction rituals. Butler’s framework invokes sentiments similar to Goffman’s by implying that our performative bodies materialize themselves in a variety of contexts throughout all of our interactions. It is now apparent that performance pervades all levels of social actions and has the potential to materialize in many different ways. Hence, it is possible to apply archaeology to a study of performance.
2.3 Performance Studies Applied to Archaeology

Although performance theories in other social science venues have developed over the last half century, performance theory applied to archaeology is more recent. There are many reasons for the lack of performance analysis in archaeology, but perhaps the most paramount is the idea that going back and recreating specific events in antiquity could be seen as empirically impossible (Moore 2002). As archaeologist Stephen Houston (2002: 139) notes, “Barring unsettling inventions…we are not in a position to buy tickets to Pastland”. Despite this, Houston and others (e.g., Houston 2002; Inomata 2002; Moore 2002) are attempting to journey into this uncharted territory. They have demonstrated that aspects of the archaeological record can be tied to performance through careful analysis. The empirical strength of performance archaeology lies in the ability to correlate data from a variety of different methods in order to gain a synthesis of all available data.

The most explicit source for archaeologists concerned with performance is the ethnographic and ethnohistorical record. However, ethnohistorical records must be carefully consulted to account for historical biases. Archaeologists have employed ethnohistorical evidence into their analyses by projecting back detailed accounts of historic performances, namely colonial accounts in the Americas (e.g., Inomata 2002; Moore 2002). An example of ethnohistoric based performance analysis Takeshi Inomata’s (2002) research on ancient Maya political theaters. Inomata (2002: 192) uses contact period documents written on the Campeche in the northern Maya lowlands which give vivid accounts of theatrical spectacles and their various actors, settings, and characteristics. Inomata correlates these historical accounts with archaeological data at the site of Aguateca. In this way, archaeologists can mitigate potential biases in written accounts, as well as account for culture change between large temporal gaps.
Inomata argues that Classic Maya performance took on qualities reminiscent of Turner’s views where:

> Theatrical events were critical arenas where communities were reconstituted and asymmetrical power relations were imposed, negotiated, and resisted…(where) public events counteracted the divisive tendency of a Maya polity consisting of smaller kin and local groups that may have weighed more in individual identities than their polity affiliation (Inomata 2002: 213).

Inomata’s interpretations are crucial for understanding performance and its role in social complexity from the context of spectacle and community maintenance. His research illustrates the utility of ethnohistory as a way of gleaning information on performance that may not survive in the archaeological record, such as speech. My research consults ethnohistorical and ethnographic sources from traditional Andean and Amazonian contexts as having possible correlates with the archaeological record at Caylán.

Another empirical avenue utilized by performance archaeologists is the use of spatial analysis. At Aguateca, Inomata (2002) notes the discrepancy in large scale “common” public space versus more fragmented public spaces. Degrees of spatial exclusivity entail differing types of interactions at Aguateca, such as an intimate royal performance in a private palace or a large scale spectacle in an open plaza (Inomata 2002: 203). While Inomata’s work on access patterns was based on personal observation, the employment of computerized view shed analysis could provide even more quantitative potential for evaluating access patterns to potential performance venues. In addition to patterns of access, Inomata consults spatial analysis to interpret the functionality of monumental space, commenting that the centrality of large plazas surrounded by monumental architecture reflects the importance of periodic large scale spectacles for the ancient Maya (Inomata 2002: 198).
In a similar vein of spatial analysis, Jerry Moore (1996a) notes the significance of “publicness” versus “rite” associated with patterns of access and function by making distinctions between three Andean plaza construction traditions. Moore (1996a: 798) highlights the importance of considering spatial analysis from the perspective of experience, stating that “proxemics can provide new insights into the prehistoric built environment…(which) consider constructed spaces as architectural arenas that shape and are shaped by human interactions”.

Moore’s and Inomata’s considerations of constructed landscapes lend themselves to further spatial analysis of landscape which speak to overall conceptions of space and place (e.g., Ashmore 1991; Coben 2002; Knapp and Ashmore 1999: 1-2; Isbell and Vranich 2004; Turnbull 2002). An example of landscapes and performance analysis is Lawrence Coben (2002)’s work on studying patterns of Inka expansionism. Coben analyzes Inka replication of sacred constructed landscapes of Cuzco at peripheral colonies, constructed for pilgrimages and performances. For Coben, performance by the Inka was an imperial strategy, and this replication of landscape played an integral role in solidifying their collective populace through state expansion. I rely heavily on spatial analysis in this study to divulge data on constructed landscapes, accessways, movement, sight, and sound.

Iconography often provides explicit pictorial accounts of ancient performances. Adam T. Smith (2002), citing his work in Urartu, considers performance and iconography. Smith (2002: 113) cites the importance of understanding iconographical context when inferring actual events from iconographical displays, which could be quite mythical and abstract. Smith (2002: 127) sees iconographic displays of performance as displaying divine mediation in political relationships, thus “positioning the self in the polity”. Therefore, images associated with public gathering spaces would have constantly reminded the populace of the cosmological legitimacy of
social rank (Smith 2002: 127). Along the same lines, Inomata (2002: 204) notes aspects of ancient Maya ceramic iconography depicting royal court interactions. Iconographic data can be used from a variety of different standpoints in considering performance, from a visual standpoint to depictions of real events. For this research, I correlate archaeological data with iconography from other coastal groups in the Andes who had vivid pictorial accounts on ceramics, namely the Moche (100-800 CE) and Nasca (100-750 CE).

Archaeologists have also consulted experiential and cognitive aspects of performance, dubbed as proxemics (see Hall 1966). Borne out of earlier cognitive approaches (Renfrew 1982, 1993), performance archaeologists have looked at cognitive trends further to divulge sensual experiences which may be measurable in public arenas (e.g., Houston 2002; Moore 1996a, 1996b, 2002). For instance, Jerry Moore (2002) takes a neuro-scientific approach to analyze universal aspects of experience, as well as to understand cultural relativistic conceptions regarding the senses. Moore (2002: 72) contends that drumming in association with Andean funerary processions creates a common performative emotion among participants at specific intervals of the procession. For Moore, the understanding of the experience of the performance is key to the analysis of cultural conceptions of public life.

Along the same lines as Moore, Stephen Houston (2002) considers a number of sensual qualities associated with ancient Maya performances. Houston looks at Maya cultural conceptions of sight, specifically the qualities of projective and peripheral sight which, according to him, are qualities of sight culturally identified by the Maya (Houston 2002: 140). Houston (2002: 140-141) takes Maya social constructions of sight and applies these to an analysis of sight and spectacle, contending that the visual projection of the performance was essential. To compound this notion, deity friezes located in visual distance of performative arenas were
ritually killed by having their eyes mutilated, thus eliminating them from the visual experience of the performance (Houston 2002: 141). Houston takes a similar framework in analyzing various other qualities of performance for the ancient Maya, including motion associated with dance, and sound associated with music. Taste would undoubtedly have also played a role in perceptual experiences. Bryan Hayden (1996, 2001) and Michael Dietler (1996, 2001) have remarked extensively on the place of feasts in maintaining social cohesion in transegalitarian communities. My analysis at Caylán relies on a proxemic and perceptual framework. I look at sight, sound, movement, and taste as key perceptual markers that define the place of the plaza in Caylán’s social fabric.

All of the aforementioned categories of empirical data are only useful when combined with material data, which forms the foundation of any archaeological understanding of performance. Archaeologists have failed to analyze artifacts associated with performance in enough detail in many cases, even though performance related artifacts are often recovered. In one case where these artifacts are considered with respect to performance related analysis, Inomata (2002) notes a cache of musical instruments and masks in a storeroom nearby to a causeway and royal court, which would have been used by elites in spectacles. Inomata correlates these artifacts with iconography depicting elite performance, illustrating the role of elite participation in theatrical spectacle (Inomata 2002: 207-208). This is but one example where artifacts which could be associated with performance can be considered contextually and correlated with other fields of evidence. I consider a performance context for each type of artifact found at Caylán, and focus on a dichotomy between social and mundane contexts of the material record.
2.4 Contemporary Debates in Performance Archaeology

Theoretical debate in archaeology has followed suit in much the same way as the earlier mentioned discussions. Archaeologists have weighed in on the ambiguity in the term “performance” itself (Hymes 1975; Inomata and Coben 2002). Although some anthropologists prefer a fluid definition of performance to account for various interactive realms (Butler 1993), from one on one interaction to mass spectacle, others have preferred more concise definitions to refer to differing types of social interactions (e.g., Hymes 1975; Hodder 2002; Inomata and Coben 2002).

This discrepancy in the conception of performance has led to heated debates, including whether monumental venues of performance are more important and valid for archaeological study than other interactive realms (see Hodder 2002; Houston 2002). Ian Hodder (2002) prefers a definition of performance as simply a venue of “showing and looking,” which includes all scales of performance and a lesser emphasis on performances as heightened encounters in large scale events. This position is central to Hodder’s project, since his research at Catalhoyuk has yet to uncover a large public space which would have been used for large scale spectacle. However, Hodder argues that large scale spectacles should not be given credence over daily performance. For him, performance must have played an integral role at Catalhoyuk despite the site’s lack of monumental public spaces (Hodder 2002: 82). In Hodder (2002: 96-97)’s view, spectacle takes meaning in its disciplinary quality within domestic spaces, where dimensions of social life are articulated through daily interactions which are reflected in art motifs.

Stephen Houston (2002) refutes the idea that small scale interactions take on similar qualities to large scale performance. On the contrary, Houston takes a position that large scale public performance transcends every day experience (see also Hymes 1975). Houston makes an
analogy of mundane interaction in a fast food restaurant to illustrate his ideas on the lack of importance of certain “every day” contexts in lieu of large scale performances (Houston 2002: 136-138). This debate can be traced back once again to early performance theorists, where Houston’s position conflicts with Goffman’s approach to performance in the everyday (Houston 2002, Goffman 1959).

Archaeologists are also still debating the importance of textual meaning versus situational context as being primary concerns in performance analysis. Inomata (Inomata and Coben 2002), Coben (Inomata and Coben 2002), and Houston (Houston 2002) see context being paramount in understanding qualities of performance, whereas Hodder (2002) believes that meaning should be considered as well. In Houston (2002: 136)’s view, it is not “crucial that esoteric messages broadcast by spectacle be widely understood… It was mostly important that the spectacle impress and entertain”. In opposition, Ian Hodder (2002: 85) states that meaning can be a fruitful venture when combined with context, and that the duality of both provides the most information relative to performance and social life.

I contend that, as Butler (1993) demonstrated, performance is a force within our minds and bodies which constantly dictates our actions and experiences in different situations, or performance “genres” as Turner (1987: 75) calls them. For the purposes of this research, I consider the genre of public performance in the way that Hymes, Inomata, Coben, Houston, and others have, through an emphasis on performance as heightened interaction outside of domestic or quotidian life. I adopt this view because my research was conducted within monumental constructed space inferred to be utilized for public events. Although I emphasize performance in heightened interactive environments, I also acknowledge the possibility that performance exists in other more domestic or mundane contexts. These are genres of performance equally
important for research, albeit not in a form analogous to performance in communal space. I do not limit my examination of performance in monumental space to episodic spectacle, and consider daily social interactions in public space.

My analysis is concerned with social context, rather than symbolic or textual meaning. For more on symbolism and meaning in archaeology, see (Hodder 1986; Tilley 1991); for a critique, see (Inomata 2006). Although the pursuit of symbolic meaning may yield significant data, especially when coupled with context, the inherent fluidity of performance and action (Inomata 2006: 807; Schieffelin 1985), as well as the difficulty of retrieving symbolic meaning quantitatively (Moore 1996b: 17; Inomata 2006: 808), make such a pursuit beyond the scope of this research. As such, I do not focus on abstract symbolism underlying performances and public spaces as much as I do a comprehensive empirical analysis of the spatial, material, and inferred social contexts of performance in communal space through an action and experience-based approach.
CHAPTER 3:
THEATERS AND SPECTACLES OF THE FORMATIVE PERIOD (1600-1 BCE)

Throughout the Andes, open monumental spaces dominate the ancient cultural landscape, and illustrate the centrality of performance to Pre-Columbian life. Today, Andean communities continue to identify and distinguish themselves through public performances and festivals (see Mendoza 2000). During the Late Archaic (2,500-1,600 BCE) and Formative Period (1600-0 BCE), Andean traditions of public life originated with the development of monuments in concert with agriculture, maritime subsistence, sedentism, and emerging social inequalities (e.g., Feldman 1987; Haas 1987; Moseley 1975) and develop over time into increasingly complex and diverse systems. This chapter traces the developments of Andean public spaces over time, and discusses continuities and transitions between different regional and temporal Formative traditions.

3.1 Geography of the Central Andes

This thesis focuses on the Central Andes, which comprises the modern day nations of Peru, northwest Bolivia, and southern Ecuador. The Central Andes are divided between three principal regions. The first region pertains to coastal areas located either directly on the Pacific coast, or within the lower portion of a series of river valleys which descend from the upper Andes. Eastward, the second region encompasses the mountainous region located within the Cordillera Negra and Cordillera Blanca mountain passes. Further eastward across the Andes is the lowland Amazon, or Ceja de Selva. These three regions are divided into sub-regions based on cardinal directions within the Central Andes, as well as ecological sub-regions based on altitudinal zonation (Willey 1971; Wilson 1999: 58-59). This thesis focuses on the sub-regions of the Andean coast (Figure 1). The geographical and ecological sub-regions of the Andes form differing settlement patterns in addition to spheres of interaction based on subsistence and
Figure 1. Map of Peru showing coastal regions and sites discussed in text (drawing by Matt Helmer).
prestige trade (Topic and Topic 1983), and are factors which play into performative dynamics in terms of landscape, prestige items and feasting materials.

3.2 Chronological Framework

There are two Andean chronologies which deal with the time period discussed in this thesis, mainly between 1,600 BCE and 1 BCE (Figure 2). The first chronological framework, put forth by Max Uhle and further developed by John Rowe (1962) and Edward Lanning (1967), is a chronology based on cultural “horizons” consulted largely by North American Andeanists. The second chronology is the Formative chronology developed by Luis Lumbreras and utilized more often by Peruvians and international Andeanists (Lumbreras 1974). I rely on the Formative chronology, due to its broader usage and recent adaptations which deal with new data and the reconsideration of chronological boundary placement (Kaulicke 1994, 2010). However, I frequently mention the Horizon chronology when referencing researchers who have utilized it. Other regional chronologies are subsequently consulted when discussing site level and valley level diachronic events.

3.3 Setting the Stage: Late Archaic and Early Formative Andean Theaters (3,000-1,600 BCE)

In order to better understand later developments of ritual and performance in the Formative Period, a brief synopsis of the earliest traces of public and ritual life reflected in constructed space is needed. I discuss a number of case studies throughout the Formative Central Andes which either contain explicit theoretical frameworks applied to public space, or pertain directly to Caylán in terms of regional or temporal association (Figure 1). It is important to note that the break between the Late Archaic and Early Formative Period should not be viewed as a static cultural boundary, as difficulties with dating, long periods of occupation, and
considerable heterogeneity in the existence of ceramics has been noted with numerous Archaic sites (Quilter 1991).

In the highlands, ceremonial space in the Late Archaic and Early Formative Period are small and isolated in comparison to their coastal contemporaries (Aldenderfer 1991; Grieder et al. 1988; Izumi and Sono 1963). Highland communities in the North-Central Andes built small, shaft ventilated hearth structures which were used for rituals referred to as the Mito-Kotosh religious tradition (Grieder et al. 1988; Izumi and Sono 1963). Mito-Kotosh rituals within these hearths involved transformation through sensual overload, such as the burning of chili peppers as evidenced at La Galgada (Grieder et al. 1988), and burned offerings as an expression of religious ideology (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1986: 65).

Along the central Andean coast during the Late Archaic and Early Formative, markedly different public gathering patterns are extant in open constructed spaces. As opposed to small
circular public spaces in the highlands, Archaic and Early Formative public spaces on the central Andean coast are associated with graded access atop large mounds with small, designated entryways (Feldman 1980, 1985; Moseley 1975; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Williams 1980). At the site of Caral in the Norte Chico region of the central coast, the most discussed Late Archaic coastal site, immense platform mounds associated with three large sunken plazas would have facilitated rituals and performances on a scale unknown in the Americas during this time period (Haas et al. 2006, Shady 2006). Musical instruments were located in a large “amphitheater” at Caral, highlighting the “early role of participatory artistic performance in Andean cultural heritage” (Shady 2006: 59). Graded access and monumentality associated with ritual space early in time becomes a prominent theme throughout coastal developments temporally.

Action based studies of performance and ritual associated with late Archaic-Early Formative societies are rare, however, a recent study conducted by Rafael Vega-Centeno at the site of Cerro Lampay provides valuable insights into early performances in the Late Archaic Norte Chico region of the Andean coast. At Cerro Lampay, Vega-Centeno (2005, 2007, 2010) analyzes the relationship between ritual feasts and episodic monumental construction through a neo-evolutionary perspective. Cerro Lampay’s architecture is similar to the coastal Late Archaic-Early Formative model, with a mound and courtyard plaza complex laid out along a northeast oriented axis. Cerro Lampay is used by Vega-Centeno to comment on broad scale social processes involved in the construction of monumental public architecture throughout the central Andean coast.

Utilizing feasting theoretical frameworks based on commensal and competitive politics (e.g., Dietler 2001; Hayden 1996), Vega-Centeno (2005: 158-160) interprets episodic depositions
of food remains followed by construction episodes as being indicative of multiple renovations and the subsequent ritual entombment of the main mound at Cerro Lampay. This is used to argue for a heterogenous form of society at Cerro Lampay and elsewhere along the coast, where communal labor conscripted through commensal politics could produce monumental architecture without a formal hierarchy associated with institutionalized inequalities (Vega-Centeno 2005: 169). The ability to construct monumental public space without established, coercive authority contrasts with previous interpretations of corporate labor on the coast (Moseley 1975; Feldman 1985; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Williams 1980). Interpretations of early social organization enacted through public space become useful when analyzing even larger, more complex public spaces which develop during the subsequent Middle and Late Formative Periods.

3.4 Monumentality and Public Life in the Early and Middle Formative (1,600-1,000 BCE)

During the Middle Formative, architectural canons become grander in scale and detail in accordance with the intensification of irrigation agriculture and regional exchange systems. These larger public venues reflect the existence of increasingly complex social organizations which require active communal space to establish and maintain a collective identity.

In the south-central highlands during the Middle Formative, Christine Hastorf (2003) focuses on ritual actions in public space to interpret social dynamics at Chiripa in the Titicaca Basin. Hastorf builds on ideas advanced by Jerry Moore that ancestors played a key role in both the construction and usage of ritual space during the Formative (Moore 1996b: 124-125). Hastorf identifies a series of enclosed rooms at Chiripa, in addition to large sunken plazas atop a large (50 x 50m) mound associated with a number of high status burials (Hastorf 2003: 313). Hastorf documents a multitude of performance and ceremonial associated artifacts throughout the ritual mound precinct, including serving vessels, foodstuffs, and musical instruments (Hastorf
In addition, multiple renovation episodes seem to be tied in with the usage of the rooms atop the mound, analogous to Vega-Centeno’s work at Cerro Lampay (Hastorf 2003: 321; Vega-Centeno 2007). Renovations and continuity spanned an immense time period at Chiripa, from 1500-200 BC until the imposition of Tiwanaku and increased homogeneity throughout the Titicaca Basin (Hastorf 2003).

Hastorf interprets public space at Chiripa as an eternal landscape, where communitas (Turner 1982) is established through the active participation of deified ancestors in public space, asserting communal bonds to past lineages through performed memory (Hastorf 2003: 321, 327). In addition to the significance of ancestors playing a key role in community establishment, exclusivity to ancestral communion for certain individuals is interpreted as the usage pattern for more exclusive rooms atop the ceremonial mound, reflecting a two-tiered ceremonial landscape (Hastorf 2003: 327). Thus, while some stratified contexts with respect to access are asserted, the importance of inclusion, rather than exclusion seems to be paramount in the articulation of public life. Hastorf’s work elucidates the importance ancestors play as active agents in the community throughout the Andean past (see Lau 2002; Makowski et al. 2000; Moore 1996b) as well as privilege associated with spectacle access.

Monumental architecture of the Middle Formative on the central coast followed a prototypical model exemplifying a mound complex with extended U-shaped wings surrounding an immense plaza. Around the Lurín, Rimac, Chillón and Chancay river drainages, this cultural similarity with respect to architectural style is referred to as the Manchay tradition (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991, 1998). At Manchay sites, including Garagay, Cardal, and Mina Perdida, central staircase fronted mounds displayed vivid frieze iconography within immediate visibility of the plaza. Further inside these mounds is an atria associated with enclosed, private ritual
access. At Cardal, Burger and Salazar-Burger documented the central mound staircase as being remarkably intact, indicating light use-wear associated with privileged access. Notably, smaller ritual plazas are located all around the periphery of the monumental core, indicating the possibility of “lower level,” more intimate ritual settings for smaller social groups as well (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991: 292). They hypothesize that these smaller ritual structures are evidence to a precursor of “ayllus” (Andean supra-familial social groups), and possibly analogous to the “kiva” (sunken ritual structures of the American southwest) arrangement of ritual performances, where similar building types of different scales are used for public and private ritual venues (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991: 292-293).

At the site of Mina Perdida, a caiman effigy puppet was found ritually interred on top of the principal mound of the U-shaped temple (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998). Burger and Salazar-Burger (1998: 51) interpret the function of the object as a sort of shadow puppet within the private atrium, but may also have been used for display and possible procession through the main plaza. In addition to the puppet, a number of ritually interred individuals were located underneath the floor of a room atop the mound, indicating ancestor veneration was involved with public life on the coast as well. Based on Burger and Salazar-Burger (1991, 1998)’s work in the Manchay region, the paradox between ritual exclusion and inclusion is displayed in terms of community spectacle. Although corporate authority (Feldman 1985; Moseley 1975; Williams 1980) might be inferred based on this pattern of differential ritual access, they contend that these societies were still loosely integrated (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991).

Jerry Moore (1996b) has re-evaluated the data at Manchay to make observations on Formative proxemics. Moore, looking at intentionality by architects of public spaces to illicit particular experiences, considers viewshed from “isovistas,” or angles of incidence where
architectural forms completely envelop one’s view (Moore 1996b: 98-120). Moore (1996b: 113) notes that Manchay mounds, while not as physically large as others of the coeval Sechín style, described below, have dramatic inclines which create an enhanced sense of scale as one moves closer to the mound, and that isovistas were designed to occur directly at the base of the mound. This leads Moore to interpret a mound centered experience in Manchay public space, which would have been further enhanced by the supernatural polychrome murals and the large shadow puppet documented in excavations (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998). Mounds become less of a factor in public space during the Late-Final Formative, including Caylán.

The Middle Formative on the north coast saw the development of the Cupisnique tradition with feline supernatural polychrome murals. At the Caballo Muerto site in the Moche Valley, Huaca de los Reyes is seen as the model of Cupisnique culture (e.g., Conklin 1982; Nesbitt et al. 2010; Pozorski 1980, 1983). Thomas Pozorski (1980)’s work at Huaca de los Reyes documented two principal mounds associated with three plazas. The three plazas are associated with increased graded access as one moves further into the urban core. Pozorski interprets plaza access as being indicative of social stratification and exclusion, where these plazas become smaller, more enclosed, and associated with more vivid frieze iconography as one moves deeper into the compound (Pozorski 1980).

This pattern of enclosed, fragmented plaza landscapes contrasts with the large, singular mound-plaza complexes of the central coast, although frieze iconography is similar. Pozorski’s belief that Caballo Muerto was only the result of two construction phases controlled by institutionalized corporate labor runs contrary to others’ beliefs that multiple constructions, and thus “looser” political organizations, were extant within the administration of monumental spaces (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Conklin 1982; Pozorski 1980; Pozorski 1995b).
Subsequent work at Caballo Muerto supports the idea of looser social organization associated with many more building phases (Conklin 1982; Nesbitt et al. 2010).

On the North-Central coast, public venues took on a scale unlike anywhere else in the Americas at the time, with massive pyramid mounds constructed of conical adobes fronting plaza courtyards extending as much as a kilometer (see Moore 1996b; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987). Based on the degree of monumentality, and inferred corporate building events, Pozorski and Pozorski (2005: 143) interpret a state level society in the Casma Valley of two competing polities, the Sechín Alto complex and Las Aldas complex, organized around massive U-shaped mound-plaza complexes. The Pozorskis focus the majority of their public space attention on the 300 x 250m. and 35m. high main mound of Sechín Alto and the amount of corporate labor required to build such a monument. For them, state sponsored ritual performances at hypothesized urban cores (Pozorski and Pozorski 2005) would have undoubtedly served different functions than periodic pilgrimages and building episodes (e.g., Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Vega-Centeno 2005). The Pozorskis have also identified an I-Shaped “ballcourt” at Pampa de las Llamas-Moxeke, another site ascribed to the Sechín Alto polity, dated from 1600-1200 BCE (Pozorski and Pozorski 1995a: 276). At this I-shaped structure, they found spectacle related materials, including benches, possible “goals,” and even peanut snacks located along the benches (Pozorski and Pozorski 1995a: 277-278). Of note, this benched courtyard appears structurally similar to later Formative Period plazas in the same region with tiered benches (Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Chicoine 2006a).

With regard to proxemics at Sechín Alto, Jerry Moore conducted viewshed analysis and hypothesized that the low retaining walls of Sechín’s more than 1 kilometer long plaza created an experience of extended depth, making the principal mound seem distant and the plaza
court yard space extend further into the horizon (Moore 1996b: 111). In addition, Moore argues that the broad vistas of Peru’s desert landscape would have enhanced the experience of enhanced depth within Sechín Alto and Las Aldas (Moore 1996b: 112). It is important to note that Sechín, as with most other U-shaped complexes, faces 35 degrees east of north, oriented up valley toward the Cordillera Negra. Moore (1996b) argues that orientation plays a key role in the visual experience from the main mound, where extended depth creates an infinite view across the plaza courtyard and horizon into the Cordillera Negra. A similar orientation continues at Late-Final Formative sites, including Caylán.

In contrast to the aforementioned Manchay example from the central coast, Moore notes that the Sechín Alto mound, although four times the size of Manchay mounds, has a much lower angle of incidence, and thus becomes less of a scalar factor within the immediate surrounding public space (Moore 1996b: 110). As such, Moore (1996b: 160-161) hypothesizes a plaza focused experience at Sechín sites, and interprets Sechín’s central axis as a modicum of movement, possibly for processions, whereas Manchay performances focused more on mound display (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998). Lastly, with respect to acoustic experiences of Middle Formative public spaces, Moore (1996b) considers sound projection (see Hall 1965). Moore (1996b: 158) argues that these large U-shaped centers focused on easily projectable forms of expression, such as shouted phrases, body postures, and music which were amplified by the U-shaped design creating an acoustic shell, and that mound top interactions were much more intimate in nature (Moore 1996b: 159). Research at Caylán indicates a clear shift toward more enclosed public displays later in time.

Research conducted on Middle Formative sites has focused extensively on social organization reflected in monumentality and building episodes (e.g., Conklin 1982; Feldman
1985; Hastorf 2003; Pozorski 1980; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987) and shows the beginnings of established hierarchy in a multi-tiered public landscape between mounds and plazas. However, debate exists as to the extent of established hierarchy during this time period (e.g., Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Pozorski 1980, 1995b). A few of these Middle Formative sites have been evaluated with regard to the function and nature of performances, and were found to have had ancestral, cosmological, musical, and procession components (Hastorf 2003; Moore 1996b; Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998). These debates and insights into earlier forms of social organization and public activities become frames of reference when considering events at Caylán.

3.5 Pan-Regional Spectacle, Chavín, and the Middle-Late Formative (1,200-800 BCE)

Public venues between the coast and highlands appear somewhat isolated in terms of influence previously in the Formative. However, significant exchange between belief systems by the late Formative is indicated by the emergence of the widely renowned “Chavín” tradition which permeates the Central Andes with common feline-supernatural art styles (see Lathrap 1971; Rowe 1967; Tello 1943, 1960). The placing of Chavín de Huantar diachronically is still being debated (see Burger 2008; Kaulicke 2010; Mesía 2007; Rick and Kembel 2001; Rick 2005). Predating Chavín-like elements at Sechín, Manchay, and Cupisnique sites refute the long held notion putting Chavín de Huantar at the center of Formative development (e.g., Burger 2008; Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Pozorski and Pozorski 2005). Although dating and the tracing of “Chavín” to a single source of influence is problematic (Rick and Kembel 2001; Rick 2005), Chavín de Huantar remains salient in the discussion of the centrality of the Chavín phenomenon (e.g., Burger 2008; Kaulicke 2010; Rick 2005).
Chavín de Huantar represents a landscape which is complex and anomalous, consisting of underground galleries, megalithic architecture, and the most vivid carved stone iconography of the Formative. Chavín de Huantar’s public space consists of two main plazas, a large temple mound, a series of subterranean galleries and chambers, and iconography depicting plants, animals, humans, and esoteric themes of supernatural transformation. Chavín’s architectural landscape invokes both highland and coastal qualities, including the coastal U-shaped structure, circular plazas, and highland interior chambers.

Although many aspects of the “Chavín” phenomena are currently disagreed upon, one source of consensus is that Chavín de Huantar represents a pilgrimage center (Burger 2008: 684; Lumbreras 1972; Rick 2005), evidenced by the wealth of exotic ceramics in relation to local materials (Druc 1998), including spondylus shell, strombus shell, lithics, cinnabar, and metals. The geography of Chavín de Huantar provides a viable venue for a pilgrimage center, being located in the Callejon de Huaylas, the largest pass between the Cordillera Blanca and Negra mountain chains and at the confluence of two rivers (Burger 2008: 684). Chavín is also easily accessible to the upper Amazon through an eastward mountain pass, a hypothesized source of Chavín’s jungle centric iconography (Lathrap 1971). Ritual activities may have been guided by cosmological factors, evidenced by an immense stone located near Chavín’s larger rectangular plaza sculpted into what is interpreted as Pleides (Lumbreras 1970: 83; Burger 2008). The Chavín de Huantar experience relied on a manipulation of light through dark, maze like subterranean chambers (Lumbreras 1993), and possibly the control of sound through these galleries where musical instruments were found (Abel and Rick et al. 2008; Rick 2005). Experiencing Chavín de Huantar would have been further enhanced by hallucinogenic use, widely evidenced throughout Chavín art and materials which include San Pedro cactus wielding
supernatural shamans and excavated snuff materials (see Lumbrares 1972; Torres 1995; Rick 2005; Tello 1943).

In terms of recent views on Chavín social organization, John Rick (2005: 80) argues for a systems serving model at Chavín. Within this model, elites asserted ideological and sociopolitical authority through their abilities to create and manipulate such profound experiences, which would have been further reinforced through hallucinogens (Rick 2005: 80-82). Rick’s assertions are illustrated by controlled access within the pyramid temple, where invisible entryways deep within the pyramid were hidden from open plaza view, and aerial staircases are built into the façade of the temple to create the illusion of mythical presence. In contrast, Burger argues for a less Chavín de Huantar centric model of power within the pan-regional Chavín phenomena. Burger (2002, 2008) argues for a World Systems model of interaction, where Chavín acquired exotic and subsistence resources from peer polity sites throughout the highlands and coast in exchange for participation in the Chavín cult. Although the current Chavín analyses diverge from one another in terms of power, both current streams of thought indicate that Chavín de Huantar’s landscape was not limited to the site and its surrounding communities, but was a key player in a pan-regional landscape where performance and ritual became pan-regional commodities.

On the coast, sites which are quite similar to Chavín have been documented, especially in Nepeña at Cerro Blanco and Huaca Partida (Tello 1943; Shibata 2002, 2010). As with many Manchay, Sechín, and Cupisnique sites, Cerro Blanco exhibits the characteristic U-shaped mound-plaza complex (Tello 1943). Hugo Ikehara and Koichiro Shibata (2005) analyze public life and political economy at Cerro Blanco through a competitive and commensal feasting lens. Ikehara and Shibata uncovered a wealth of serving vessels of both local and imported origins.
These serving vessels were interpreted as prestige items, and occurred in higher proveniences in comparison to other utilitarian vessels. This led them to interpret a feasting context within the monumental core (Ikehara and Shibata 2005: 29). Ikehara and Shibata (2005: 151-152) interpret Cerro Blanco social organization as being relatively egalitarian, with the exception of the episodic public spectacle where members from differing neighbor communities came together in large numbers and elites displayed power through commensal politics. Cerro Blanco is located within five km. from Caylán, and is frequently consulted in this research for temporal comparison.

**3.6 Late-Final Formative (800-200 BCE): The Rise of Urbanism and Diffused Performative Landscapes on the North-Central Coast**

Between 1,000 and 800 BCE, changes in settlement patterns resulted in the abandonment of U-Shaped mounds along the coast in favor of enclosure compound based architecture of patio groups and plazas (Brennan 1982; Daggett 1987; Daggett 1999; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Wilson 1988). As a result, the public and social dynamics of these societies shifted as well. Instead of being dominated by a singular mound-plaza complex core, coastal groups nucleate around a number of plazas and smaller mounds, where singular public spaces no longer dominate the constructed landscape (Brennan 1982; Chicoine 2006a; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987).

Enclosure compound sites are documented around the North-Central coast, in Nepeña (Proulx 1968; Daggett 1984, 1987; Chicoine 2006a, 2006b, 2010), as well as the neighboring valleys of Santa (Wilson 1988), Casma (Ghezzi 2006; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987, 2005), and into the Viru and Moche valleys further north (Billman 1996; Brennan 1978, 1982; Collier 1955). A variety of causes for this settlement change have been put forth by scholars, including warfare, internal political turmoil, and environmental forces (Pozorski and Pozorski 1987: 118; Daggett 1987: 70-71; Burger 1992; Ghezzi 2006; Wilson 1987). In Casma, Pozorski and
Pozorski (1987, 2005) interpret this settlement shift as an abandonment of the Sechín-Alto state society, which they see as being replaced by Late Formative “squatters” who lived atop abandoned U-shaped structures, in addition to the compounds of Pampa Rosario, San Diego, and Chankillo in Casma (Ghezzi 2006). Enclosure compound sites have been linked with material culture associated with festivals, including panpipes and maize associated with beer production (Daggett 1987; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987, 2005; Proulx 1985).

It is hypothesized that increased urbanism, or large permanent populations, associated with centrally planned sites organized around a series of residential compounds may be the source of this settlement pattern shift (Brennan 1982; Chicoine 2006a, 2006b). While it may appear that these Late-Final Formative communities abandoned tradition, the aforementioned discussion suggests otherwise. As Burger noted, smaller, separate public spaces existed in conjunction to central mound-plaza complexes, suggesting the beginnings of communal diffusion at monumental sites early in time (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998).

In the Nepeña Valley, Chicoine (2006a, 2006b) conducted extensive excavations at the enclosure compound site of Huambacho. Chicoine documented enclosure compounds composed of store rooms, patios, corridors, and sub-compound plazas with high grades of access (Chicoine 2006b: 18). He argues that high grades of access and fragmented ritual space display a distinct change from U-shaped traditions which reflects differing patterns of social organization (Chicoine 2006b: 18).

Chicoine notes art styles at Huambacho which contrast markedly from the earlier Chavín-Cupisnique art style focused on felines, supernaturals, and polychrome designs, and instead favored abstract stepped geometric designs of varying depths to manipulate light (Chicoine
Chicoine also recovered high amounts of ceramic panpipes, serving vessels, and prestige goods which contributed to Huambacho’s festive landscape (Chicoine 2006b: 7, in press). Low platform mounds at Huambacho further emphasize the prominence of the plaza as the focal point of monumental activity. Within the main plazas at Huambacho, activities focused around a colonnaded, roofed patio surrounding the unroofed plaza center (Chicoine 2006b: 12-13). Similar colonnaded patio architecture was documented in smaller patios around the periphery of the plaza in the main platform complex, which Chicoine suggests are more intimate and private spaces than the plaza (Chicoine 2006b: 13).

Chicoine (2006a: 15-17, 2006b: 1) takes an agency and action based approach to understanding social organization at Huambacho. He argues that Huambacho represents an independent polity which operated outside of the Chavín cult (Chicoine 2006b: 1). Although recent re-dating of Chavín (Rick and Kembel 2001) may call for reconsiderations of the placement of Chavín and its relation to Huambacho, Chicoine’s analysis highlights the importance of focusing on site level processes associated with public space and communal ideology instead of over-emphasizing cross-regional similarities.

Chicoine also emphasizes feasting and political economies, arguing for diacritical and more exclusive public gatherers. He sees feasts as solidifying communities but creating labor obligations and institutionalized hierarchies through a mask of hospitality (Chicoine in press.: 6-8, 31). This highlights an important shift in festive landscapes away from commensal politics (e.g., Ikehara and Shibata 2005; Vega-Centeno 2007) and toward established hierarchies who control access to public space and resources. Chicoine’s understanding of feasting and political
economy at Huambacho (Chicoine in press) provide a foundation for understanding public space at neighboring Caylán.

3.7 Formative Framing of Caylán

Formative Period studies of public space in the Andes have demonstrated the utility to interpret a variety of cultural patterns pertinent to archaeologists through different analytical focuses. These include neo-evolutionary positions of early complexity (Vega-Centeno 2005), perspectives on ritual landscapes and ancestor veneration (Hastorf 2003), agency based conceptions of public space ideology (Chicoine 2006a; Chicoine 2006b) and fodder for debate over degrees of sociopolitical power (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Ikehara and Shibata 2005; Pozorski and Pozorski 1980; Rick 2005). Caylán is situated at the apex of this Formative dynamic, at a culmination and subsequent transition into a new era of urbanism and state society throughout the Andes at the turn of the millennium. In the following section, I provide a background on the history of research in Nepeña, lay out current hypotheses on Caylán sociopolitical organization, and present the methods and excavation results of my research.
CHAPTER 4:  
EXCAVATIONS AT PLAZA-A, CAYLAN

In the previous chapters I have foregrounded the theoretical and diachronic implications of my research by focusing on theories of performance and the history of public architecture in the Central Andes. In this chapter, I examine the history of research in the Nepeña Valley, discuss current Nepeña research, and lays out project hypotheses. Then, I detail field and laboratory methods employed in the research. The chapter concludes with preliminary excavation results regarding stratigraphy, construction techniques, occupation phases, and amount of materials recovered. Excavation results are then analyzed and discussed in depth with regard to performance in Chapter 5.

4.1 Nepeña: History of Investigations and Current Research Questions

The Nepeña river valley is located within the North-Central coast (Figures 1, 3), a region distinguished by geographical and cultural similarities separating it from the neighboring regions of the North coast and Central coast (see Sandweiss 2008; Vidal 1987; Willey 1953; Wilson 1999). Within the North-Central coast is the modern political district of Ancash, which comprises a series of river drainages, the most notable of which are the Santa, Nepeña, Casma, descending from the Cordillera Negra and into the Pacific Ocean. Caylán is located in the Nepeña Valley, which is slightly smaller than the neighboring Casma and Santa river valleys, but still offers continual annual rainfall (Proulx 1968: 2; Robinson 1964) as well as an easier route into and down from the Cordillera Negra than do the much steeper Santa and Casma drainages (Daggett 1987, 1999). A division in the valley is made between the lower valley, a wide area of littoral near to the coast (0-30km.), and the narrower upper valley leading into the Cordillera Negra (30-60km.) in terms of settlement patterns (see Proulx 1968; Daggett 1984; Ikehara 2010).
The earliest excavations in Nepeña were conducted by Julio C. Tello, who documented Chavín-esque feline supernatural friezes at numerous Formative sites in the valley, including Cerro Blanco, Huaca Partida, and Punkurí (Tello 1943, 1960, 2005). Paul Kosok (1965) surveyed portions of the valley in his excursions through various Andean river valleys, recording regional site data in 1949. Later, Donald Proulx (1968, 1973) conducted an extensive valley wide survey of Nepeña, modeling his work after Gordon Willey (1953)’s highly successful settlement pattern survey of the Virú valley to the north.

Although Proulx’s survey encompassed sites from all different time periods, considerable attention was paid to Early Horizon developments based on ceramic and architecture seriation (see Proulx 1968, 1985). Proulx (1968, 1985: 26) argues for two phases of development during

**Figure 3.** Nepeña Valley (drawing by David Chicoine).
the Early Horizon, an early phase characterized by Chavín-like temples and Stamped Circle-Dot ceramics, and a later phase with megalithic fortresses and Pattern-Burnished ceramics. Proulx (1985: 265-266) sees an Early Horizon migration of Chavín into the valley around 900 BCE, centered around Cerro Blanco and Punkuri, with strong ties to the much larger Casma valley. During the final third of the Early Horizon, or Proulx’s Phase 2, Proulx (1985: 273-274) argues for an abrupt end to Chavín in the valley, with the fluorescence of megalithic fortresses of highland influence.

Richard Daggett (1984, 1987, 1999) later expanded Proulx’s work on the Early Horizon in Nepeña, and put forth a three phase chronology of development. In contrast to Proulx, Daggett (1987: 121) sees Chavinesque sites such as Cerro Blanco as pre-dating Chavín and the Early Horizon. Daggett sees the beginning of the Early Horizon as a time of tremendous upheaval with the collapse of the Sechín polities in Casma, and a possible invasion from the highlands resulting in ridge-top settlement (Daggett 1987: 80; see also Pozorski and Pozorski 1987: 118-119). In Daggett’s sequence, the Early Horizon begins with large, valley floor sites and upper valley ridge-top sites, with the eventual dominance of ridge-top sites during the last two phases as warfare and competition over resources intensifies (Daggett 1987: 82; see also Ghezzi 2006; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Wilson 1987, 1988 for a regional warfare perspective). Materials indicative of Phase 1 include Stamped Circle-Dot ceramic sherds, ceramic panpipes, discs, and polished stone blades (Daggett 1987: 72-73). These diagnostic materials continue in use throughout Phase 2, with the addition of applique and Textile-Impressed sherds (Daggett 1987-74). During Phase 3, Phase 1 artifacts gradually fall out of favor, with Pattern-Burnished and post-fire scratched sherds becoming the dominant decorative style (Daggett 1987: 76).
4.2 Current Research in Nepeña

Current research in the Nepeña Valley within the last decade has further developed and revised the work of Proulx and Daggett’s settlement pattern studies with the aid of excavation (Chicoine 2006a; Chicoine 2006b; Chicoine 2010; Chicoine and Ikehara 2010; Ikehara 2010; Ikehara and Shibata 2005; Shibata 2002, 2010). A new chronology has been developed for Nepeña based on Shibata’s excavations at Cerro Blanco (Figure 2), which I consider within the broader Formative Framework (Kaulicke 1994, 2010; Shibata 2010: Figure 17). This chronology has four main divisions: (1) The Huambocayan phase (1500-1100 BCE), associated with the first raising of the pyramid mound at Cerro Blanco; (2) The Cerro Blanco phase (1100-800 BCE), which is roughly coeval with the Cupisnique and Manchay traditions associated with the U-shaped construction; (3) The Nepeña phase (800-450 BCE), correspondent with the abandonment of Cerro Blanco’s U-shaped tradition and the shift to megalithic construction; (4) The Samanco phase of the Late-Final Formative (450-150 BCE) corresponding with the abandonment of Cerro Blanco (Shibata 2010: 305-306).

Research by Hugo Ikehara (2010) in the upper valley has also shed light on Late-Final Formative megalithic traditions and the possibility of increased conflicts after 500 BCE. Ikehara conducted excavations at the ridge-top megalithic site of Kushipampa, which has a ceremonial sector built of massive stones and lintels, and an outerlying domestic sector (Ikehara 2010: 375). Ikehara (2010: 395) confirms Proulx and Daggett’s assertions of the decline of Circle-Dot ceramics at this time in the upper valley, with the fluorescence of Pattern-Burnished decorations on large vertical walled bowls which do not appear in the lower valley. Although upper valley sites have markedly different settlement patterns, construction techniques, and material culture,
exchange is documented by high amounts of shell remains found at Kushipampa (Ikehara 2010: 398).

As part of an effort to provide better insights into the Late-Final Formative Period, David Chicoine (2006a, 2006b) conducted extensive excavations at the aforementioned site of Huambacho, yielding new and significantly different data from Late Formative traditions such as Chavín-Cupisnique Cerro Blanco and Final Formative megalithic upper valley sites. The occupation of Huambacho is placed during Shibata’s Nepeña and Samanco phases, and represents a possible competing tradition of residential compounds that eventually takes over the lower valley during the Samanco phase and abandonment of Cerro Blanco (see Chicoine 2010).

4.3 Proyecto de Investigación de Arqueológica Caylán: Inquiries into Early Urbanism

Building on his previous work at Huambacho, Chicoine (2009) has recently begun a new project at neighboring Caylán, which is coeval but much larger. The Proyecto de Investigacion Arqueologica Caylán (PIAC) was initiated in order to better understand Late-Final Formative developments throughout the lower Nepeña from the excavation of the largest site in the valley. Caylán is located 15 km. from the Pacific Ocean and 60 km. from the base of the Cordillera Negra mountain system (Daggett 1984: 215). Caylán is also located at approximately 130 m. above sea level, in the center of the arid chala ecological sub-region suitable to limited natural vegetation (See Sandweiss 2008; Topic and Topic 1983; Vidal 1987), but extensive irrigation based agriculture (Proulx 1968: 2-3).

Caylán was first acknowledged by the archaeological world by Paul Kosok who conducted brief surface surveys. Kosok (1965: 208-209) was struck by Caylán’s expansive, labyrinthean layout, and likened it to other sites he had encountered with enclosure compounds and seemingly invisible accessways. Caylán’s large size and urban layout continued to baffle
scholars decades later, in addition to a heavy reoccupation at the site around 1200 CE (Proulx 1968, 1973). Daggett was the first to document Caylán as an Early Horizon site, comparing it with the recently investigated Pampa Rosario and San Diego in the Casma valley (Daggett 1984: 215; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987: 58). Daggett ascribes Caylán to his Phase 1, based on the discovery of Stamped Circle-Dot sherds, clay panpipes, and polished slate points (Daggett 1984, 1987: 74). Daggett recorded a basic map of Caylán’s nucleus (Daggett 1984: 215) showing valley floor square rooms, one main mound, large defensive walls, and ridge-top components to site layout.

PIAC’s first two seasons produced a map (Figure 4) detailing the approximately 90 hectare monumental nucleus and 200 hectare extent of Caylán. The site is organized as a series of enclosure compounds with low rising mounds and plazas, interior colonnades, patio rooms, store rooms, and restricted access ways emphasizing corridors and right angles (Chicoine and Ikehara 2010: 353-358). Walls are built in the orthostatic technique, with quarried granite stones set in mortar between double walls. The results of mapping also show that large portions of Caylán were centrally planned and built around at least three avenues which crosscut the site and are the principal accessways. These indicate that Caylán may have been built over a short period of time and likely housed a large population (Chicoine and Ikehara 2010: 365). As such, current research focuses on the population extent of Caylán, and qualities of social complexity involved with urbanism.

Central to this argument is the existence of “compounds,” each with its own layout of a plaza, patios, and smaller domestic or storage rooms (see Chicoine and Ikehara 2010). These compounds are reminiscent of the two compounds documented at Huambacho, but
Figure 4. Map of Caylán with Compound-A shaded (drawing by David Chicoine, Hugo Ikehara).
appear in much larger numbers, with at least eight individual compounds currently documented. Current hypotheses by Chicoine and Ikehara (2010: 362) argue that this layout reflects the existence of a centralized “archaic state” (Drennan and Peterson 2006) with various competing co-resident groups occupying differing compounds who operate together to achieve regional influence throughout the valley.

In order to understand how Caylán’s large population envisioned, enacted, and experienced public space, my thesis project was initiated to excavate one of the largest and best preserved plazas at Caylán, Plaza-A (Figure 5). Plaza-A is located in what is referred to as Compound-A (Figure 4, 6), a series of patios and smaller rooms nucleated around Plaza-A sharing a similar layout. This compound may have extended further toward the main mound area, but I focus on areas which show direct access and association with Plaza-A. Excavation goals included: the confirmation of Plaza-A as a Formative habitation area; the mapping and excavation of all plaza architecture and surrounding accessways; the recovery of plaza material culture; the documentation of building techniques; and the identification of stratigraphy and occupation episodes. Excavation goals were addressed through two field seasons of excavation, mapping, and survey in 2009 and 2010, and two months of laboratory research at the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP) in Lima.

4.4 Plaza-A Spatial Organization

Investigations at Plaza-A began with enhancing the Caylán map started in 2009 to better document accessways. Most of the architecture at Caylán is still intact and visible on the surface, although some areas are covered by superficial wall collapse which was hand cleared in order to be mapped. In other cases, full scale excavation was required, especially to trace entryways covered by monumental walls around Plaza-A. Mapping was conducted with a
Figure 5. View of Plaza-A looking northeast (photo by David Chicoine).

Figure 6. 3-D model of Compound-A (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Topcon Total Station, converted and extracted with the Surfer program, and entered into the AutoCAD computerized mapping program.

Utilizing the AutoCAD mapping data converted into the program Google SketchUp, a three dimensional reconstruction of Plaza-A (Figure 6) and the surrounding compound area was created to interpret view shed patterns and shadow manipulation discussed in the following chapter. View sheds are interpreted from perspective views within the 3-D model, and shadow manipulations were charted through testing shadow projections at various days and times. The reconstruction also serves as a visual aid for perceiving the plaza area. The 3-D reconstruction was made by importing a portion of the AutoCAD map and extruding walls and other architectural features such as columns, platform benches, friezes, and entrances. Architectural features are to equal scale with mapping and excavation data on length and width. Wall heights were estimated to approximately two meters of wall collapse from remaining wall structures in relation with profile data in excavated contexts. In unexcavated areas, wall heights were estimated based on visible comparative heights, and generally measured approximately 2 meters high with the exception of higher walls in the south and southwestern extents of Compound-A.

Plaza-A is retained by a large, square wall which encompasses an approximate 45 x 45 meter area. This wall is estimated to have stood around 4.8 m. on the northeast, northwest, and southeast extents, and around 6.3 m. on the southwestern side based on profile and stratigraphical data. The orientation of the walls encompassing Compound-A all face approximately 46 degrees west of north, and do not align with a larger site orientation system which converges at a point on the northwest valley margin. The more monumental southwestern side of the plaza faces 40 degrees east of north, directly up valley. Entry into Plaza-A comes
from small corner entryways (approximately 1m. wide), analogous to the plazas excavated at Huambacho but smaller in width (Chicoine 2006b).

Architecture clearing indicates that Plaza-A was not directly accessible by two nearby alley ways which connect large areas of Caylán. Access rather originates in patio rooms around the periphery of Plaza-A. Two corner entryways are documented for Plaza-A, one in the west corner (Entrance 1), and the other in the east corner (Entrance 2). No accessways are visible from surface clearing in the northern and southern corners of Plaza-A. In the southern corner of Plaza-A, the outer wall clearly connects to enclose any area of possible entry. As a result, excavations centered on the two areas with accessways (Figure 7).

4.5 Plaza-A Excavation

Excavations consisted of two area excavations (UE-2, UE-5) and a test pit (HP-8) which aimed at gaining a representative sample of architecture, access patterns, floor deposits, construction episodes, stratigraphy, and material culture of Plaza A and the surrounding area. The total area excavated was approximately 180 sq. m. (Figure 7). The first area excavation, located in the eastern, more monumental corner of Plaza A, UE-2, measured 75 sq. m. UE-2 was excavated under the direction of David Chicoine and Jessica Ortiz in 2009 (see Chicoine and Ikehara 2009). UE-5 was placed on the opposite side of UE-2 to gain a larger representative sample, comparatively analyzing data from UE-2 to understand the function and material assemblage inside the plaza, and piece together symmetry based on the opposing excavations. UE-5 was excavated under the direction of Matt Helmer, David Chicoine, and Hugo Ikehara. In addition to building on data inside the plaza from UE-2, UE-5 extended outside of the plaza to discover access directions,
Figure 7. Plaza-A with excavation areas shaded (drawing by Matt Helmer).
and how access was controlled between the inside of the plaza and surrounding rooms outside of
the plaza around the northern and eastern extents. UE-5 measured approximately 105 sq. m.

Excavations were conducted in natural and cultural layers and focused on the division
between superficial deposits, floor deposits, refuse piles, construction fill deposits and sterile
sub-soil. Excavation and artifact processing were conducted by David Chicoine, Matt Helmer,
Jessica Ortiz, local field assistants, and field school students. All soil was screened with three
mm. (1/8 inch) screens, and smaller sieves were used in contexts with dense botanical materials
or for features. Materials and strata were recorded on level forms and compiled into a database.
All materials were kept for processing and analysis except for courseware body sherds
measuring less than a quarter in diameter. Decorated and rimsherd artifacts were drawn and
analyzed while body sherds were differentiated between fine and courseware. All non-ceramic
vessel artifacts were cataloged and analyzed based on type and relative presence or absence.

4.6 Excavation Results: UE-2

Architectural features were not visible at the surface aside from the monumental outer
plaza wall, and were realized through excavation. UE-2, located in the eastern corner of Plaza-
A, uncovered the most intact friezes and architecture within Plaza-A (Figure 8). Measuring
approximately 75 sq. m., UE-2 revealed three levels of clay frieze decorated platforms terracing
down to the plaza floor. The lowest platform, Bench 1, was approximately 1.3 meters wide, and
was not excavated to floor level. Bench 2 measured approximately 1.3m. high from Bench 1,
and approximately 2m. wide. A third level of platform, labeled as Upper Room, connected to
Entrance 1, measured approximately 1.3 m. above Bench 2 and 2.4 meters wide. At this top
level, there is a 1.3 m. wide corridor leading from Entrance 1 across the highest bench level.
This corridor also leads to a 1 m. wide staircase which descends through the platform benches
Figure 8. UE-2 platform levels and staircase (photo by David Chicoine, drawing by Jessica Ortiz, Mary Lee Eggart).
and down to the plaza floor. Other architectural features uncovered in UE-2 included a portion of a .7 x .5 m. column with a sculpted “S” design (Figure 9) which would have supported a roof structure along Bench 2. A window was also discovered at Bench 2 level, which was approximately 1 meter wide with an inset frame. Two niches were found on either side of Entrance 1 that may have been associated with a lock system (Figure 10). Friezes were designed as inverted step designs which were sunken at three separate depths into the platform bench walls. All walls excavated in UE-2 were covered with a fine yellowish brown plaster (10 YR 7/2), which was likely covered with white paint seen at UE-5.

Excavations in UE-2 were focused on horizontal excavation of architecture during the last main occupation phase, and the majority of the unit was dug through wall fall and rubble fill down to the first plastered floor and terminated. However, within the Upper Room near to the main entrance, a vertical excavation extended 4.3 m. down to the sterile bedrock layer presumed to predate initial construction (Figure 11, Table 1). The vertical excavation of the Upper Room revealed four definite floors, and possibly a fifth (Floor 3). Basic stratigraphy was as follows (see Chicoine and Ikehara 2009 for detailed UE-2 stratigraphy): Stratum 1: Wall fall and rubble fill with Formative artifacts (0-1.2m.); Stratum 2: A layer of compact sand above the floor of the last occupation (1.2-1.3 m.); Stratum 3: Floor 1 plaster through a brief gravel construction fill layer down to floor 2 (1.3-1.45 m.), interpreted as the original floor which floor 1 was a renovation of. Stratum 4: gray gravel construction fill down to floor 3 (1.45-1.75 m.), ascribed to the abandonment of floor 3 and construction of floor 2 occupation level and the raising of wall heights of the Upper Room. Stratum 5: Floor 3 construction fill down to floor 4 (1.75-2.05 m.), interpreted as a floor of previous occupation to the Upper Room based on materials of previous structures within the construction fill. Stratum 6: Floor 4 construction fill down to floor 5 (2.05-
Figure 9. Plaza-A “S” shaped colonnades (photo by David Chicoine, drawings by Hugo Ikehara, Matt Helmer, photo by David Chicoine).
Figure 10. Entrance 1 (photo by David Chicoine).

Figure 11. Floor sequence UE-2 Upper Room (photo by David Chicoine).
2.25 m.), interpreted as the first occupation episode. Stratum 7 extended deep under this level in order to document sterile sub-soil of gravel bedrock (2.25-4.35 m.).

Materials recovered from the area excavation portion of UE-2 include 1,969 ceramic sherds, 49 ceramic objects not of vessel origin (pan pipes, ceramic discs, and tiles), 36 lithic artifacts, 642 g. of animal bones, 2,455 g. of shell remains, 2,775 g.s of botanical remains, wood and carbon sent for dating, destroyed clay decorations (some white and graffiti), and miscellaneous artifacts including parrot feathers, decorated gourd fragments, hair, spondylus shell, textiles, and yellow paint. The vertical excavation of the Upper Room of UE-2 yielded 666 ceramic sherds, 15 ceramic objects not of vessel origin (panpipes, ceramic discs, and tiles), 12 lithic artifacts (cores, groundstones, flakes, stone polishers, quartz, projectile point fragment), and painted clay decorations (white, some with graffiti). The vast majority of these artifacts were recovered from secondary refuse deposits within sandy gravel construction fill layers. A few notable cases of floor deposits were noted, although floors were generally kept clean inside the plaza. Material data from UE-2 are discussed further in the following chapter.

Table 1. UE-2 Upper Room stratigraphy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Depth (m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wall fall</td>
<td>10 YR 6/3 fine sand and rocks</td>
<td>0-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Floor 1</td>
<td>10 YR 7/3 compact sand with few rocks</td>
<td>1.2-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction fill 1; Floor 2</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 loose gravel and sand</td>
<td>1.3-1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction fill 2; Floor 3</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 loose gravel and sand</td>
<td>1.45-1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction fill 3; Floor 4</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 loose gravel and sand</td>
<td>1.75-2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Construction fill 4; Floor 5</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 heavy gravel and sand</td>
<td>2.05-2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Construction fill 5; sterile sub-soil</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 heavy gravel and sand</td>
<td>2.25-4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Excavation Results: UE-5

UE-5, located in the eastern corner of Plaza-A, extended out from the plaza corner and into surrounding architecture immediately outside of the plaza (Figures 12-14). UE-5 focused on plaza materiality and access patterns, comparatively analyzing plaza architecture data with UE-2 from a less monumental side of the plaza. UE-5 excavations covered approximately 105 sq. meters. Two 19 x 2 trenches (UE-5, Extension 1, 2, and 3) extending across either side of the Plaza-A eastern corner were excavated, which encompassed a series of walls, corridors, platform benches, and portions of the open ground surface of Plaza-A. A third 5 x 5 m. unit (Extension 4) was opened in the outer extent of the eastern corner to determine which corridors provided access into the plaza. UE-5 excavations documented 20 walls within and around the eastern quadrant of Plaza-A (Figure 14), some of which exhibited fine smooth plaster (with remnants of white paint along walls inside the plaza) analogous to walls documented in UE-2, while others were crudely plastered with finger prints or not plastered at all. Architectural features inside the plaza included three platform benches on either side of the eastern corner, intact friezes between platform levels with an identical design to UE-2 emphasizing step design of varying depths, two colonnades with destroyed “S” shaped designs, and a staircase blocked by wall seals. Outside of the plaza, seven deep corridors within high walls were excavated, and a destroyed staircase blocked by a wall seal in the corner entrance to Plaza-A.

UE-5 excavations originally focused on large scale horizontal excavations to document the last major construction phase of Plaza-A (Floors 1 and 2 from UE-2). However, anomalous construction patterns of wall seals coupled with bad preservation of this last occupation level led to an extension into deeper strata in certain areas. Vertical excavations inside the plaza went through the various strata of the plaza surface and through two major construction phases of a
Figure 12. UE-5 outer excavations (photo by David Chicoine).

Figure 13. UE-5 inner excavations (photo by David Chicoine).
staircase and its subsequent entombment. Immediately outside of the plaza, a vertical excavation in the previous corner accessway extended through dense trash fill blocking the entrance down to sterile sub-soil. The two 19 x 2 m. trenches were combined to gain an approximately 40 m. cross section detailing the various rooms, floors, elevations, and strata across the plaza and outerlying corridors.

Strata inside Plaza-A were much like strata from UE-2, although only a sequence of four floors instead of five were documented (Table 2). Additionally, the last construction phase surface layer was much shallower and more destroyed in certain areas than in UE-2. These strata comprised of a layer of wall fall and rubble fill down to a 10 centimeter layer of loose sand above floors of the last occupation. In deeper excavated areas, floors were separated by layers of sandy gravel trash fill. Fill was sandier and more organic between later fill contexts, whereas fill in deeper strata comprised of larger chunks of bedrock gravel likely ascribed to an earlier phase of construction where nearby refuse was more sparse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Depth (m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wall fall</td>
<td>10 YR 6/3 fine loose sand and rocks</td>
<td>0-.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Floor 1, irregular fill, Floor 2</td>
<td>10 YR 7/3 fine sand with few rocks</td>
<td>.30-.41m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction fill 2; Floor 3</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 sandy gravel</td>
<td>.41-.88m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction fill 3; Floor 4</td>
<td>10 YR 5/2 heavy gravel and sand</td>
<td>.88-1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the original UE-5 (9 x 2 m.), two platform levels and four surfaces were documented (Figure 15). The first surface is a top corridor (Platform 1) roofed by two destroyed columns of the “S” shape design with a 2.5 m. wide floor. Other surfaces are a second slightly destroyed platform at equal level approximately 2 m. wide (Platform 2), and a third (Platform 3) platform which was only partially preserved. The final surface excavated was the open area
surface of the plaza (Plaza Surface). The platforms were excavated to the last occupation floor (Floors 1 and 2), and the plaza surface was excavated to the fourth floor which was plastered into the wall and assumed to be the initial occupation floor (Figure 17). In the area delimited as UE-5 Extension 1, platform benches at identical level to the original UE-5’s platform benches were excavated (Figure 17). These were from the last construction phase and built directly on top of an entombed staircase (Figure 18), providing evidence of two major construction phases of original plaza prototype model and subsequent modification (Figure 19). Friezes were found across the second bench level façade which matched those excavated from UE-2.

Outside of the plaza, UE-5 Extension 2 extended outward from Extension 1 another 9 m., documenting three corridors over a meter deep (Figures 14, 20). Corridors 1 and 2 measured approximately 1.5 m. wide, and Corridor 3 extended into part of a larger room on modern surface level. Corridors 1 and 2 comprised of one very deep layer of compact wall fall and rubble fill with sparse artifacts on top of very well preserved floors, while Corridor 3 was shallower with a more destroyed floor (Figure 21). In contrast, the corridors excavated in Extension 3 extending outward from the original UE-5 show higher patterns of usage. Here, four corridors were documented with similarly deep rooms covered by denser layers of surface trash, especially in the case of Corridor 1B (Figures 22-23). Corridor 1B was approximately 2 m. wide, while corridors 2B1, 2B2, and 3B were slightly over a meter in width.

In Extension 4, a very superficial layer of wind-blown sand, wall fall and rubble fill laid atop dense layers of construction fill related trash associated with a destroyed portion of Entrance 2 (Figure 24). A dense construction fill deposit within the area labeled “Rise 1” was laid atop a destroyed staircase entryway. Remnants of a wall seal and an imprint in the shape of stairs were still evident in the entryway. Within the areas labeled Rise 2, Room 1, and Room 2, walls were
Figure 14. Plan view of UE-5 (Drawing by Hugo Ikehara and Matt Helmer).
located which blocked all excavated corridors with the exception of the upper corridor (Corridor 3B) in UE-5 Extension 3. Unfortunately, no definitive floor sequence was documented from extension 4 due to poor preservation in the area. Preservation was further complicated by a modern road which crosscut a portion of the unit.

A vertical excavation was conducted through a small portion of the area Room 1 to document sterile sub-soil and the extent of walls and construction fill episodes in UE-5 Extension 4 (Figure 25). Within this vertical excavation, a number of possible destroyed floor surfaces were excavated, one of which likely connected with the floor in Corridor 1B. In addition, compact silty layers possibly associated with El Niño rain episodes were documented between construction deposits in the foundation of Plaza-A. Construction fill in this vertical excavation documented sandier organic gravel trash fill layers in the majority of the construction layers, with the deepest stratum comprising of more gravelly bedrock and limited artifact assemblages.

UE-5 contained 5,272 ceramic vessel sherds and 151 non vessel ceramics (panpipes, tiles, discs, spindlewhorls). Non-ceramic remains included 1 kg. of animal bones, 18 kg. of decorated adobe, .48 kg. of carbon, 36 kg. of lithics (slate flakes, cores, groundstones, stone polishers, projectile points), 2 copper artifacts, 22 kg. of shell remains, 0.2 kg. of textiles, and 2.8 kg. of botanicals. Miscellaneous artifacts recovered include parrot feathers, coprolites, camelid hair, and a wooden spinning rod. Ceramics are discussed with regard to chronology here, and other materials are discussed in the following chapter.

4.8 Excavation Results: HP-8

While excavations at Plaza-A focused on large area excavations, one test unit (HP-8) was placed in a backroom behind UE-2 to gain a better understanding of the more monumental
Figure 15. UE-5 original unit (photo by Matt Helmer).
Figure 16. UE-5 original unit profile (drawing by Matt Helmer).
**Figure 17.** UE-5 Extension 1 (photo by David Chicoine).

**Figure 18.** UE-5 Extension 1 sealed staircase (photo by David Chicoine).
Figure 19. UE-5 Extension 1 profile (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Figure 20. UE-5 Extension 2 (photo by David Chicoine).

Figure 21. UE-5 Extension 3 (photo by David Chicoine).
Figure 22. UE-5 Extension 2 profile (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Figure 23. UE-5 Extension 3 profile (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Figure 24. UE-5 Extension 4 (photo by David Chicoine).
Figure 25. UE-5 Extension 4 profile (drawing by Matt Helmer).
western plaza side. This unit was placed in a hypothesized store room, and measured 1 x 2 m. with a 1 m. extension. Only one floor was located below 90 cm. of wall fall. The unit then extended into sterile sub-soil another 50 cm. below the floor. An extension followed the floor an additional meter. Materials recovered from HP-8 include 57 g. of animal bones, 313 ceramic vessel sherds, 49 g. of carbon, 272 g. of lithics, 696 g. of shell remains, 20 shell beads, 9 panpipe fragments, and 43 g. of botanical remains. Architectural features included two columns that likely supported a roof extending from two walls in the room.

4.9 Temporal Analysis of Plaza-A: Ceramic Evidence and Construction Phases

Due to their dominance in the material record, I consult ceramics as a source for dating Plaza-A. During the Late-Final Formative in Nepeña, ceramic vessels adhere to earlier Formative traditions comprised of a majority of neckless jars, and to a lesser extent neck jars, bottles, bowls, and open basin vessels, with bottles and carinated bowls encompassing finer decorated vessels (Daggett 1984; Proulx 1968, 1985). This pattern aligns well with regional Formative patterns (e.g., Burger 1992; Fung-Pineda 1988; Grieder 1975; Grieder 1988; Izumi and Sono 1963; Kaulicke 2010; Proulx 1968; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Willey 1945). As such, taxonomies and seriations have focused on decorative qualities.

Some ceramic designs continue to be used throughout the Formative, while others are abandoned. One Middle Formative ceramic decoration which continues to be used in the Late-Final Formative is the style of triangular zoned punctations within incised areas, ascribed to the Las Haldas style traced to the Formative center of Las Haldas in the lower Casma Valley (Fung-Pineda 1988; Grieder 1975; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987, 2006). These are similar in design, but often smoothed or polished in later Formative contexts (see Proulx 1985: 191).
The “Janabarriu” ceramic style ascribed to a later Chavín phase (Figure 2) is also evident on the coast during the Late-Final Formative (Burger 1984: 81-106; Burger 1992: 170; Mesía 2007). Janabarriu ceramics are widely documented throughout the coast and highlands during the Late Formative, and occur in high frequency during the latter phases of occupation at Cerro Blanco in the lower Nepeña (Shibata 2010: 305; Ikehara 2007; Kaulicke 2010: 284). Proulx (1985: 187) states that these are the most common decorated ceramics during the time period. However, these commonalities may not necessarily coincide with a direct Chavín presence on the coast during the Late-Formative (Chicoine 2006b, 2010). Janabarriu styles emphasize stamped circles and dots, vertical “S” designs, beveled thickened rims, and Pattern-Burnished designs (Burger 1992: 170). Proulx (1968, 1985: 188) and Daggett (1984, 1987) ascribe Janabarriu type ceramics to their earlier phases of the Early Horizon, but differentiate Stamped Circle-Dot to an earlier phase, and Pattern-Burnished to a later phase (see Daggett 1987; Proulx 1985: 202-203).

Janabarriu ceramics are notable because these designs occur more in utilitarian contexts. Burger (1992: 170) argues that Janabarriu ceramics represent a production line exporting Chavín ceramics. Later research by Isabel Druc (2004), looked at sourcing Chavín ceramics through electron microscopy, comparing Chavín assemblages with Formative sites in the upper Nepeña Valley (Druc 2004: 345). Druc’s findings indicate the reverse, where nearly 30% of the ceramics he sourced at Chavín were of foreign origin, and that ceramics at the other sites studied in upper Nepeña appear to be locally derived (Druc 2004: 345). This would lend credence to the belief of Chavín as a pilgrimage center of offerings, but may discredit the diffusional model of a Chavín core during the Late Formative. In lieu of this new evidence, both Burger and Druc have subsequently argued for a view of ceramic “emulation” of Chavín styles through Janabarriu
Janabarriu ceramics in Ancash likely represent an interaction sphere of utilitarian and medium quality ceramics which extended throughout the region, yet may have been gradually replaced by new ceramic norms around 500 BCE, earlier than Burger has asserted (Ikehara 2010; Mesía 2007; Rick 2008).

Vessels at Caylán are also designed to a different iconographic standard emphasizing white paint on red slip with geometric designs bordered with incisions, and an abandonment of supernatural feline designs on polished black slip of previous Cupisnique-Chavín elements (Billman 1996; Brennan 1978; Collier 1955: 211; Larco Hoyle 1945; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987: 68). These White-on-Red geometric incised pottery types belong to what others have referred to as Salinar in Late Guañape or Early Salinar in the Moche Valley (Billman 1996: 185; Brennan 1978), Patazca in the Casma Valley (Collier 1960:413), or Puerto Moorin in the Viru Valley (Collier 1955: 211) which are believed to correspond to a period post-dating 200 BCE and the beginning of the Early Intermediate Period.

At Plaza-A, vessel shapes are divided into nine types based on rim angle of incidence and other diagnostic characteristics (Figure 26). Neckless jars are a common Formative utilitarian coarse ware vessel with a restricted mouth (7-20 cm.) and no neck, resembling a gourd. Neckless jars were the most common ceramic recovered. They are a coarse utilitarian ware with few instances of finer contexts which are discussed later. They are a reddish brown color and frequently show evidence of cooking. Neck jars are less common in the Formative, which have an extended neck more vertical than flared. (4-20 cm.). These generally had a slightly finer slip than neckless jars. Incurved bowls resemble neckless jars in shape, but have a wider mouth (20-40 cm.) for eating or drinking. Deep bowls are an eating or drinking vessel with a rim angle of incidence at approximately 90 degrees, forming a deeper basin. Bowls have an angle of
incidence which is slightly more open, around 45 degrees for eating and drinking. Shallow bowls have a more open basin, with an angle of incidence around 30 degrees. Carinated bowls are small, fine incurved bowls which are usually fine or decorated. Stirrup spout bottles are the finest of Formative vessels, with restricted mouths and two curved necks with a globular or carinated base. Other bottles are also generally fine, but do not have a dual neck.

I classify decorated ceramics based on common decoration types into 8 type variety categories (Figure 27), but do not use cultural names which are given to these styles elsewhere since these types are ascribed to particular sites or regions and do not necessarily reflect influence. Work is currently ongoing to develop a sequence which specifically fits new Nepeña excavation evidence (Chicoine 2010; Shibata 2010). I group white paint on red slip sherds reminiscent of Puerto Moorin, Salinar, Patazca styles together. Stamped Circle-Dot sherds and Pattern-Burnished sherds similar to the Chavín Janabarriu style are categorized into two different sub-categories, as they have been ascribed to different phases in Nepeña (Daggett 1984, 1987; Proulx 1985). Zoned textile impress sherds are grouped together, which share a long tradition on the North-Central coast going back to Cupisnique times (Conklin 1978), although Proulx (1985: 213) dates them to the Early Intermediate Period. Zoned punctate sherds like those discussed of the Las Haldas tradition are grouped together, which also share long traditions in the region. Incised Applique sherds are grouped together, which are generally fine blackware, polished sherds with modeled geometric designs bordered by incised lines. A general type is assigned to fine blackware sherds which cannot be placed into the aforementioned categories. Lastly, a miscellaneous category encompasses anomalous designs. These are organized based on their first appearance in the material record during the Formative.
Figure 26. Plaza-A vessel shape examples (drawing by Matt Helmer, Mary Lee Eggart).
Figure 27. Plaza-A decoration type examples (drawing by Matt Helmer, Mary Lee Eggart).
### Table 3. Decorated sherd contexts inside Plaza-A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>White-on-Red</th>
<th>Pattern Burnish</th>
<th>Circle-Dot</th>
<th>Incised Applique</th>
<th>Zoned Textile Impress</th>
<th>Zoned Punctate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wall Fall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Decorated sherd contexts (corridors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>White-on-Red</th>
<th>Pattern Burnish</th>
<th>Circle-Dot</th>
<th>Incised Applique</th>
<th>Zoned Textile Impress</th>
<th>Zoned Punctate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wall Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Plaza-A, 7,528 total ceramic vessel sherds were recovered from excavations, 7,396 of which are diagnostic to the Formative Period based on vessel shape, decoration pattern, and technology. The 244 ceramics deemed intrusive from later occupations came from surface contexts, with the exception of one whole vessel offering found deep in the plaza floor provenience. Of the sherd total, 305 diagnostic vessel sherds were recovered, the majority of which were rim sherds with a smaller amount of neck or base sherds. There were 288 decorated or fine sherds recovered which resemble the Salinar, Janabarriu, Las Haldas, and other aforementioned Formative decorative styles, although some of these were either duplicates or could not be assigned a diagnostic type variety. Of these 288 fine or decorated sherds, 76 decorated ceramics from individual vessels were recovered from Plaza-A excavations which exhibited a decoration and could be placed within a type variety. These were drawn and analyzed into type variety categories, while the remaining fine classified sherds were counted and distinguished based on finer slip or firing characteristics.

In total, 78 diagnostic decorated sherds were noted (Tables 3-4). The majority of decorated sherds came from the zoned Textile-Impressed (25%) and zoned White-on-Red (21%) categories (Table 5). The prevalence of Zoned Textile-Impressed ceramics is not surprising given their ascription to latter developments of the Early Horizon by Daggett (1987) and the Samanco phase by Shibata (2010). Pattern-Burnished and Stamped Circle-Dot sherds typically documented in Late-Final Formative contexts were more uncommon in the Plaza-A assemblage, totaling approximately 12% of the decorated total. Incised Applique sherds which do not resemble those mentioned by Proulx (1985: 200) and encompassed 8% of the sample. Zoned punctate and Textile-Impressed ceramics were the only decorated sherds documented in the deepest strata, but were also documented in strata of the last occupation phases. Circle-dot and
Pattern-Burnished ceramics came from middle and upper strata contexts, as well as White-on-Red ceramics.

The ceramic data indicate a Late-Final Formative, or Early Horizon context for Plaza-A. However, more precise separation of occupation phases through ceramic data is not possible, due to their intermixed nature (see Chicoine 2010). Ceramics were found from all of Proulx’s (1985) and Daggett’s (1984; 1987) phases, indicating either a longer occupation at Caylán, or the need for a re-appraisal of ceramic typologies for the valley. However, only two Pattern-Burnished sherds were documented at Plaza-A, which differs from upper valley contexts of the Final Formative (see Proulx 1985: 202-203; Daggett 1987; Ikehara 2010). The relatively small amount of Janabarriu type ceramics at Plaza-A indicate that Caylán may not have participated heavily in this pattern of hypothesized pan-regional interchange (see Burger 1993, 2008; Druc 2004; Mesía 2007; Rick 2005; Shibata 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Decorated sherd frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-on-Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle-Dot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised Applique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoned Textile Impress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoned Punctate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Blackware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the biggest contribution to ceramic chronology from the plaza excavations is the discovery of a high amount of White-on-Red decorated ceramics. White-on-Red ceramics, generally assumed to post-date 200 BCE (Billman 1996; Brennan 1978; Collier 1955; Larco 1962; Wilson 1988) were found in deeper strata at Plaza-A, inter-mixed with earlier appearing
ceramics such as Stamped Circle-Dot, zoned punctate and zoned Textile-Impressed decorations (Ceramic Table Figure). This may indicate that White-on-Red ceramics were used earlier in time along the coast than previously thought, and aligns well with new evidence in the central highlands showing a similar 500 BCE date of White-on-Red rectilinear ‘Huaras’ ceramics post-dating Chavín and Janabarri designs (Lau 2002; Mesía 2007).

In Nepeña, this ceramic transition is likely made between the decline of lower valley U-shaped sites such as Cerro Blanco and the fluorescence of enclosure compound sites such as Caylán at the beginning of Shibata’s Samanco Phase (500 BCE). The discovery of White-on-Red ceramics in deeper occupation phases at Plaza-A sheds light on questions posed by Chicoine at Huambacho, where he hypothesized that White-on-Red ceramics were likely intrusive because of their previously ascribed Early Intermediate Period dates, citing the need for further research to answer their chronological placement (Chicoine 2006a: 130). Chicoine (2010: 343) also noted the lack of diachronic seriation between ceramic styles at Huambacho based on the previous ceramic sequences (Daggett 1987: 71-78; Proulx 1985).

Ceramics could not be used to delineate different occupations within Plaza-A, although architectural and stratigraphical data show two major construction phases. A sequence of five floors was documented inside the plaza from UE-2 on the high bench level, and four from UE-5 on the open surface of the plaza. Each level was associated with a raising of floor and platform bench levels at intervals ranging from 20 to 50 centimeters. The first four occupational floors do not show deviation from the original plaza layout, with the exception of raising the architecture vertically. Radiocarbon samples taken from Stratum 7 in UE-2 dated from 750-400 cal. BCE (2 sigma), and three dates from 400-200 cal. BCE from Strata 2-4 in UE-2 (2 sigma) are believed to correspond to these two phases.
During the last occupation representing the two final floors (Phase 2), the previous architecture was entombed, and access ways were blocked. I refer to the two major occupational phases as Phase 1 (early phase), and Phase 2 (late phase). This was most evident in UE-5 Ext. 1, where a staircase was blocked with wall seals, and platform benches were built atop the staircase which was left preserved underneath (Figure 18). Phase 2 likely corresponded with the blocking of access into the plaza, shown by the access seal in the eastern plaza entrance (Entrance 2).

After blocking access from Entrance 2, the final phase of occupation likely focused on the more monumental western side of the plaza (Entrance 1). The dense middens located atop the last floor of the eastern entrance corridor (Corridor 3B) indicate its usage as a place of refuse, rather than a point of access during Phase 2. This final stage of occupation appears to have been used more intensively than previous phases. The first three floors appeared in single layers, and appeared to still be in good condition upon their abandonment. In contrast, the final stage of occupation was marked by less preserved, uneven floors which were renovated at the existing floor level, rather than raising the floor with construction fill.

Interestingly, decorated conical adobes which were mounted into walls to adorn plazas at Huambacho, and were uncovered at the main mound at Caylán, were not documented in floor or wall fall contexts inside Plaza-A. However, during Phase 1, conical adobes may have adorned parts of the plaza, as evidenced by their presence in construction fill in UE-2 and in outer plaza construction fills from UE-5 Extension 4. White painted conical plaster remains were documented in wall fall contexts from UE-5 extension 3 outside Plaza-A, and may have been used primarily to decorate outer walls, rather than inner portions during Phase 2.

Phase 1 and 2 architectural layouts are consistent, and no major shifts such as the building of new foundations were noted. The outer retaining wall of the plaza extends some 2.5
m. below the surface level down to sterile sub-soil, indicating that the plaza maintained its original plan layout throughout the entirety of usage. Therefore, only elevations and access patterns were modified over time.

To conclude on the temporal placement on Plaza-A, ceramics date within the Early Horizon and Late-Final Formative phases put forth for the valley, with a mixed context of styles. These individuals did not participate heavily in the Janabarriu tradition, evidenced by the low amount of Stamped Circle-Dot ceramics. Clear differences with upper valley populations are shown by the scarcity of Pattern-Burnished designs so common in the upper Nepeña, which align well with differences in settlement patterns. It is apparent that groups at Plaza-A utilized their own decorative ideologies, emphasizing Zoned Textile-Impressed motifs and White-on-Red designs. Data indicate that Plaza-A was not significantly modified over time in terms of layout, although interesting changes in the heights benches and numbers of entryways remain perplexing. While the sealing of Entrance 2 indicates a real effort to further control access into Plaza-A, the entombment of the monumental staircase leading to the sunken plaza area may indicate a more ceremonial disconnection with this side of the plaza. These diachronic data are used in the subsequent section on plaza actions and experiences to create a better picture on life at Plaza-A, Caylán, and Nepeña in the Late and Final Formative.
CHAPTER 5:
PERFORMANCE AT PLAZA-A

When conceptualized as theaters, plazas invoke a feeling of being on stage within a space where one can observe and be observed (Low 2000; Richardson 1982). Miles Richardson (1982: 430) argues that the saliency of modern Latin American plazas comes from their stage-like presence and socially refined environment, dichotomized with a chaotic and unrefined public space of the marketplace. At Caylán, excavation and mapping data indicate that Plaza-A was organized as an enclosed space surrounded by tiers of monumental benches accessed through pairs of stairwells. The plaza is also twice the size of other rooms at Caylán, indicating a place of important social encounters. I hypothesize that Plaza-A is analogous with Richardson’s conception of the plaza experience.

In this chapter, I lay out how Plaza-A may have achieved the extraordinary through a comparison with the mundane (see Eliade 1957). This is central to the precept that performances entail heightened interactions (Hymes 1975). I explore experiential data from four categories (bodily movements, visual perceptions, soundscapes, and foodways) as a model for testing how Plaza-A created an extraordinary public experience. I correlate each perceptual category with different activities that could have taken place within the plaza. My analysis focuses on continuities and changes during the Formative from the early urban context at Caylán. I also evaluate the critical question of how the plaza was used. My evaluation of performance in early urban contexts aims to shed light on the debates posed by Hodder, Inomata, Houston, and others over the place of performance in complex societies (Goffman 1967; Houston 2002; Hodder 2002; Hymes 1975; Inomata 2002; Turner 1980).
5.1 Methodology for Evaluating Plaza-A Performance

For each perceptual category, I consider portions of the data set from Plaza-A with material expectations that indicate extraordinary, mundane, every day, or episodic contexts. Each perceptual realm is evaluated under its own methodological framework, in addition to crosscutting comparisons. Bodily movements consider access ways, compound layout, and architectural use wear. Visual perceptions are evaluated based on view shed, monumentality, spatial layout, art motifs, and cosmological factors. Soundscapes are evaluated based on architecture layout, sound transference, and levels of audibility and inferred interactions. Foodways are considered under feasting frameworks, and a dichotomy between social and mundane contexts.

Each category is supplemented by comparisons with two other areas of excavation at Caylán, the Main Mound (UE-1, UE-4) and a domestic compound area (UE-6). These three contexts excavated comparable total areas (Table 6). With regard to material provenience, I present data pertaining to different plaza areas (i.e. platform bench vs. corridor) and different stratigraphic contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation Unit</th>
<th>Area (sq. m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plaza-A (UE-2, UE-5, HP-8)</td>
<td>176 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Mound (UE-1, UE-4)</td>
<td>173 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic (UE-6)</td>
<td>164 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stratigraphic contexts at Plaza-A are divided into surface, wall fall/rubble fill, floor, trash, or construction fill depositional contexts, in addition to depth relative to differing diachronic occupations (i.e. Floor 1, Fill 2, etc.). A general problem came from sourcing materials to specific contexts, since much of the Plaza-A sample came from secondary deposits involved with construction fills. The need for construction fill before renovation episodes would
have been most pragmatically solved by utilizing trash produced nearby. While these contexts are certainly mixed, a large sum of this nearby trash likely came from Plaza-A usage. However, it has been noted that construction fills and middens found in domestic or public contexts generally correlate with their usage (Smith 1971). The same assumption is valid for the context of above floor refuse middens and wall collapse contexts, where these materials were likely not the result of faraway activities, but discarded nearby.

The presentation of the Plaza-A dataset relies on a dichotomy between special, or public objects versus mundane or domestic objects. This division is much more pronounced in Andean traditions than others. In traditional lowland Amazonian societies, personal objects produced uniquely for public or ritual interactions are imbued with subjectivity and their own ‘life cycle’ (Santos-Granero 2009: 13; Hill 2009). These materials are categorized differently from utilitarian or mundane items which are closer to western conceptions of objects as inanimate or devoid of subjectivity (Santos-Granero 2009: 10). The Moche frequently portrayed objects as animated supernaturals, with arms, legs, or heads (Donnan and McClelland 1999: Figures 4.69, 4.70; Quilter 1990).

I conceive of personal objects at Caylán in the same manner, where these objects were more significant than mundane objects. These items were likely utilized for much longer periods of time than utilitarian objects which were discarded and remade on a more frequent basis (see Deal 1998; Roddick 2002). This could lead to a disparate relationship between numbers of utilitarian versus numbers of public or ritual artifacts in the material record. The de-facto provenience of personal items utilized is further complicated by the clean floors noted inside Plaza-A. Burger and Salazar-Burger (1998: 30-31) make a similar argument at Mina Perdida, claiming that clean floors in ceremonial spaces and primary deposits of ritual objects outside of
their usage context account for their paucity in the archaeological record. As a result, I do not consider the amount of materials located in floor contexts as much as I do a relative presence or absence in relation to the amount of these materials located in the total excavation.

I comparatively reference other Formative sites discussed in the regional background sections. Another crosscutting source of comparison for each category is a consideration of iconography from the Moche (100-800 C.E.). The Moche are renowned for their fine line ceramic drawings which show vivid depictions of different activities (see Donnan and McClelland 1999). The Moche occupied Nepeña only a few centuries after Caylán’s proposed abandonment, and built an outpost facing Caylán directly across the valley at the site of Pañamarca (see Schaedel 1967). As such, the Moche provide the closest link to explicit iconographic evidence available for interpreting performance.

I also consult ethnohistorical data from the Inka, and ethnographic evidence from traditional Andean and Amazonian groups who utilize many of the same materials discussed here. Burger and Salazar-Burger (1998) have made a similar analysis between traditional Andean-Amazonian groups and Formative performance at Mina Perdida. They argue that although significant changes have occurred, a common culture history between these groups and ancient Andean cultures creates one of the few cross-cultural references available for evaluating ancient performance (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998: 29).

5.2 Bodily Movements

Physical access into Plaza-A is one of the most defining characteristics of what made the plaza extraordinary for its patrons. As aforementioned, earlier Formative plazas on the North-Central coast emphasized large, open spaces, with graded access relegated to mound tops (e.g., Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991; Moore 1996b; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Shibata 2002). To
access earlier U-shaped areas, one could simply walk into the monumental area from the peripheral natural landscape. Evidence from Plaza-A at Caylán, and plazas from Huambacho (Chicoine 2006a, 2006b) indicate that fragmented, enclosed plazas with graded access become more common later in time. In this section, I consider plaza usage from a context of movement and access that could entail who could access the plaza, how often it was used, and what types of activities occurred. I utilize a methodology based on access and reflected spatial hierarchy (Hiller and Hanson 1984; Vega-Centeno 2010) and consider types of movements and reflected interactions (Moore 1996b, 2002, 2005).

During Phase 1 of Plaza-A usage, access was dictated to Entrances 1 and 2 from eastern and western surrounding patio rooms (Figures 28-29), presumed to be collective domestic spaces based on excavated patio rooms at Huambacho (see Chicoine 2006a, 2006b) and UE-6. During Phase 2, eastern inhabitants of Compound-A would have had to navigate extra distances through the western patios toward Entrance 1. Direct access to Plaza-A did not come from Caylán’s large avenues. The nearest avenue to Plaza-A is located approximately 20 m. northeast of the plaza, which connects Compound-A with the Main Mound and eastern site limit. This pathway could have funneled individuals to Entrance 1 through patio rooms. Individuals would have had to travel approximately 200 m. through this avenue and into the compound before passing through patio areas and into the plaza. A second major avenue is located 50 m. west of the compound, although no entrances to Compound-A have been documented.

Additional distance was created from these patio rooms into the plaza by long, zig-zagging corridors. In the case of UE-5 and the eastern Compound-A patios, three corridors extended to form a combined 114 m. long entrance with up to nine turns before entering the plaza through Entrance 2. In real distance this area is located less than 10 m. from the plaza.
Figure 28. Entrance 1 access, UE-2 (drawing by Matt Helmer).

Figure 29. Entrance 2 access, UE-5 (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Access from the southeastern side of the plaza was funneled southward away from Entrance 2, toward a 20 sq. m. patio room, before arriving at the plaza from Corridor 1B. Each of these patio rooms has an additional access path from smaller rooms which connect with the patio. On the northeastern extent of Plaza-A (UE-5 Ext. 2), the corridors did not connect to Entrance 2.

Patios from the western side of the plaza have less distance to traverse into Entrance 1. Here, two patio rooms measuring approximately 20 sq. m. and 15 sq. m., and one small backroom had direct access to the plaza from a single 20 m. long corridor with two turns before arriving at Entrance 1 (Figure 28). The relative degrees of access from patio room to plaza likely reflect spatial hierarchies (Hillier and Hanson 1984) with regard to plaza privilege. Access privilege is nucleated at the monumental western extent of Plaza-A. Here, compound walls are higher, and the plaza has an extra bench with the higher Entrance 1 and lock system.

Once inside of the plaza, access patterns were still rigidly controlled. One meter wide staircases located in corners allowed access through the various bench levels and down to the sunken floor, two of which were excavated and another two which are inferred based on symmetrical comparison. All staircases appear to have been used quite heavily based on stair use wear. This contrasts with Middle Formative monumental staircases leading from plazas to fronted platform mounds, which appeared to have been used more sparsely (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991). During Phase 2, the western staircase was entombed and subsequently blocked, perhaps as a further form of spatial control placed upon plaza access. This occurred when Entrance 2 was blocked, and the cutting off of movement from this side of the plaza likely had significant social implications involved with the confinement of use to the monumental Entrance 1. It is inferred that patio groups around Entrance 1 controlled plaza access at this time.
At Huambacho, Chicoine notes similar access patterns with regard to plazas, but comparative differences are also noted with Plaza-A. The way in which entrances are designed, through high walled, narrow corridors is identical (Chicoine 2006a: 106, Figure 3.4). Huambacho’s plazas are also accessed through patio rooms (Chicoine 2006a: 68; Figure 3.9). The corridors at Huambacho, however, are much shorter, with fewer turns than those documented at Plaza-A. Navigation into the compound area is much easier at Huambacho, since there are only 2 compound areas in contrast to at least 20 estimated at Caylán (see Chicoine and Ikehara 2010). Larger compound areas facilitating more individuals from differing social groups likely created the more stringent access patterns seen at Caylán, although both sites share the same general access ideology.

Patterns of access indicate two way, maze-like motion as a key component to experiencing Plaza-A during spectacles. Andean performances do not happen as stationary events, and movement is critical to performative events (see Mendoza 2000; Moore 2002, 2005). Moore has posited that Formative groups, more than any other Andean time period, had a fascination with creating axial space and “literally designing a site around such dynamic displays,” especially on the coast (Moore 2005: 116). Human depictions in ancient Andean iconography are almost exclusively shown in side profile emphasizing human motion, and frequently portray music, dance, and procession in conjunction with one another (e.g., Bolaños 1988: Figures 4-5; Moore 2005: Figure 4.4; Donnan 1982; Donnan and McClelland 1999: Figures 4.29, 4.31, 4.83, 4.84).

The spatial layout of Plaza-A lends itself to an extensive procession component. Processions could have started in separate domestic patios, and then passed through the maze-like corridors before funneling into the plaza through the designated entryways. Longer
processions, possibly involving outsiders, could have been conducted from the long avenue passing by the Main Mound, then traversing through Compound-A’s western patio groups before entering Plaza-A. This route would have required leaders with intimate knowledge of the space to traverse the compound area. These leaders were likely Compound-A residents. Moche iconographic processions show one individual leading a musical procession of some 31 dancers interlocked in held hands followed by musicians (Donnan and McClelland 1999: Figure 4.31). This indicates a leader-follower nature of processions. Once inside Plaza-A, paths continue to be controlled, with the tiered rows of benches and staircases laying out a connected path throughout the plaza. The worn nature of Plaza-A’s stairs attests to their heavy traffic. At Huambacho, Chicoine has also argued for a procession component to public performance, where he proposes that labyrinthian layouts may symbolized the flow of water associated with irrigation canals (Chicoine 2006a: 198).

Another type of episodic spectacle indicated by spatial data is the entombment of architecture, seen at the UE-5 Ext. 1 staircase marking the division between Phases 1 and 2 of plaza usage. Ritual entombment of monuments is commonplace throughout the ancient Andes (e.g., Grieder 1988; Hastorf 2003; Izumi and Sono 1963). In the case of Cerro Lampay, renovation events of public spaces may have taken place as a hosted festive event (Vega-Centeno 2006, 2010). It has been argued that ritual entombment may have been tied to performed memory, involved with commemoration of ancestors, possibly dedicating a structure to a particular leader and burying the leader with the monument (Hastorf 2003). Wall seals atop the entombed staircase in UE-5 Ext. 3 were not plastered over, so that the outline of the previous staircase entrance could still be seen. All of the renovations inside the plaza appeared as single
deposition episodes, and it is likely that the entombment of Phase 1 plaza architecture was part of a major public event involved with the symbolic closing of access ways.

Motion created an extraordinary, exclusive experience in Plaza-A. Worn floors and staircases show that the plaza was well traveled, which likely necessitated the series of floor raisings. Access patterns indicate a relationship between nearby patios and the plaza. In terms of episodic spectacles, procession was the defining bodily experience of performances. The entombment of architecture was likely also a public event, and the closing of monumental accesses may indicate a symbolic disassociation with the eastern side of Compound-A. The heavy use-wear and central location of the plaza also attest to its place as a venue for regular social interactions. In addition, the diversity of artifacts recovered rules out a pure usage of the plaza for special occasions. Accordingly, I Plaza-A was likely utilized by Compound-A co-resident groups for every day social interactions between more formalized usages as a venue of public spectacle.

5.3 Visual Perceptions

Extraordinary visual experiences are crucial in the creation of a special place. What one could or could not see sheds light on how the plaza was experienced by its patrons, and what types of visual experiences people valued. Visual fields also shed light on how the plaza was spatially controlled. Methodology for interpreting visual qualities of plaza monumentality follows Moore’s (1996b) methodology, looking at perspective views from various vantage points of the plaza to discern where sight was directed. I use the 3-D reconstruction as an indicator of plaza view shed and perspective views (see Vega-Centeno 2010 for a similar endeavor at Cerro Lampay).
The most apparent visual field which created an extraordinary experience of the plaza is the level of monumentality employed in the construction and level of detail. Plaza-A, at approximately 90 sq. m., is more than double the size of the second largest rooms at Caylán, patios which average 40 sq. m. in Compound-A (Figure 6). Walls were higher, larger, and also more finely constructed. For instance, the retaining wall of the plaza stood between five and six meters, and towered over walls of other structures which average two meters in height. Outer walls visible to outsiders had smooth white plaster, which would have shined in the sunlight. They were also adorned with white decorated adobes, evidenced from wall fall in UE-5 Ext. 3 wall fall and UE-5 Ext. 4 construction fill (Figure 36). Typical architecture in domestic contexts at Caylán is unpainted and either unplastered or crudely plastered with fingerprint marks. Inside the plaza are the only monumental entrances at the site, made of finely plastered staircases and rises. Plazas are one of the most highly decorated areas of Caylán, with complex, step designed geometric friezes.

Other extraordinary visual experiences inside Plaza-A are indicated by isoviews and hypothesized visual focal points inside of the plaza. The high wall surrounding Plaza-A blocked any potential viewing from outside of the plaza, except for the area atop the main mound (Figure 30). Plaza-A is also visible from the ridge-top component at Caylán, but is located 400 m. from the plaza, where visual detail is minimal. This indicates an effort by individuals at Plaza-A to create exclusivity with regard to visual access, rather than earlier Formative plazas which were specifically designed to broadcast (see Moore 1996b; Burger and Salazar-Burger 1991, 1998). The long outer plaza corridors are little more than a meter wide, with roofs evidenced by plaster with cane imprints in UE-5 Ext. 3 construction fill, and sunken floors that created an enclosed experience much like the subterranean galleries of Chavín (see Lumbreras 1993). This contrasts
with the open, white painted plaza creating bright light. Visual fields inside the plaza are quite open, with the entire 180 degrees of visual plane encompassing a single space inside of Plaza-A (Figure 31). The high walls retaining Plaza-A would have enclosed view shed to the plaza as a focal point in itself, rather than a fronted pyramid such as the aforementioned Manchay sites (Moore 1996b: 113), or an extension of view into the horizon extending the plaza into space, like Sechin Alto (Moore 1996b: 111).

The large surface area of Plaza-A in comparison to other rooms facilitated a space where one could have face to face interactions with much larger numbers of individuals. All platform bench areas and plaza floor areas are viewable to anyone inside the plaza (Figure 12). The shaded upper platform level of the three less monumental walls took visual focus away from this area, and toward the open sunken floor. Individuals entering Entrance 1 would have been more prominent upon entry, as this area appears unroofed and is atop a higher bench level. A window located near to this entrance provided a viewing area for individuals inside the plaza to the outside (Figure 32); however this window is too high for individuals outside of the plaza to see in (Figure 33). Encircling benches all face the sunken plaza floor as a visual focal point, indicating a stage-audience orientation for possible plaza interactive experiences (Figure 31).

Wide visual fields with different tiers of occupied space could have facilitated face to face interaction between individuals on the same bench level, and between individuals sitting on the benches and standing at the floor level (see Vega-Centeno 2010: 134 for a similar argument of bench-floor interaction). Moche iconography shows interactions between individuals sitting on the benches and standing on a lower level, possibly associated with elite-commoner relations and offering ceremonies (Donnan and McClelland 1999: 59, 100; Moore 1996: 205-206). Entrance 1 and the top bench on the western side of the plaza likely served as another focal point
Figure 30. Perspective view from a western patio room outside of Plaza-A (drawing by Matt Helmer).

Figure 31. Inside Plaza-A, view from North (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Figure 32. Entrance 1 and the high window from inside (drawing by Matt Helmer).

Figure 33. Entrance 1 and the high window from outside (drawing by Matt Helmer).
of plaza vision as a high, unroofed area. Frieze iconography would have been visible from anywhere in the plaza, although maximum viewing would have come from the plaza floor (Figure 34).

Plaza art styles undoubtedly contributed to an extraordinary visual experience (Figure 34). The stepped frieze designs inside Plaza-A made a continuous, replicated abstract design across the platform bench facades, without a clear start or ending point. Combined with the manipulation of light and shadows through varying depths, these friezes become increasingly prominent and complex to the eye. The powerful sunlight within the open desert environment at Caylán creates conditions conducive to shadow manipulation in the bright landscape. Artists took advantage of this to create mesmerizing iconography inside plazas. These experiences may have been further augmented by mind altering substances such as Coca (*Erythroxylum coca*), San Pedro cactus (*Echinopsis pachanoi*), and *Anadenanthera sp.* beans, widely documented in iconography and material culture throughout the Formative and Pre-Columbian Andes as a part of ritual experiences (e.g., Burger 1992; Donnan and McClelland 1999: 109; Indriati and Buikstra 2001; Knobloch 2000; Lumbreras 1972; Torres 1995; Torres and Ripke 2006).

Additionally, recent research has argued that Spondylus, also found at Plaza-A, may have been ingested to gain a hallucinogenic state (Glowacki 2005). Chicha consumption, which is further discussed in the following section on foodways, probably played a factor in the visual experience of plaza art as well.

Specific frieze design motifs may have been markers of particular plaza compound groups. The friezes in Plaza-A are similar to those found from Huambacho in terms of stepped, shadow enhanced frieze iconography, but make slightly different designs. Plaza-A friezes form
Figure 34. Plaza-A shadow art with December Solstice colonnade shadow-cast (drawing by Matt Helmer).
a continuous design with interlocking “J” shaped positive and negative designs, while the plaza excavated at Huambacho forms “F” shaped positive and negative designs (Chicoine 2006a: Figure 3.12; Figure 3.13). The discovery of these markedly different iconographic themes than earlier feline supernaturals seen just a few centuries earlier at nearby Cerro Blanco (See Shibata 2010: Figures 14-16) may indicate a conscious disassociation with Chavín-Cupisnique in favor of a completely different, abstract and light manipulated iconographic experience devoid of colors and animate creatures.

Colonnade designs employ the same artistic motif of geometric designs at varying depths, but are also completely hollow in some areas allowing for light to pass completely through the design. At Plaza-A, columns were designed with an “S” shape (Figures 9, 36). These columns may also have been a signature of different social groups, as columns with other geometric designs such as zig-zags have been documented through surface clearing at Caylán. The pillars in Plaza-A produce an “S” shadow-cast on the northeast high platform floor during the month of December at sunset (Figure 34). The shadow-cast fits perfectly into the corridor of the top platform bench level, and would have been made further visible by the roof atop the colonnades. The area where the shadow-cast is formed is located to the northeast facing up-valley, a common orientation of earlier U-shaped sites (e.g., Pozorski and Pozorski 1987). During Inka times, pillars were used to mark solstices along the horizon and punctuate agricultural cycles (e.g., Aveni 1981; Magli 2005; Zuidema 2008).

At Chankillo, a Final Formative (ca. 300 BCE) site which is contemporary with Caylán and just slightly to the south in the neighboring Casma Valley, the first solar calendar in the Americas has recently been documented as a series of 13 mound platforms tracking increments of time between the June and December solstices (Ghezzi 2007). Additionally, the main temple
Figure 35. White decorated plaster.

Figure 36. Miscellaneous Plaza-A display items (Spondylus beads and Macaw feathers).
at Chankillo, the Temple of Pillars, was aligned to the December solstice (Ghezzi 2006: 77). These pillars were decorated in a dual step motif, similar to those found at Caylán and Huambacho (Ghezzi 2006: 78). Ghezzi’s finds indicate that other groups in the region were paying particular attention to solar observations during the Late-Final Formative. Solar qualities of monumental architecture and cosmology stretch back to the late Archaic period on the Andean coast. Robert Benfer uncovered a solar observatory at the late Archaic (2,000 BCE) site of Buena Vista in the Chillón river valley, which also showed architectural correlates with the December solstice (Benfer 2004: 87-89). The December solstice also marks the beginning of the rainy season in the Andes, when crops are planted and Solstice offering rituals are conducted as part of an agricultural cycle (Gillin 1945: 15, cf. Chicoine 2006b). As such, Plaza-A may have been imbued with cosmological and agricultural importance as part of the visual experience.

Display items recovered, such as weapons, exotic adornments, decorated vessels and clothing would have added to the exceptional visual experience (Figure 35). These included two stone pendants, one of which was found above the floor on Platform 3A which was polished with spiral incisions, and another located outside of the plaza in Corridor 1B wall fall (Figure 40). Two fragments of mace heads were located in construction fill from the open plaza surface. Two fragments of polished slate projectile points were also documented, one of which was located in floor context on Bench 2 in UE-2. These have been considered as markers of the Early Horizon in Nepeña, given their frequency throughout different sites of the time period. Different interpretations have been put forth for these weapons, from indicators of ‘real’ warfare (Daggett 1987; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Wilson 1988), to ritual battles (Ghezzi 2006; Topic and Topic 1982) and multivocal use (Proulx 1985).
The idea of the plaza as a venue for ritual warfare would entail a type of extraordinary visual event. Returning to Chankillo, numerous weapons have been recovered including maces and projectile points (see Ghezzi 2006). It remains unclear, however, whether these are indicators of ‘real’ conflicts or competitive ‘ritual’ conflicts (Bourget 1998; Ghezzi 2006; Topic and Topic 1987; Urton 1994). Chankillo is a two component site, with a valley floor residential compound component analogous to Huambacho and Caylán, and a fort with parapet concentric walls and locks with a temple inside. The majority of the site exists outside of the fortified portion, on the indefensible valley floor, while structures and usage inside the fort appear to be strictly ceremonial (Ghezzi 2006: Figure 3.1). The discovery of ceramic warrior figurines at Chankillo leads Ghezzi to the conclusion that a caste of warrior elite may have controlled the socio-political environment during the Final Formative (Ghezzi 2006: 67). Traditional Andean societies continue to embrace ritual battle as a part of performance, engaging in symbolic competitions called Tinkus and blood offerings during fertility rituals (see Urton 1994). From such an inference, the plaza could have been a type of ritual ‘arena’, where competitive battles were played out through performance. However, these could have simply been display items utilized in spectacles, as evidenced by Chavín imagery from plazas showing individuals with weapons in processions (Burger and Salazar-Burger 1998: 30-31).

Other display items included parrot feathers and spondylus shell beads (Figure 35). Red down feathers were recovered in floor context on Bench 1 in UE-2, and UE-2 construction fill. In Corridor 1B trash pile, down and plume, as well as much larger contour red, blue, and green parrot feathers were recovered which likely came from the scarlet macaw (Ara macao). Macaws are not indigenous to coastal Peru, and are located much further to the east across the Andes in the lowland Amazon rain forest. Exotic Spondylus shell (Spondylus princeps) beads were
recovered from wall fall contexts in UE-2, and in HP-8 wall fall. These are indigenous to Ecuador far to the north and are considered to be Andean prestige items which were used throughout antiquity (see Paulsen 1974). Spondylus shell beads and parrot feathers have only been documented in plaza contexts at Caylán, indicating their specific use in plaza activities. Ikehara (2007) argues that the procurement and display of exotics at Cerro Blanco played a primary role in spectacles as one of the few indicators of social status in Formative Andean chiefdoms. Display of exotics at Caylán may have also been a visual indicator of social status.

To conclude on sight at Plaza-A, monumentality, exclusivity, manipulation of light, geometric art, cosmology, display, open space, and face to face encounters between large numbers of individuals were all qualities of sight culturally identified by Caylán groups in the forming of public place. These are the clearest perceptual indicators of how the plaza experience contrasted with the mundane. I contend that the plaza had cosmological importance, possibly associated with agricultural cycles as a type of episodic spectacle. The plaza could also have been a place for daily inspiration through interactions with art and larger numbers of individuals than in one’s own patio group.

5.4 Soundscapes

The transference and experience of sound is hypothesized to be another extraordinary experience at Caylán, inferred from the sunken environment and the amount of panpipes recovered. I expect the acoustic environment at Plaza-A to reflect significant data on different types of interactions and experiences. In order to accomplish this, I set up a sound test which charts sound manipulation such as amplification and restriction in normal open environments at Caylán versus the enclosed, sunken environment at Plaza-A. Sound tests were built from Edward T. Hall’s idea of “reaction bubbles,” where differing levels of interpersonal interactions
are reflected in the relative distance of comprehension on a scale from intimate experience on one end, to public at another (Hall 1959, 1965, 1968). A similar test was conducted by Jerry Moore (2005) looking at contemporary and ancient cases of Andean soundscapes, whose work I consult for decibel volumes and interactions.

For my sound study, there are three variables: the position and relative distance between the speaker and listener, the volume of spoken discourse, and the intelligibility of said discourse. Three volume levels were tested: The first volume tested the audibility of intimate or personal interactions (estimated at 30-40 decibels) at a volume where one would speak to another person in immediate proximity (2-5 m.). The second volume tested audibility at a slightly higher decibel level labeled as social interaction (estimated at 50-60 Db), where one might speak to another in louder or more social settings, and a third volume labeled public interaction which tested the audibility of shouting (80-90 Db), the inferred volume of large scale interaction, song, or dance. These audibility levels were recorded on a three tiered scale of comprehension: 1.) Hear and understand what was spoken; 2.) Hear the sound but not understand what was spoken; 3.) Neither hear nor understand what was spoken. One test was conducted with the speaker inside the plaza and the listener moving from the plaza out in various transects until sounds at each volume level were not heard or understood. A second comparative test was conducted within open space at Caylán to track the regular transference of sound under the same methodological framework for a comparative perspective.

There were a few methodological constraints which needed to be addressed. My goal was to recreate sound transference under the most pristine conditions to see the maximum transference. A large site presumably occupied by many individuals would have created significant background noise. This sound test was conducted with 15-20 other individuals on
site working nearby, and while not as loud as Caylán likely was, created a favorable comparative environment when looking at maximum sound transference. Wind speeds pick up significantly at Caylán in the afternoons, so all tests were conducted in the morning for minimal wind disturbance. Lastly, original heights of walls would have muffled sounds more than the test shows, but this problem was mitigated through charting maximum transference as a base for further inference on sound control.

Sound test results show a significant effort to trap and reverberate sound within Plaza-A (Table 7; Figures 39-41). At the level of intimate or personal interaction decibel level, sounds projected from Plaza-A were only heard and understood inside of the plaza, and were heard but not understood in a small area surrounding the plaza, in addition to the main mound. At the social interaction decibel level, sounds were heard and understood inside and in the immediate vicinity of the plaza, in addition to the main mound and a portion of the ridgetop component of Caylán. Sounds were heard but not understood in an area approximately 10 m. further out from the intelligible sound area around Plaza-A. Sound could also be heard but not understood on the entire ridgetop area. At the public interaction decibel level, sound could be heard and understood in an approximately 630 m. circumference, in addition to the entire ridgetop area. Sound could be heard but not understood in a 942 sq. m. circle around Plaza-A. From the comparative sound test in more open space at Caylán, sound generally traveled and was either heard or understood approximately triple the distance than sounds transmitted from Plaza-A.
Table 7. Sound data comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Levels</th>
<th>Audibility range: Plaza-A (Circumference)</th>
<th>Audibility range: Open Area (Circumference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>157m</td>
<td>628m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>376m</td>
<td>1005m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>628m</td>
<td>1633m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>251m</td>
<td>1193m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>565m</td>
<td>1570m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1256m</td>
<td>2356m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rather than broadcasting sound outward like earlier U-shaped structures (Moore 1996b: 158), these tests revealed that sound was channeled inward, where sound traveled less than one third of the normal distance of sound transference in open space at Caylán. A correlation with architecture and different types of interactions was also noted. Intimate-personal interactions were constrained to an area of intelligibility only inside the plaza, and social interactions could be understood within the compound area. Only public interaction volumes could have been heard outside of the compound area, Main Mound, or distant ridge-top area.

Sound transference inside the plaza was likely a form of spatial control in terms of access and privilege at the compound level. It also contrasts with the mundane through the ability to mitigate background noise in a noisy city with high levels of human activity. The natural landscape of Caylán sits inside the corner of the valley, which forms a funnel where sound travels quite easily over very large distances, as seen in the open area sound test. Additionally, wind speeds pick up in the afternoons at Caylán, which greatly hinder the ability to hear. As such, Plaza-A formed a pocket where sound would maintain unique clarity. This could have served to amplify and clarify spoken iterations, but also to amplify musical experiences.
Figure 37. Intimate-personal interaction sound contour of Plaza-A and open space (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Figure 38. Social interaction sound contour of Plaza-A and open space (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Figure 39. Public interaction sound contour of Plaza-A and open space (drawing by Matt Helmer).
Within the sunken plaza, amplified musical experiences are evidenced through the discovery of panpipes. These are some of the oldest panpipes discovered in the Andes (Proulx 1985: 244), and would have had special significance as a new musical instrument. The omnipresence of panpipes throughout Late-Final Formative contexts around the North-Central coast indicates their importance in the social landscape (Chicoine 2006a; Daggett 1987; Pozorski and Pozorski 1987; Proulx 1985; Wilson 1988). Sixty-eight panpipe fragments were found in total throughout Plaza-A (Figure 40). These appear to be built to size prototypes, with minimal variation noted in the sample. Tube openings range in size from 6-10 mm. in diameter generally, with one incidence of larger tubes with 15 mm. diameters. Proulx (1985: 244) argues that these were built with a slip-cast technique to create size prototypes and are the first documented instance of ceramic panpipes. These predate the widespread use of casts and molds for vessels. Panpipes were located in floor contexts on the ramp and staircase (Floor 3) level of UE-5 Extension 1. These had a finer dark red slip than the typical brownish red unpolished slip (Figure 40). Panpipe fragments were also recovered in Floor 1 context from Corridor 2B1 in UE-5 Extension 3, and in the Corridor 1B trash pile, while the remaining fragments came from wall fall and construction fill contexts.

Music was not a casual activity for popular consumption in Andean prehistory. Rather, music was a privileged ritual activity reserved for special occasions, a peculiarity which was noted by the Spaniards upon arrival to the Americas (Cobo 1956; Romero 2002: 20-21). Ethnohistorically, different genres of Andean music were accompanied by specific instruments for each activity (Bolaños 1988: 226-227). Christopher Donnan (1982) has discussed the diversity of dance and music in Moche iconography, likely for different types of performances and rituals. Traditional Andean societies continue to reserve different types of music for
different performances, such as rites of passage, festivals, religious music, and work music (Romero 2002: Figure 2). Today, panpipes are generally used in music associated with rites of passage, such as marriage or one’s first haircut (Romero 2002: 31).

Figure 40. Plaza-A panpipe fragments (photos by Matt Helmer).
Chicoine notes a variety of musical instruments at Huambacho, including drumsticks, flutes and panpipes (Chicoine 2006a: 134, 177, Figure 6.5). Ivan Ghezzi uncovered panpipe offerings inside of a plaza at Chankillo (Ghezzi 2007: 1241). At Cahuachi on the south coast (200-600 ACE), Nasca’s largest ceremonial site interpreted as a pilgrimage center, ceramic iconography shows the usage of these panpipes in public ceremonies (Carmichael 1998: Figure 13), possibly associated with agricultural fertility performances (Townsend 1985: 125).

Panpipes of the Nasca have been extensively sound tested, and found to have been built to prototypes where different panpipes emitted the same frequencies (Gruszczyńska-Ziółkowska 2009). It has been argued that Nasca panpipes were constructed to size codes, engineered to produce a sound of complex dissonance (Gruszczyńska-Ziółkowska 2009: 164).

Modern panpipes are also built at specific size prototypes, where each size corresponds to an octave range (Romero 2002: 30). In traditional Aymara communities, panpipe performances are frequently paired as duets played in an interlocked exchange of complementary notes in different ranges (Stobart 2002:80-81). Donnan (1982: 99, Figure 4) also notes that Moche panpipe players are usually paired in iconography, with their panpipes tied together. Larger panpipe performances during feasts form a melodic dissonance as groups of individual players engage in competitive playing of different melodies (Stobart 2002: 89). The panpipes at Caylán also appear to be constructed to size prototypes, with two sizes documented at Plaza-A and minimal observable variation (Figure 40). Hence, Caylán’s plaza soundscapes likely embodied a particular musical ideology, possibly associated with duets and melodic dissonance to create a mesmerizing experience in complement with abstract plaza art.

To conclude on soundscapes at Plaza-A, exclusivity and reverberation were created through the engineering of a high walled, sunken plaza environment. This trapped and amplified
sound inside the plaza, while muffling noise of a densely occupied settlement in an arid
environment where sound travels long distances. The plaza could have served as a place to
gather in regular social interactions where spoken iterations were clearer, but could also be done
in privacy in a space where sound does not travel. During public interactions and spectacles,
panpipes were the defining musical instrument of plazas used in this amphitheater-like
environment. These were constructed to size prototypes to create specific sounds, possibly
associated with duets and dissonant sound. This would have created an extraordinary experience
for both daily and episodic plaza interactions in different contexts.

5.5 Foodways

Feasting is the most frequently addressed context of performance as episodic public event in
archaeology (e.g., Dietler 1996; Hayden 1996, 2001; Mills 2007) including the Andes (Bray
2003; Goldstein 2003; Ikehara and Shibata 2005; Jennings 2006; Lau 2002; Roddick 2002;
Swenson 2006; Vaughn 2004). Feasting analyses focus on the production and consumption of
foodstuffs in ceremonial contexts which are used to discuss political economies. Hayden (1996)
argues that a venue conducive to feasting, a stable resource base, and a viable host are all
necessary components to a feasting environment. The plaza is an ideal venue for publicly hosted
events, given its large size and central location. A wide array of food remains is available at
Caylán, including crops, marine foods, and mammal meat. Viable hosts for a feast are likely
residents of Compound-A. I compare possible feasting contexts at Plaza-A with Chicoine’s
(n.d.) work at Huambacho and Ikehara’s (2007) work at Cerro Blanco.

At Plaza-A, I dichotomize what I consider to be public versus mundane contexts in
ceramic vessels and food remains to deduce material feasting contexts. This was done based on
vessel shape, rim diameter, and surface decoration. A similar framework was employed at the
south highland Formative site of Chiripa (Roddick 2002). For a broader discussion of ceramic classification return to the previous chapter discussing excavations and chronology.

Table 8. Comparative ceramic frequencies per excavation area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sherd Total</th>
<th>Fine/Decorated Total</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plaza-A (Units 2 and 5)</td>
<td>7396</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1:25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Mound (Units 1 and 4)</td>
<td>13653</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1:52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound Rooms (Unit 6)</td>
<td>14779</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1:61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Total</td>
<td>48321</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1:44.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with the other area excavations from the Main Mound and UE-6, Plaza-A excavations yielded approximately half the amount of total ceramic sherds despite a similar total excavated area (Table 8). Additionally, the frequency of fine or decorated sherds in Plaza-A is significantly higher than the site average and the average of the Main Mound and Compound area excavations. Of the Plaza-A ceramic dataset, approximately 50% of diagnostic vessel sherds were neckless jars, with the remaining 50% coming from various types of bottles, bowls, and neck jars (Table 9). These were differentiated based on hypothesized usage context, divided between storage and cooking vessels represented by necked and neckless jars, and serving vessels which encompass the rest of the assemblage categories. Of the 305 diagnostic vessel sherds, 30 were also decorated. Bottles were the most common decorated vessel, along with fine carinated bowls, making up approximately 80% of the decorated diagnostic vessel assemblage. Coarser ware vessels such as jars, ollas, and non-carinated bowls were rarely decorated, each type displaying less than 5% frequency of fine or decorated instances.

With regard to depositional context, 2.3% of ceramics came from surface recovery, 19.0% from wall fall, 11.5% from above floor contexts, 54% from construction fill, and 12.2% from trash piles atop floors not associated with construction fill. Aside from surface collections,
all noted vessel types were recorded from each type of deposition (Tables 10, 11). All vessel shapes and decorations were located in inside plaza contexts in addition to corridor contexts immediately outside of the plaza (Table 12). Two nearly complete broken stirrup spout bottles were recovered in Plaza-A excavations. One bottle was recovered atop the North Bench in UE-2, and one within a trash pile deposited directly on top of the floor in UE-5 Ext. 3 Corridor 1B. On the staircase floor in UE-5 Ext. 1, several pieces of a neck jar with thin walls and finger imprint

Table 9. Vessel shape frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Shape</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Min. Diameter (cm.)</th>
<th>Max. Diameter (cm.)</th>
<th>Avg. Diameter (cm.)</th>
<th>Percent Decorated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fine serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>n=9; 64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirrup Spout Bottle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>n=9; 64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinated Bowl</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n=8; 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>n=0; 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow Bowl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>n=0; 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Bowl</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>n=0; 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurved Bowl</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>n=1; 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking/storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck Jar</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n=1; 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neckless Jar</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>n=4; 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>n=32; 10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Vessel shape depositional contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Shape</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent from surface context</th>
<th>Percent from wall fall context</th>
<th>Percent from trash pile context</th>
<th>Percent from floor context</th>
<th>Percent from fill context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n=1; 7.1%</td>
<td>n=4; 28.6%</td>
<td>n=1; 7.1%</td>
<td>n=2; 14.3%</td>
<td>n=6; 42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirrup Spout Bottle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=1; 7.1%</td>
<td>n=2; 14.3%</td>
<td>n=1; 7.1%</td>
<td>n=10; 71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinated Bowl</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n=1; 6.3%</td>
<td>n=3; 18.8%</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=3; 18.8%</td>
<td>n=9; 56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=3; 20%</td>
<td>n=1; 6.7%</td>
<td>n=2; 13.3%</td>
<td>n=9; 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow Bowl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=2; 33.3%</td>
<td>n=1; 16.7%</td>
<td>n=1; 16.6%</td>
<td>n=2; 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Bowl</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=4; 36.4%</td>
<td>n=1; 9.1%</td>
<td>n=1; 9.1%</td>
<td>n=5; 45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurved Bowl</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=8; 26.7%</td>
<td>n=2; 6.7%</td>
<td>n=5; 16.7%</td>
<td>n=15; 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck Jar</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>n=1; 2%</td>
<td>n=10; 19.6%</td>
<td>n=6; 11.8%</td>
<td>n=5; 9.8%</td>
<td>n=29; 56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neckless Jar</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>n=0; 0%</td>
<td>n=29; 20%</td>
<td>n=23; 15.5%</td>
<td>n=16; 10.8%</td>
<td>n=80; 54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>n=3; 1%</td>
<td>n=64; 21%</td>
<td>n=37; 12.1%</td>
<td>n=36; 11.8%</td>
<td>n=165; 54.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Vessel shape floor contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Bottle</th>
<th>Stirrup Bottle</th>
<th>Carinated Bowl</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>Shallow Bowl</th>
<th>Deep Bowl</th>
<th>Incurved Bowl</th>
<th>Jar</th>
<th>Neckless Jar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bench 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staircase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Bench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform 2A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Surface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 2B1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 2B2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decorations was located. An anomalous sherd with a modeled shell design was excavated in wall fall on Platform 3A floor built atop the staircase in UE-5 Ext. 1. White-on-Red, pattern burnished, zoned Textile-Impressed, and zoned punctate sherds were all located in floor contexts inside and outside of the plaza (Tables 1-2).

Results indicate that Plaza-A contained higher amounts of decorated ceramics than other units elsewhere at Caylán, and fewer total ceramic sherds (Table 6). This is interpreted to be an indicator of a public, rather than intensive domestic context of plaza use. Above floor contexts of decorated stirrup spout bottles and carinated bowls also revealed that Plaza-A served as a locus for usage of ceremonial serving vessels. While there were a greater number of decorated ceramics indicating a higher incidence of fine serving vessels from other contexts at Caylán, the ratio of total serving vessels to storage/cooking vessels found from Plaza-A was 1 serving vessel to every 1.89 storage/cooking vessel (1:1.89). In his examination of feasting ceramic ratios, Roddick (2002: Tables 2-3) indicates that in Andean and cross cultural contexts, pure feasting depositional contexts contained significantly higher ratios of serving vessels to cooking/storage vessels. Thus, Plaza-A may not have been used exclusively for feasting, although I still argue for a feasting component to plaza usage.

Serving vessels were likely accompanied by social foods which differed from every day meals. The abundance of shell remains found throughout Caylán indicates that a shellfish based diet dominated the everyday subsistence of Caylán’s populace. Therefore, I consider shellfish to be a type of daily meal that contrasts with other food remains. Additionally, tuber type plants appear to decline in the Late Formative or Early Horizon (Piperno et al. 1998), with maize becoming more dominant in the ceremonial diet (Chevalier 2002: 222; Ikehara 2007). A
favorable preservation environment allows for a detailed comparison between food based contexts.

Shellfish species encountered included a wide variety of bivalve and gastropod species, including *Thais Chocolata, Crepidula Lessonii, Chiton sp., Fissurella Crassa, Tagelus Peruvianus, Fissurella Maxima, Concholepas Concholepas, Argopectam Purpuratus, Semimytulus Argosus, Donax sp.*, and others. Shell remains in Plaza-A were rarer than what might be expected, given their prevalence throughout Caylán (Table 12). 29.2 kg. of shell remains were recovered, most of which were located in construction fill deposits. Small amounts of shell remains were located in above floor contexts on UE-2 benches, and Platform 2A in UE-5 totaling approximately .41 kg. One notable above floor context came from Corridor 2B1, where 1.1 kg. of shell remains were located in a layer directly above the floor. Plaza-A excavations contained 12 kg. less of shell remains than UE-6, 62 kg. less of shell remains than UE-4, and make up only 12.8% of the total excavated shell remains on site.

**Table 12. Comparative food remains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Shell remains (kg)</th>
<th>Animal bone weight (g)</th>
<th>Peanut remains (g)</th>
<th>Maize remains (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plaza-A</td>
<td>29kg</td>
<td>1,642g</td>
<td>23.8g</td>
<td>723g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mound</td>
<td>91kg</td>
<td>3,231g</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE-6</td>
<td>41kg</td>
<td>3,403g</td>
<td>1.8g</td>
<td>43g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, certain botanical remains were much higher inside Plaza-A than other contexts. From Plaza-A excavations, extensive food remains were recovered from botanical varieties. These included: maize (*Zea mays*), a variety of beans (*Phaseolus sp.*), squash (*Cucurbita sp.*), paca (*Inga feuillei*), yucca (*Manibot esculenta*), avocado (*Persea Americana*), lúcuma (*Pouteria lucuma*), and peanuts (*Arachis hypogea*) (Table 13). Maize dominated the assemblage, with 51.7% of total botanical remains by number and 71.5% of total botanical
weight (Figure 37). Peanuts were also recovered in high frequencies, with 238 remains recovered representing 29% of the total botanical weight. Squash and avocado had sizable representations, but the rest of the assemblage species were very uncommon, with few numbers and less than 5% of total weight from the assemblage. Most botanical remains were located in fill deposits, and floor contexts were only documented in each corridor of UE-5 Ext. 3. Notable floor contexts included Corridor 2B2 from UE-5 Ext. 3, where over 70 peanut shell fragments were recovered. In the trash pile located atop Corridor 1B, approximately 200 maize cobs were recovered, many of which were much larger than the site average around 5 centimeters. A similar midden of over 100 large maize cobs was located in the second construction fill layer in UE-2.

The dominance of maize at Plaza-A compared to domestic contexts attests to its value as a social food or drink. For instance, UE-6 yielded only 43 g of maize remains, while 723 g were recovered from Plaza-A (Table 12). I argue that the high incidence of maize found in Plaza-A could be an indicator of a social crop relegated to chicha beer consumption, given maize’s lack of nutritional value when compared to other available foodstuffs (See Katz et al. 1974) and the conversely powerful qualities of fermented maize. Ethnohistorically and ethnographically in the Andes, chicha beer has been documented as a powerful ritual drink involved in displays of power, work party feasts, rites of passage, festivals, and many other socially related events (e.g., Cavero Carrasco 1986; Jennings and Bowser 2009; Murra 1961; Saignes 1993). Maize’s ritual and social status separated it from more menial crops such as potatoes for the Inka (Murra 1961: 375). Archaeologically, chicha has been linked to social transformations involved with the introduction of expansionist societies as a means of alliance building and reciprocal work party feasts (Goldstein 2003; Hastorf and Johannssen 1993; Moseley et al. 2005). Ikehara (2007)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>N; Weight (g)</th>
<th>Remains %; Weight %</th>
<th>Floor Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea Mays</em> (Maize)</td>
<td>n=425; 723g</td>
<td>51.7%; 71.5%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phaseolus sp.</em> (Beans)</td>
<td>n=27; 19.7g</td>
<td>3.3%; 1.9%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cucurbita sp.</em> (Squash)</td>
<td>n=80; 4.9g</td>
<td>9.7%; 0.5%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manihot esculenta</em> (Yucca)</td>
<td>n=1; 62.2g</td>
<td>0.12%; 6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Persea Americana</em> (Avocado)</td>
<td>n=46; 168.9g</td>
<td>5.6%; 16.7%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pouteria lucuma</em> (Lucuma)</td>
<td>n=4; 3.5g</td>
<td>0.5%; 0.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arachis hypogea</em> (Peanuts)</td>
<td>n=238; 23.8g</td>
<td>29%; 2.4%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inga feuillei</em> (Pacae)</td>
<td>n=1; 4.8g</td>
<td>0.12%; 0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n=822; 1010.8g</td>
<td>100%; 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
notes that neckless jars were likely used to produce chicha beer on the coast during the Formative, before widespread use of much larger *tinaja* jars. Chicha is traditionally consumed in maté gourd bowls (Cobo 1956: 242, cf. Moore 1989), and 413 maté gourd fragments were located in plaza excavations. From a performative perspective, I consider chicha as a medium which promotes social interactions through intoxication, where communal relations are both challenged and reaffirmed through performed discourse (see Weismantel 2009).

Ethnohistorically and ethnographically in the Andes, chicha beer has been documented as a powerful ritual drink involved in displays of power, work party feasts, rites of passage, festivals, and many other socially related events (e.g., Cavero Carrasco 1986; Jennings and Bowser 2009; Murra 1961; Saignes 1993). Maize’s ritual and social status separated it from more menial crops such as potatoes for the Inka (Murra 1961: 375). Archaeologically, chicha has been linked to social transformations involved with the introduction of expansionist societies as a means of alliance building and reciprocal work party feasts (Goldstein 2003; Hastorf and Johannssen 1993; Moseley et al. 2005). Ikehara (2007) notes that neckless jars were likely used to produce chicha beer on the coast during the Formative, before widespread use of much larger *tinaja* jars. Chicha is traditionally consumed in maté gourd bowls (Cobo 1956: 242, cf. Moore 1989), and 413 maté gourd fragments were located in plaza excavations. From a performative perspective, I consider chicha as a medium which promotes social interactions through intoxication, where communal relations are both challenged and reaffirmed through performed discourse (see Weismantel 2009).

The second most prominent food remains located in Plaza-A were peanut shells. Only 1.8 g. of peanut shells were recovered from the UE-6 domestic unit compared to 23.8 g. from Plaza-A (Table 12). Peanuts have been found in public contexts at Pampa de las Llamas-
Moxeke in nearby Casma (Pozorski and Pozorski 1995) and at Huambacho (Chicoine 2006a). Peanuts’ high protein content could have made them a prized food commodity in Andean antiquity (Dillehay 2004: 1891). I would also argue that the nature of eating peanuts, a repetitive, socially apt activity which could be done over longer periods of time before becoming full as opposed to eating a hearty stew is an indicator of their social quality.

Lastly, meat based foods were likely a part of the festive landscape. Animal bones recovered come from camelids, canines, guinea pigs (*Cavia porcellus*), small rodents such as mice and rats, and various species of bird and fish. Faunal remains from Plaza-A weighed a total of 1,642 g., none of which were worked. 645 grams of faunal remains were definitively ascribed to camelids, although smaller unidentifiable bones from the sample were also likely of camelid origin. Many of these camelid bones also showed cut marks, indicating that these were food remains. Camelid bones were located in floor context on Bench 2 in UE-2, and were recovered from Corridor 1B trash pile in UE-5 Ext. 3. Remaining camelid bones came from construction fills.

Guinea pig bones are often difficult to differentiate from other rodents. Three instances of identifiable guinea pig remains were documented, one of which was located in floor context in UE-5 Ext. 3 Corridor 2B1, and a mummified guinea pig leg from the UE-5 Ext. 3 Corridor 1B trash pile above the floor. Approximately 146 fish vertebrae of varying sizes were recovered, with over 50 vertebrae coming from Corridor 3B. Small amounts of fish vertebra came from floor contexts in Corridor 2B2 (One large vertebra) and the floor in UE-2 (Five vertebra), and 12 vertebra from the Corridor 1B trash pile, with the remainder coming from construction fill. In total, plaza faunal remains were drastically lower than UE-4 and UE-6, which each contained
approximately double the amount of faunal remains than were recovered from UE-2 and UE-5 in Plaza-A (Table 12).

Floor contexts of guinea pig remains, including the mummified guinea pig leg indicate their probable plaza usage. Guinea pigs are the best source of animal protein in the Andean diet compared with other mammals (Morales 1995: 46, Table 2.1), and hold ritual, as well as culinary significance (see Andrews 1972; Morales 1995; Sandweiss 1997). Today, guinea pigs are considered to be fine culinary fare which “binds individual or group reciprocities and social contracts, preserves cultural identities, and plays a part in various ceremonies and rituals” (Morales 1995: 49). Archaeological evidence has been found for the dissecting of guinea pigs in a similar manner to modern divining rituals in the ancient past, indicating continuities in their cultural usage (Sandweiss 1997; Silverman 1993). Floor contexts of camelid bones also indicated their place as a festive meat, although perhaps less so than other foods. For instance, three times the amount of animal bones were documented in the Main Mound and UE-6 units, based on weight (Table 12). The majority of animal bone weight came from large mammal bones, ascribed to camelids.

To conclude on foodways at Plaza-A, there is high evidence of social food consumption and usage of decorated ceramics, but less evidence of pure feasting contexts based on the higher number of utilitarian vessels compared to serving vessels. The Plaza-A assemblage indicates that festive meals, as well as daily meals occurred throughout the area. During spectacles, I argue that chicha beer consumption promoted social interactions and enhanced performances. Socially or ritually apt foods such as peanuts and guinea pigs were consumed, where shellfish may have been more a part of the daily diet. Festivals at Caylán contrast from commensal feasts at Cerro Blanco (Ikehara and Shibata 2005; Ikehara 2007) and align with feasting data from
Huambacho and the exclusionary nature of diacritical feasts based on architecture layout (Chicoine in press).

5.6 Evidence of Public Craft Production

Outside of spectacles, other types of interactions occurred in Plaza-A, as evidenced by the plaza’s central location in a densely occupied settlement, use wear, and material assemblage (see Silverman 1994). Material data suggest that craft production may have been a public activity conducted in Plaza-A. Craft production has been interpreted as an activity conducted by skilled artisans in later state level societies of the Andes as a means for creating and spreading state ideology (e.g., Chapdelaine et al. 2001; Shimada 1996; Topic 2003). However, craft production was significant much earlier in time during the Formative as well. Shimada has remarked on the tendency of craft production analyses to confine studies to one particular craft, rather than understanding how different craft artisans interacted with each other, something John Topic calls “horizontal integration” (Shimada 1996; Topic 1990: 164-165). Later state level societies such as the Moche relied on artisan workshops to produce such goods, but workshops are less evident in the Formative.

Studies on craft production have been deemed especially important in “middle-range” societies, where state-level coercive force is absent (see Costin 2007; Vaughn 2004, 2006). In a non-state evaluation on the power and context of craft production, Kevin Vaughn (2004: 114) notes in the case of the Nasca that elite craftsman likely produced prestige goods such as polychrome pots which were widely used and distributed as vehicles of power and ideology. Although Vaughn links craft production at the site level to the pilgrimage and elite residential center Cahuachi, he was unable to discern specific room context for production.
In the absence of identified workshops, I consider the plaza as a possible venue for social inter-craft production by Compound-A inhabitants as another activity involved with Plaza-A. Costin (2007) notes that for the Chimu significant craft production occurred in neighborhood settings. It is important to consider not just the usage of finished objects of social and ritual significance, but the context of their production. If certain objects are imbued with subjectivity, as I argued earlier, certainly the production and creation of the animated object would have been important as well.

In traditional Amazonian societies, the production of personal objects gain their value through the human interaction involved in their creation (Erikson 2009: 176). Erikson also attributes interactive craft production to the homogeneity of material culture, remarking that great lengths are taken in the crafting process to measure one’s craft with another’s to ensure that there is not a deviation from object prototype ideology (Erikson 2009: 185-187). Artifacts at Caylán also appear to be crafted to size standards, such as panpipes and projectile points. Being the central public space of a residential compound, the plaza could have provided an ideal venue for social interaction involved in craft production, as well as spatial inspiration from plaza art in the process of making.

Textile production is indicated by a number of related materials found in Plaza-A excavations. These include camelid and cotton fibers, clothing fragments, notched discs for wrapping textiles, a spindle whorl, and a wooden spinning rod, or huso (Figure 41), with camelid fibers wrapped around it. Textiles recovered were a plain white, white with blue geometric designs, solid red, and solid orange. Significant textile artifacts were recovered from Corridor 1B in a refuse pile above the floor leading into the plaza. These included white and blue textiles along with camelid fibers, cotton fibers, the huso rod and a ceramic spindle whorl. Six notched
ceramic discs were recovered from construction fill in UE-5 Extension 4 which could have been used to wrap textile yarns. Conklin has noted that textile painting and camelid fibers came into use during the Early Horizon or Late-Final Formative (Conklin 1978: 1). This also corresponds with the appearance of loom created textiles and increasingly complex weave patterns instead of earlier twine patterns (Conklin 1978; Doyon-Bernard 1990). The abundance of Textile-Impressed ceramics at Caylán indicates an affinity to these intricate woven designs and the interplay between different crafts.

Lithic production is also evident inside Plaza-A. In total, 40 slate flakes, nine cores, and two projectile point fragments were recovered through excavations (Figure 42). Floor contexts include two flakes atop the staircase (Floor 3) in UE-5 Ext. 1, and eight flakes on Floor 1 in Corridor 2B1. Cores were recovered from the Corridor 1B refuse pile and various construction fills. The projectile points found at Caylán, a polished bi-face slate point design which is unique to the time period (Daggett 1984, 1987) were likely knapped inside Plaza-A during neighborhood interactions. One such projectile point was located on the floor on Bench 2 in UE-2. Evidence of the entire lithic production process comes from the discovery of cores, various sizes of flakes, and the finished projectile point product. As a mobile production event, lithic production could have been done with relative ease inside the plaza. Although low in density, the extent to which floors were cleaned inside the plaza make any floor presence significant.
Figure 41. Textile artifacts (from top left to bottom: red textile; blue and beige textile; basic beige textile; complex weave pattern; spindle whorl; notched discs; *huso* rod (photos by Flannery Surette, Matt Helmer).
Figure 42. Lithic artifacts (from upper left to lower right: flakes; cores; pendant; mace head; polishers; groundstone; projectile point; quartz (photos by Matt Helmer).
Ceramic molds were not used in the Andes until the Early Intermediate Period, and as such the context of ceramic production is more obscure. However, ceramic production inside Plaza-A is indicated by a few notable artifacts. A broken jar found on UE-5 Ext. 1 staircase had a series of three fingerprints embedded into it, which may have been a sort of maker’s mark (Figure 27). The hypothesized slip-cast design of Caylán’s panpipes (Daggett 1984: 177; Proulx 1985: 244) and conformity to size and design prototypes indicates the existence of skilled artisans employed in the ceramic crafting process. Direct evidence of post-fire ceramic production comes from six stone polishers (Figure 42), some of which were found in floor context in the outer plaza corridors in Extension 3. Small fired clay chunks were also found in UE-5 Ext. 4 construction fill that were likely a by-product of ceramic production. However, their more precise locus of production is yet to be determined.

Finally, the production of prestige items such as Spondylus beads is evident from HP-8, where four pre-forms and 16 beads were recovered in wall fall context (Figure 36). The abundance of production related materials around the plaza suggest that many different types of objects may have been created there. Craft production may have been a ritual-based activity analogous to Cahuachi, where these objects gained symbolic power through their creation in monumental space. This is one type of regular public activity that likely occurred inside of Plaza-A.

5.7 Plaza Usage and the Multivocality of Performance

To recap, the monumentality of Plaza-A is an immediate indicator of the space’s experiential difference from other areas which necessitated a more thorough analysis of the plaza’s extraordinary qualities. Patterns of physical, visual, and auditory perception show that particular attention was paid to creating an enhanced, exclusive experience inside Plaza-A which
would have contrasted with interactions in domestic space. It is clear that Plaza-A was important for a number of public events including processions, musical performances, feasts, and possible Solstice events. Large periodic spectacles would have showcased the plaza at its ideal, as a theater where the community of Compound-A could perform for themselves and perhaps invite others in solidifying their own communal ties.

At other times, the plaza functioned as a neighborhood courtyard, when more personal interactions took place in an exclusionary nature. I have illustrated at least one probable context of this type of public interaction inside Plaza-A, as a place for social and spatial inspiration involved with craft production. Private rituals could have also taken place in the plaza without outsiders being able to hear or see them. Regular encounters inside Plaza-A could have formed an attachment to place inside Plaza-A, necessary for the identification of one’s community and ideology (Low 1992; Tuan 1977). Plaza-A art motifs were probably a signature of the Compound-A group. In the concluding Chapter, I discuss the centrality of performance at Caylán and the unique type of social order plaza performance reflects during Late-Final Formative.
CHAPTER 6: PERFORMANCE AT PLAZA-A: CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter, I revisit my thesis goals, results, and analyses in light of excavations from Plaza-A. I conclude by blending actions and experiences into a holistic analysis of performance at Plaza-A. I analyze how the context of these performances reflect the type of social order employed in Compound-A, and project this organization into site level discussions of performance, community, and power. I then reflect on Late-Final Formative social organization at Caylán, considering its relationship to earlier, later, and regional developments around Nepeña and the North-Central coast. Finally, I return to discussions of performance’s place in complex societies, and illustrate how the work done at Caylán contributes to our understanding of performance, archaeology, and culture.

I began this study with a theoretical overview of performance and archaeology, outlining how my approach focused on a contextual, action and experience based approach to understanding performance as heightened interaction. I used this theoretical framework to understand dynamics of community and social order at the Late-Final Formative (800–2 cal. BCE) site of Caylán in the lower Nepeña Valley through the excavation of a monumental plaza and surrounding access ways. I argue that plazas at Caylán were the core interactive center of neighborhood communities, where co-existant groups maintained their own autonomies in a new, urban environment.

6.1 Time and Space at Caylán: Plaza-A

Plaza-A was built and used during the height of Caylán’s occupation, situated between 800–200 cal. (2 sigma) BCE. Site layout differed in many ways from earlier traditions, emphasizing enclosures and increased access control through corridors and residential areas. Massive central pyramid mounds fronted by open plaza courtyards were abandoned in favor of
more fragmented enclosures and benched plazas. Conical adobes used in the construction of Middle Formative pyramids became decorative elements mounted into monumental walls. Monumental art moved away from Chavín-Cupisnique feline supernaturals and toward abstract geometric designs which manipulated light and shadows. Chavín-Cupisnique supernatural art was also abandoned in ceramic designs, with Textile-Impressed and White-on-Red ceramics becoming more prominent. Megalithic building traditions were eventually abandoned in lower valley sites, with enclosure compounds dominating the social landscape and Caylán at the core of lower valley society. At the same time, certain traditions endured from earlier Formative traditions, such as the usage of colonnades, orthogonal walls, and similar ceramic vessel shapes. Most of all, plazas continued to be the center of communal interactions, although in significantly different, more exclusive ways than before.

Between 800 and 500 BCE, earlier U-shaped Chavín-Cupisnique centers such as Cerro Blanco and Huaca Partida declined after a brief restructuring as megalithic temples (see Shibata 2010), with Caylán style enclosure compounds gaining complete lower valley prominence. At the same time, megalithic traditions became more focused in the upper valley of Nepeña in the form of fortified, isolated ridge-top settlements (see Ikehara 2010). This was likely a time of increased conflict (see Daggett 1987; Ikehara 2010), which necessitated the co-habitation of different groups at Caylán to maintain access to land and resources. Plazas became the loci of communal autonomy, where these groups could maintain their own exclusivity through regular performances and episodic spectacles.

Plaza-A appears to have been in use throughout the majority of Caylán’s occupation based on radiocarbon measurements. Five floor renovations were documented in association with the raising of platform architecture. One major remodellation during the latter portion of Plaza-
A usage was documented where staircases were ritually entombed and blocked, with platforms built on top. The eastern corner access to Plaza-A was also blocked at this time, funnelling access to the more monumental western entrance. This phase of plaza usage appears to be more intense, with warped, worn floors and reparations. Monumental defensive walls made with dismantled structures appear around the perimeter of Caylán, and may have been constructed during these latter occupation times nearing the turn of the millennium as a sign of conflicts. Further excavations to document the contemporaneity of these walls, and the nature of a ridgetop fortified segment of Caylán may shed light on the abandonment of the valley floor area of Caylán and Plaza-A.

6.2 Performance at Caylán: The Extraordinary and the Multivocal

Plaza-A was indeed a theater, where the experience of the extraordinary relied on the concentration and manipulation of the senses in concert with art, movement, sight, and sound. Sound was funneled and reverberated inward, movement was restricted but continuous, and sight was confounded by view shed, light, and shadow manipulation. During spectacles, social experiences were lubricated with alcohol accompanied with nutritious social foods which paired well with social interaction. Spectacles centered on music and procession as activities of ritualized movement and sound which created common performative emotions (See Moore 2002). Exotic and artistic display items were adorned as individual markers of status, contributing to the personal experience of plaza performance. Spectacles may have emphasized a trance like experience through dance, axial movement, abstract art, and dissonant amplified sound. Bodily co-presence between various members of the Compound-A group was paramount to public interactions and the maintenance of community. Compound-A members likely also used the plaza to impress outsiders brought in from the north avenue through the neighborhood.
It is likely that each compound’s respective plaza was a marker of group status within urban Caylán. Spectacles reinforced communal ties, as well as ties with the landscape through probable Solstice and agricultural festivals.

However, spectacles were not all that Plaza-A had to offer in terms of public interactions. Daily interactions in the plaza formed attachment to place through frequent, more intimate interactions between larger festivals. These interactions likely included mobile craft production, private ritual, and other activities which gained symbolic power through the extraordinary plaza space. All of this was done in an effort to distinguish the plaza, and interactions within it, from the mundane, as well as from other communities through the promotion and display of community.

6.3 Caylán: Heterarchy, Performance, and Public Space

I argue that Caylán was a theater city, where plazas and the spectacles they housed were central to reproducing social order. This is a unique time period for the plaza in the Andean past. Earlier and later groups focused monumentality toward royal pyramid mounds as a symbol of lordship and hierarchy, while the plaza was the salient monumental space at Caylán. The fluorescence of maize agriculture around 800 BCE in the valley likely facilitated a new communal fascination with chicha beer, which became the prime commodity in the festive landscape. Although extant throughout the Andean past and present, music and panpipes in particular played a crucial role in performance. As Caylán expanded, communities emulated distinct compound layouts, with plazas at the core of each compound community.

Chicoine and Ikehara (2010) have argued for a heterarchical social organization at Caylán, where neighboring co-resident communities competed and collaborated for communal prestige in an early urban environment without a clearly defined, singular hierarchy.
this heterarchical organization was the ability of different groups to host public events which emphasized both inclusion and exclusion in a diacritical nature (Chicoine in press; see also Hayden 1996). At Huambacho, these public events were held at a ritual elite center, while at Caylán they were held in large residential compounds in close proximity to neighboring groups. This type of political economy differed from Middle Formative public events which emphasized a commensal, patron-role nature of public events encompassing large numbers of individuals from outerlying areas for an episodic event as a means of conscripting labor (Ikehara and Shibata 2005).

In terms of spectacle, compound groups likely vied for power through their ability to host the best performances in their respective plazas. While past public events at Middle Formative sites emphasized the display of exotics likely associated with the Chavín cult (see Ikehara and Shibata 2005), public events at Caylán emphasize the distribution of social food and drink, as well as exotic display of material from faraway lands such as spondylus and parrots. The size of the plaza, complexity of art, number of platform benches, and height of walls were likely an indicator of plaza success and prestige. Compound-A was one of the most successful plazas and compounds, with one of the largest plazas and highest platform benches to host more individuals. To be a part of and have access to Plaza-A was likely a significant privilege.

Conversely, the controlled nature of the plaza experience reflects a desire for privacy in early urban environments in both a real and symbolic sense. Caylán was a crowded, noisy place where the ability to achieve privacy played a big role in the maintenance of community. Ambient noise and open view was blocked through high walls and sunken environments, with fragmented and monitored accessways insuring an intimate experience inside one’s own neighborhood. The plaza was a space for groups to come out from their patios and living
quarters to interact through different types of events on a regular basis. Symbolically, exclusive space insured that differing co-resident groups felt autonomous from their neighbors. These qualities were most manifested at the plaza, which was the defining face of each group. I have focused my analyses on spectacle-related plaza use, but also describe evidence for public craft production. Further research is needed to fully understand how plazas at Caylán were regularly used for other types of activities.

This study could be further developed by the excavation and analyses of multiple plazas at Caylán to better understand the relationships between different co-resident groups. Basic differences can be gleaned from the surface mapping data, but further excavation is needed. This could provide more material data in terms of overall plaza function, art ideology, and cultural agency employed by differing co-resident communities in their creation of public space. Additionally, a more definitive chronology is needed to confirm the contemporaneity of different compound areas. Data from Huambacho provide a foundation for understanding regional public space dynamics throughout the lower valley, and more excavation at lower valley sites is needed to fully develop a regional perspective. Further research is needed to understand the relationship between lower valley enclosure compound sites, and upper valley ridge-top fortification sites which show stark differences in terms of site layout over a short distance. Ikehara (2010) and Chicoine (Chicoine and Ikehara 2010) are currently working on a valley perspective that should help to answer these questions. Lastly, excavations at Early Intermediate Period sites in the valley are needed to better understand the decline of Caylán and the enclosure compound tradition, and the resurgence of monumental mound architecture in the lower Nepeña with the Gallinazo, and Moche traditions.
6.4 Performance and Archaeology: Perspectives from Formative Ancash

My research melded performance theory and archaeology through a contextual approach. A contextual approach allowed for the understanding of basic actions and experiences involved in plaza performance. The methods I used in deciphering performance contexts borrowed from other performance archaeologies, focusing on excavation, spatial analysis, proxemics, ethnohistory, and cross regional-temporal comparative analyses. Methodologically, mapping was the key to understanding degrees of exclusivity, access direction, and connecting areas associated with Plaza-A. Area excavations were the best way to document architectural layout, monumental art, and to maximize the amount of material culture recovered. Carefully placed, deeper units allowed for representative samples of stratigraphy and diachronic events. Proxemic qualities were able to be understood with the aid of 3 dimensional models, sound tests, material culture, and mapping.

The results from Plaza-A indicate the centrality performance plays in the maintenance and transformation of complex societies. In this case, performance was a key component which glued together different communities living in the same space for the first time by maintaining diffused communal autonomies. My interpretations of public space usage and performance as multivocal at Caylán illustrate the need to consider many different contexts of public space usage. In this case, the strength of the plaza was its ability to be used in a number of different ways, from episodic spectacle to communal craft production and every day social exchange in a heightened interactive realm. This work emphasizes that performance is indeed salient in heightened interactive environments, as Hymes (1975) and others have suggested (e.g., Inomata and Coben 2002; Inomata 2002, 2006; Schieffelin 1985). However, heightened interaction does not necessarily entail purely episodic performances, and public spaces can be fluidly used under
different interactive contexts. The data from Caylán suggest that we can go beyond previous performance related debates by studying the interplay between both small-scale and large-scale performance. My research shows that significant data can be gleaned from a contextual approach to understanding performance on its own terms, without necessarily having to take the inferential leap into symbolic metaphors underlying performance.
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APPENDIX:
UE-5 EXCAVATION DATA

UE-5 (19x19 Meters):

Location:

The unit was placed along a section of the east inner wall of Plaza A encompassing a corridor, 2 benches, and a sample of the plaza floor. The first extension of UE-5 was placed adjacent to this original unit in the east corner of Plaza A to determine whether or not there was a staircase entrance associated to the benches and corridors excavated in the original UE-5. UE-5 Extensions 2 and 3 were excavated directly behind the original UE-5 and first extension, but outside of the monumental plaza wall to determine what type of architecture was located immediately outside of the plaza. Namely, the objectives of extensions 2 and 3 were to determine whether or not the space outside of the plaza corresponded to access or usage patterns in association with Plaza A. While UE-5 extensions 2 and 3 both revealed corridors and backrooms possibly associated with usage of Plaza A, a final extension directly in the outside corner of the plaza was needed to understand which corridors from extensions 2 and 3 pertained to access into Plaza A, and how each of these corridors related to one another.

UE-5 Walls:

M1: M1 is one of the largest walls associated to UE-5 which forms the retaining boundary of the plaza. M1 is located between Platform 1 and Corridor 1B and extends down between Rise 1 and Room 1. Plaster: Smooth Fine Plaster with preserved white paint in some areas.

M2: M2 is a colonnaded platform wall located in the original UE-5 unit delimiting Platform 1 and 2. The wall forms a small 10 cm. step which has 2 columns built on top of it. Plaster: Smooth fine plaster associated with sculpted colonnades with destroyed “S” design.

M3: M3 is a frieze plastered wall located between Platforms 2 and 3. Plaster: Smooth Plastered Frieze with destroyed step design.

M4: M4 is a benched platform wall forming the boundary between the surface level of the plaza and Platform 3 / Platform 3A in UE-5 and UE-5 Extension 1. Plaster: Smooth Fine plaster above first floor, smooth fine white plaster below first floor level.

M5: M5 is a small wall seal between Room Plaza Surface A and the Platform 3A Staircase which was used to build floors on top of the blocked staircase. This wall exhibits no plaster.

M6: M6 is a small wall seal between Room Platform 3A and Platform 2A which were used to block a staircase in order to build floors on top. This wall exhibits no plaster.

M7: M7 is a large friezed wall located between Platform 2A and Platform 3A. Plaster: M7 contains fine white plaster sculpted into inverted step designs.
**M8:** M8 is a large wall forming the boundary between Platform 1A and Platform 2A in UE-5 Extension 1. Plaster: Smooth Fine Plaster. M8 contains a destroyed column with plastered wall in between colonnade gaps.

**M9:** M9 is one of the largest walls associated to UE-5 which forms the retaining boundary of the plaza. M9 is located between Platform 1A and Corridor 1 delimiting UE-5 Extensions 1 and 2, and cross cuts rooms Rise 1 and 2 in UE-5 Extension 4. Plaster: Fine Smooth Plaster, probably painted white but eroded.

**M10:** M10 is a large retaining wall which delimits Corridors 1 and 2 in UE-5 Extension 2, and extends down to Rise 2 in UE-5 Extension 4. Plaster: Smooth Fine Plaster on the outer portion facing away from the plaza, rougher plaster with hand prints on the inner portion noticeable inside Rise 2.

**M11:** M11 is a retaining wall which delimits Corridors 2 and 3. Plaster: Poorly preserved plaster which appears rougher.

**M12:** M12 is a large retaining wall which delimits Rooms 1 and 2 in UE-5 Extension 4, and extends down to delimit Corridors 1B and 2B in UE-5 Extension 3. Plaster: Rough plaster with hand prints inside Rooms 1 and 2 and Cor. 1 B, with fine smooth plaster between Corridors 1B and 2B facing outward from the plaza.

**M13:** M13 is a retaining wall which is located inside of Corridor 2B in UE-5 Extension 3. M13 forms a 90 degree corner which delimits a portion of a small room denoted as Corridor 2B1 and a baffled corridor denoted as Corridor 2B2. Plaster: Fine Smooth Plaster facing outward, rough plaster with hand prints inside Corridor 2B1.

**M14:** M14 is a retaining wall which forms the boundary between Corridor 2B2 and Corridor 3B which turns at a 90 Degree angle to enclose Corridor 2B2. Plaster: Medium Plaster (No Hand Prints but not smooth and fine) facing inside Corridor 2B2, fine smooth plaster facing out from Corridor 3B.

**M15:** M15 is a wall which forms a 90 degree angle with M14 in the southwest portion of Corridor 3B in UE-5 Extension 3. Plaster: Medium Plaster not well preserved.

**M16:** M16 is a small corner of a wall excavated in Corridor 3B which forms the southeast extent of Corridor 3B exhibiting a baffled turn leading into the sub-compound area to the east of Plaza A. Plaster: M16 displayed medium plaster where visible inside Corridor 3B, although the wall is very destroyed and only extends for a small portion above surface level.

**M17:** M17 is a wall which forms the boundary between Room 1 and Rise 2 in UE-5 Extension 4, and appears to block access from Corridor 1 in Extension 2 into the Plaza A entrance area. Plaster: Rough plaster with hand prints inside the corridor/rise 2 area, and fine smooth plaster facing outward from the plaza into Room 1.

**M18:** M18 is a wall which is highly destroyed, but appears to be built atop a destroyed staircase level in the rise 1 area of UE-5 extension 4. While this wall is quite destroyed, it appears to have consisted of unplastered rocks laid directly on top of the staircase level, analogous to the seals within the plaza (M5 and M6).
**M19:** M19 is a wall which forms a 90 degree angle with M4 forming the corner of the plaza surface level between Platform 3 / 3A and the plaza surface. It is located below the M5 wall seal. Plaster: Fine Smooth white plaster.

**M20:** M20 is a wall located in Corridor 2B2 which turns at a 90 Degree angle to enclose Corridor 2B2 from other corridors or rooms located further east.

**UE-5 Original Unit:**

**Location:**

This unit was placed along the entirety of the east inner wall of Plaza A encompassing a corridor, 2 benches, and a sample of the plaza floor. The unit measures 9 x 2 meters. This location was chosen to gain a comparative sample from the corridor, benches, and plaza floor, as well as to expose architectural elements.

**Architecture:**

Architectural elements included in UE-5 Original include 3 plastered walls for each respective platform (M1;M3;M4), in addition to sculpted columns associated with the top platform corridor (C1;C2 atop M2). While the friezes of these columns were largely destroyed, what was left of them resembled the stepped “S” shape of columns excavated in UE-2 last year. There was preserved white paint toward the bottom of the wall in the portion of the unit located on the plaza floor. For this unit, there were 4 rooms: Platform 1 which is ascribed to the colonnaded corridor; Platform 2 which is associated to the first bench; Platform 3 associated with the second bench, and a room for the plaza floor denoted as plaza surface.

**Room:**

Platform 1 (P1): (Colonnaded Roofed Corridor which is the top outermost platform/surface associated with plaza A. This platform is wider than subsequent bench levels (P2 / P3).

Strata for this room were divided a bit differently than strata in subsequent units. Specifically, Strata 1 was broken into 2 strata, where in later rooms / units it represented 1 stratum all the way down to the floor level. In this unit, strata level was broken to a second stratum when it was presumed that we were near to the floor level. All measurements for this platform were taken from Datum 1.

Stratum 1 (0-100 cm.); (132.44-131.44m ASL): (Rubble Fill and Wall Fall in silty sand and plaster) 0-100 cm. below Datum 1. MUNSELL: 10YR 6/3 Very fine silty sand in rocky wall fall and plaster.

Stratum 2 (100-129 cm.); (131.43-131.14m ASL): (Rubble Fill and Wall Fall in silty sand and plaster above alluvium sandy layer just above plastered floor) 100 cm.-129 cm. MUNSELL: 10 YR 7/3 Very Fine Silty Sand melted as plaster (Piso).
Additional Notes: P1 contained a relatively high amount of artifacts in the strata above the floor in comparison to P2 and 3. Due to heavy wall fall from the large wall associated with Platform 1, the floor was slightly destroyed although no fill layer was exposed resulting in mixed contexts. Excavations in P1 also revealed a small step (~10 cm.) below the columns possibly breaking P1 and P2 since they are associated with the same “bench” level. In one area where the floor was broken into, an earlier construction phase with smoother plaster was briefly uncovered. There was a neckless olla rim with finer black slip located immediately above floor 1 in P1.

Platform 2 (P2): P2 refers to the first bench level delineated between colonnades from P1 and a wall with an approximate 1 meter drop down to P3. This wall contained plastered geometric friezes which were very destroyed at the top, but still exhibited intact niches and step designs reminiscent of friezes in UE-2. Strata for this room were divided into 2 above floor level in a similar fashion to platform 1. All measurements for this room were taken from Datum 2.

Stratum 1 (0-33 cm.); (131.74-131.41m ASL): (Rubble Fill and Wall Fall in addition to silty sand and compact plaster). MUNSELL: 10 YR 6/3. Strata 1 was broken just above floor level which was briefly exposed in 1 area.

Stratum 2 (33-44cm.); (131.40-131.29m ASL) MUNSELL: 10 YR 7/3: (Alluvium loose sandy layer just above floor 1)

Additional Notes: P2’s floor 1 was the best preserved bench floor, but was broken near to the wall delineating P2 and P3 which left the fill layer below floor 1 visible. Care was taken not to mix these fill artifacts with artifacts from strata 1 and 2. Artifacts for P2 were very low in number, indicating that this space was kept highly clean.

Platform 3 (P3): Bottom bench level leading down to plaza floor. This bench appears to have originally been the same size as P2, but was highly destroyed with only a small piece of the top floor preserved. P3 is delineated by the friezed wall leading up to P2, and a small step / wall leading down to plaza surface. All measurements for this unit were taken from Datum 3.

Stratum 1 (-43 cm.); (130.61-130.18m ASL) MUNSELL 10YR 7/3: Small Amounts of Rubble Fill and Wall Fall above destroyed floor 1 with lower fill layers (Gray rocky sand with high trash artifacts) and floors visible in broken portion near to the wall delineating plaza floor. Artifacts associated to this strata were also low in number, but were mixed with trash fill from underlying layers due to poor state of preservation.

Additional Notes: Unfortunately, artifact assemblages for P3 will not be very useful because of mixed fill contexts and the small portion of floor preserved. However, because a portion was preserved, this allowed for the space to be correctly identified as a bench with projected dimensions symmetrical with P2. Additionally, the broken floor allowed for a view of the sequence of building phases on this bench level with underlying floors / fills visible.
Plaza Surface: The ground level of the plaza. This space is delineated from P3 by a superficially destroyed wall which was in good condition in underlying levels with white plaster (M4). All measurements for this unit were taken from Datum 4. Due to the unexpected preserved condition of floor contexts on the plaza surface, the decision was made to dig through multiple building phases to get a sample of floor contexts and building sequences. The decision to dig past the last construction phase was also made due to the highly intrusive nature of plaza floor contexts, resulting in mixed artifact assemblages in more superficial levels, including strata 1 above the last floor.

Stratum 1: Surface-30 cm. from D4; (129.48-129.18m ASL) MUNSELL: 10YR 6/3. This layer consisted of rubble fill with loose sand and wall fall. This level was broken when rubble fill became more sparse, indicating an incoming floor. There are no mixed fill contexts in this layer.

Stratum 2 and 3: 31-40 cm. from D4; (129.17m ASL-129.08m ASL) MUNSELL: 10YR 7/3. FILL 1 This layer consisted of sparse rubble fill into a floor with more material in the floor context. There was a destroyed Floor 1 which broke immediately into a second floor, which appears to be the same floor with a reparation event. Originally, these floors were broken into strata 2 and 3, but these levels were combined due to the intertwined nature of this stratum without gray fill layer between floors. Floor 1 was preserved in the south corner of the unit.

Stratum 4: 41-74 cm. from D4; (129.08-128.75m ASL) MUNSELL 10YR 5/2 FILL 2 Gray Sandy Gravel. This layer broke through the floors and extended deep under floor surface in gray fill. Artifacts continue to be numerous in formative context; but copper artifacts were uncovered which may be late. Soil matrix is a rocky gray layer. At 60 centimeters in the west corner of the unit, there was a pocket of burned fill with cane mixed in and heavy artifacts which may have been a hearth. Within this level, a whole vessel (Casma) offering with copper needle and cotton thread inside were located. This level was broken roughly 10 centimeters before another floor.

Stratum 5: 75-88 cm. from D4; (128.74-128.62m ASL) MUNSELL 10YR 7/2 (Floor 3) 10YR 5/2 (Fill). This layer began as the gray rocky sandy fill above a floor (Floor 3 of the unit). For this strata, the unit was broken into 1.2 x 2 meters of excavation which preserved floors 1,2, and 3 in the south corner, along with the hearth type feature from the fill of strata 4.

Stratum 6: 88-100 cm. from D4; (128.61-128.50m ASL) 10YR 5/2 (Fill) 10YR 8/3 (Floor 4) FILL 3. This layer consisted of floor 3 plaster with fill down to floor 4. Floor 4 appears to be the floor of the initial construction phase, as it is the first floor which the plaster connects with the plaster of the adjacent wall. Additionally, there was preserved white paint in this portion of the wall. The soil matrix was still gray sandy fill between floors 3 and 4. In this stratum, the unit was broken down to 90 cm. x 2 meters excavated to preserve floor 3 along with the other floors in the sequence in the portion of the non excavated unit area.
**UE-5 Extension 1:**

**Location:** In order to understand access within the plaza in the portion around Unit 5, the decision was made to extend UE-5 into the eastern corner of the north wall out from the plaza surface portion of the original UE-5. This area was projected to be a staircase which would be symmetrical with the UE-2 from 2009 season. This unit was chosen for excavation primarily for architectural data, but also under the premise that contextual material usage of the plaza may exist atop this staircase where there is a presumed higher flux of movement and number of individuals. As with extension 4, this unit revealed the most significant data pertaining to the two construction phases involving early entryways which were blocked to produce higher benches.

**Architecture:** The projected architecture for this unit was only assumed to be a top corridor, with a staircase leading down to the plaza surface. Walls associated with this unit were a large outer wall which delimited inside versus outside of the plaza (M9), and connects with the wall delimiting P1 from UE-5. As a result, the corridor in this area was delimited as P1-A. Although in line with one another, P1-A is wider than P1. Toward the west extent of P1-A leading down to Platform 2A, there is a colonnaded wall (M8) which appears to be plastered between columns to make a wall during a subsequent construction phase. In P2-A, there is a frieze wall which has a 1 meter opening for a staircase (M7). This wall associated with the early entrance was subsequently blocked by a small seal wall (M6) located between platform 2A and Platform 3A. It was presumed that the staircase would be 1 meter wide, with bench contexts in the other 1 meter. When excavations began, in P2-A there appeared a bench which was built on top of the staircase, which halted excavation until these features could be drawn as this bench would have to be taken out. It was formed by building a retaining wall that sealed atop the staircase area. Platform 3A extended from the base of the plaza surface outward across the southeastern wall of the plaza connecting with Platform 3 through M4 which forms a wall / floor platform up to the base of friezed wall M7. Between Platform 3A and Plaza Surface A, there is an older wall (M19) which has the wall seal (M5) built on top of it when the staircase was built on top of.

**Room:**

**P1-A:**

Stratum 1: Surface-45 cm. from D5; (131.76m ASL-131.31m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 Fine Silty Sand (Wall fall) above 2.5Y 7/3 (Floor 1). This layer consisted of rubble fill and silty sand above a floor better preserved on the western extent of the unit near to the colonnaded wall. Both of these walls exhibited plaster.

Stratum 2: 46-62 cm. from D5; (131.30m ASL-131.15m ASL) MUNSELL: 2.5Y 7/3 (Floor/Alluvium). This layer broke through floor 1 layer in order to briefly see construction style of floor 1. There was no construction fill immediately below this layer, as the floor may have gone through renovation episodes. A small amount of gray fill was encountered at about 60
centimeters below datum 5. This was only excavated in a 1x1 portion in the southeast corner of the unit.

P2-A:

Stratum 1: Surface-33 cm. from D6; (131.52-131.19m ASL) 2.5Y 6/3 (Wall fall); 2.5Y 7/3 (Floor1). This layer was projected to go deep down to a staircase, but encountered a partially preserved bench layer which was at a very superficial level in line with the floor from P1-A. As a result, this level consisted of mixed material from areas of destroyed bench fill and preserved floor contexts. MUNSELL: 2.5Y 6/3 Fine silty sand; wall fall with plaster from destroyed portion of floor.

Stratum 2: 34-55 cm. from D6; (131.18-130.98m ASL). FILL 1. This level went through an ash layer and wall fall below bench level floor 1 down to an underlying sloping floor possibly associated with a corridor leading from the east corner of the plaza down to the north corner. A portion of floor 1 was kept intact in the north corner of the unit. During this level, it became apparent that there was a wall corner delineating a baffled 90 degree turn where the sloping floor extends down and possibly turns into a staircase leading down to the plaza surface level. Excavation was halted at this point to draw the retaining wall and portion of the overlying bench before destroying the bench to expose underlying architecture. MUNSELL: Trash Fill (2.5Y 4/1 Very Fine Ash); Wall fall (2.5Y 6/3 Fine Silty Sand in Rocks and Plaster); Plastered Floor 2 (Rise) (2.5Y 7/3).

Stratum 3: 33-95 cm. from D14; (130.81-130.19m ASL). FILL 2. This level broke through the previous two floors overlying the staircase level and revealed the actual staircase and associated rise below these higher corridors / benches. At the base of P2A below the two preserved floor areas was a sloping rise (33-49 cm.) which led down to stairs with a seal between P2A and P3A. The depths of the stairs were 49 cm., 80 cm., and 95 cm. It is inferred that there is a 15 cm. drop between middle stairs, with the higher step being between the rise level and 1st stair at a 30 cm. drop. Since the staircase was clearly identified through a representative sample, the decision was made not to destroy the wall seal due to concerns of preservation, as well as time management. MUNSELL: 2.5Y 7/3 Rise Floor and Staircase.

Additional Notes: Artifacts for Platform 2 A were broken up into various contexts: Each above floor context was bagged differently, in addition to bench versus staircase / entrance contexts which were clearly visible. The Floor 3 Rise / Staircase exhibited a slightly lighter plaster mottled with gray clay (2.5Y 7/1).

Platform 3A; staircase/entrance:

Strata 1: (Platform 3A) (Superficie); (130.20m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3. Fine Silty Sand: This strata consisted of brief superficial cleaning which revealed a possible destroyed floor
which appears to have been built on top of previous friezes but unfortunately was badly preserved. This floor appears to be in line with the broken bench level of the original platform 3.

Strata 1: (Escalinate / Entrada / Rise) (Superficie-127 cm.); (130.20m ASL-128.93m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y6/3 Wall fall Fine Silty Sand and Rocks: An attempt was made to differentiate room contexts from Platform 3 A and the area of floor built on top of the previous entryway / staircase whenever possible, although mixed context may exist in bagging. There were also difficulties in differentiating strata 1 from the entrance from the strata 1 from the platform, as they were at different depths. For instance, strata 1 of the entrance extends lower down than strata 1 in the platform area. Strata 1 for the entrance area was interpreted as an area of rubble and small layer of trash above a sloping floor built atop the staircase level. There does not appear to be a floor on top of this sloping corridor / bench, but there may have been a superficial destroyed floor at some point. My interpretation is that this area formed a small corridor leading up to the platform 3A level. The reason why it slopes down from the surface to the top remains a mystery, as this would have made the corridor difficult to walk within. The sloping surface may have formed a sloping bench for sitting.

Strata 2: (Platform 3A) (Superficie-93cm.); (130.20m-129.27m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 4/1 Very Fine Ash; 2.5Y 7/3 (Ash; Relleno); 2.5Y 7/3 mottled with 7/1 (Floor 2): Strata 2 in the Platform 3A area consisted of a dense ash layer below the destroyed floor level down to a brief level of rubble fill above the platform floor atop the wall (M4) leading into the frieze wall (M7). In this strata the friezes were clearly uncovered, and a lower portion appear to be burned, possibly in association with the ash layer. Strata 2 in the entrance below the floor was not excavated down to the staircase level since the stairs were excavated in the platform 2A area and could be projected downward. There is a second wall seal (M5) which seals the entrance area to build this floor and breaks the room between the plaza surface A and platform 3 A areas.

Plaza Surface A: DATUM 15

Stratum 1 (Superficie-59 cm.); (129.87m-129.28m ASL) FILL 1 / 2. MUNSELL 10YR 6/3 down to 7/3 Floor: On the plaza surface level in extension 1, initial excavation of rubble fill was conducted down to a compact alluvial wash layer which was later interpreted to be the destroyed floor level associated with floors 1 and 2 of the original plaza surface excavation. This strata clearly delimited how M4 continued from original plaza surface area into plaza surface A, continuing into the Platform 3A area into the frieze level. The strata also demonstrated the wall seal placed between platform 3A and plaza surface A.

Stratum 2 (59-125 cm.); (129.27m-128.62m ASL) MUNSELL 10YR 5/2. FILL 3: Extending underneath the alluvium compact layer associated with destroyed floor 1 and 2, strata 2 went through this layer in addition to a gray sandy bedrock fill layer with light artifact assemblage down to the third floor in line with piso 3 from original plaza surface. This floor was well preserved. This strata showed the fine plaster along M4, and showed that floors 1 and 2 may
have formed the area of the first step below the wall seal. Strata 2 clearly showed in profile the wall seal down to this thick plaster layer which is the possible first step, with a fine white plaster wall (M19) underneath.

**UE-5 Extension 2:**

Location: UE-5 Extension 2 was chosen to delimit access patterns outside of the plaza and into the east corner of the plaza where UE-5 is principally located. Due to heavy wall fall in this area, it was also not apparent whether or not there were back rooms or corridors in this area of the plaza. Extension 2 extends out from Extension 1 P1-A down to surface level.

Architecture: UE-5 Extension 2 consists of 3 walls (M9; M10; M11), each associated with a respective corridor. The top 2 walls associated with corridors 1 and 2 (M9; M10) are more monumental than the surface corridor wall (M11). These top two walls are both plastered, but corridor 1 wall exhibits nicer plaster possibly due to lack of conservation of corridor 2 wall. Each room was delimited as corridor 1, 2, and 3, although corridor 3 may be some type of back room instead of a corridor.

Room:

Corridor 1:

Stratum 1: Surface-157 cm. below D7; (131.42m-129.85m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 Above 2.5Y 7/3 Floor. This layer consisted of heavy rubble fill and wall fall down to a well preserved floor, possibly protected by a cap of stones or adobes to seal from destruction. This floor is enclosed by 2 high walls forming a corridor.

Corridor 2:

Stratum 1: Surface-210 cm. below D8; (129.83-127.73m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 above 2.5Y 7/3 Floor 1. This layer consisted of heavy rubble fill and wall fall (~180 cm.) with the final layer of rubble being very large rocks which appear to be larger than wall rocks. As a result, these rocks may not be associated directly with wall fall, and may have been brought in from elsewhere to seal the area. Below this rock layer was a layer of sand and adobe above a well preserved floor with a groundstone embedded inside.

Corridor 3:

Stratum 1: Surface-40 cm. below D9; (128.84m-128.44m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 above 7/3 Floor 1. This layer composed of silty sand and rubble fill above slightly destroyed floor with moderate amounts of ceramics immediately on floor. This floor was unsure at first, but melted into the wall and a brief section of gray fill soil was exposed under it. As a result, this area appears to be significantly different than the more sunken floors between high walls such as
corridors 1 and 2, and corridor 3 may be a room instead of a corridor. Furthermore, the floor of corridor 2 is actually deeper than the floor of corridor 3 which is a lower lying, superficial area.

**UE-5 Extension 3:**

**Location:** UE-5 Extension 3 was extended directly behind the original unit 5 excavation. Extension 3 extended from the wall delimiting inside/outside of the plaza (M1) down three terraced corridors to modern ground level. This location was chosen to better understand access patterns in the periphery of the plaza which may or may not connect with access into the plaza. The location was also chosen in an effort to gain material evidence of areas that may have been in direct association with the plaza. In this case, corridor 1B was the only corridor which may have exhibited direct access into the plaza down to UE-5 extension 4 Room 1. The other two corridors appear to lead elsewhere around the subcompound outside of Plaza A.

**Architecture:** (M1;M12;M13;M14;M15;M16): Extension 3 contained a number of walls associated with various rooms (Cor. 1B; Cor. 2B1; Cor. 2B2; Cor. 3B). Corridor 1B is associated with the wall delimiting inside/outside of the plaza (M1), which is one of the largest walls of the excavations and exhibits fine smooth white plaster. In corridor 2B, there is a slightly smaller plastered wall delimiting corridors 1 and 2 B (M12). In addition to these walls, an unexpected wall (M13) was uncovered which cross cut the unit and formed the corner of a small room located within the larger Corridor 2B. As a result, Corridor 2B was divided into corridor 2B1 and 2B2 to differentiate context between this small corner of a room and the rest of the corridor. Unfortunately, due to lack of time and extent of wall fall, it is not entirely clear how corridor 2B extends. It appears to be baffled, and may zig zag around numerous rooms such as Cor. 2B1. In Corridor 3B, there is a wall delimiting between Corridor 2B2 and Corridor 3B (M14). There is also a wall (M15) forming the southwest extent of the corridor forming a 90 degree turn with a third wall (M16) in the east corner of the room. All of the walls in the unit from the various rooms exhibited fine smooth plaster on the side which would have been seen from the outside, and rougher plaster with hand and fingerprints on walls which have inside components.

**Room:**

**Cor. 1B: DATUM 16**

Stratum 1: (0-130 cm.); (131.96m-130.66m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 4/3 Fine Sandy Organic Soil above 2.5Y 7/3 Floor 1.

This stratum consisted of 2 layers above a moderately preserved floor nearer to the base of M1. The first layer consisted briefly of wall fall and rubble fill above a dense gray sandy layer with heavy artifact assemblages. Below this was another layer of wall fall and rubble fill just above the floor. This second layer was bagged as above floor context. While there may have once been a floor directly on top of the trash layer in superficial context, it seems more likely that
trash was dumped directly on top of the excavated floor, as it aligns well with floors found in Corridor 2B and 3B.

**Cor.2B 1 and 2: DATUM 11**

Stratum 1: (0-115 cm.); (130.93-129.78m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3

Stratum 1 of Corridor 2B1 and 2B2 were excavated together until the unexpected walls inside the room were uncovered. This stratum was broken when the wall was initially delimited, and also at a level of a possible floor in corridor 2B1 and 2B2. It was here in corridor 2B1 that a defacto refuse pile (element 31) of mainly shells with a few ceramics was noted on this possible “floor” level that the stratum was delimited at. The soil matrix consisted of compact silty sand intermixed with heavy wall fall and rubble fill.

**Cor. 2B1:**

Stratum 2: (115 cm.-225 cm.); (129.77m ASL-128.67m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 above 7/3

Floor After breaking rooms for corridor 2B, each were excavated separately at different times, and exhibited markedly different artifact assemblages, although floors were at the same level deep down in the corridor. This room was denoted as Corridor 2B1, although it may actually be a room instead of a corridor. Stratum 2 soil matrix exhibited wall fall, rubble fill, and alluvial sediment extending deep down under element 31 level. Artifacts were bagged in 2 niveles, with nivel B denoting artifacts immediately on top of floor context. Above this floor, there was another heavy shell layer that extended throughout the unit, and was not denoted as a separate element or stratum, just as the level above floor context. This room contained heavy amounts of shell, peanuts, pumpkin/squash seeds, and red “salinar” ceramics and is exceptional from other contexts because there were no gray sandy trash layers throughout the matrix down to the floor. This floor was moderately preserved, with a broken area near to the wall section delimiting corridor 2B1 and 2B2 excavated portions.

**Cor. 2B2:**

Stratum 2: (115-227 cm.); (129.77m-128.65m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 Wall fall above 2.5Y 7/3

Floor Corridor 2B2 was only excavated in the southern portion of the corridor and briefly across the 90 degree turn made by M13 to insure that the floor followed the alignment of the baffled corridor area. In contrast to Corridor 2B1, 2B2 exhibited mixed late artifact assemblages down nearly to floor level. The floor in this section of the corridor was very well preserved throughout the extent of the unit, and artifacts above the floor were bagged as different context. The soil matrix of Corridor 2B2 down to floor level was heavier wall fall and rubble fill than in corridor 2B1, with immense boulders analogous to the corridors in extension 2.
Cor. 3B DATUM 10 (0-126 cm.); (129.98m-128.72m ASL):

Stratum 1 MUNSELL 2.5Y 4/3 Above 2.5Y 7/3 Floor: In corridor 3B stratum 1, there was a brief superficial layer of rubble fill, but the principal context of the stratum consisted of a dense trash layer down to a partially preserved floor in the southern half of the unit where muros 14 and 15 intersect. This floor was directly on the modern ground level of the site. While a higher floor might be interpreted given the dense trash that could have been associated with construction fill, the location of this floor is level with corridor 2b floors, and leads to the assumption that they are in correlation with one another, and that this area was used as a trash deposit possibly after abandonment during the primary occupation of the site.

Additional Notes: Just as in the corridors in extension 2, the corridors in extension 3 exhibited very deep floors and high walls in association with plaster. Additionally, the plaster on these walls was smooth fine plaster in areas that could be seen from the outside, and rough hand print plaster on the inside. In contrast with extension 2 corridors, all of these corridors exhibited higher artifact assemblages, possibly in association with higher use wear. Significantly, these corridors are closer to the sub-compound, with the only corridor that actually connects to the plaza.

UE-5 Extension 4:

Location: UE-5 Extension 4 is a 5x5 meter unit which was chosen to get context from the ends of the corridors from extensions 2 and 3, and how these corridors may or may not have been associated with access directly into the plaza. In addition, the location was chosen to uncover how the entrance into the plaza was aligned, and how it dictated access into and out of the plaza. This unit was also chosen under the assumption that there may be higher materials located near to the entrance of the plaza, where there was presumably a high flux of people coming in and out of corridors into and out of the plaza. This unit also aided in identifying differences in two construction phases which are dealt with by showing how the entrance was constructed, blocked, and manipulated through time to produce higher benches and possibly further restrict access to the plaza.

Architecture: UE-5 Extension 4 was divided into a number of rooms (Rise 1; Rise 2; Room 1; Room 2) associated with many walls in relation with the entire unit (M1; M9; M12; M17; M18). Rise 1 is a room which delimits the area immediately associated with the entrance into the plaza, with some area extending into the platform 1/platform 1A area in the highest area of the plaza. Rise 2 is a room which delimits the area where corridor 1 was thought to empty into rise 1, although a wall was uncovered which blocks access and appears to be associated with early walls in the plaza given plaster continuity and location, meaning that corridor 1 may not be associated with access into the plaza. Room 1 is the room which delimits the corridor area immediately in front of rise 1. Although it was labeled as a room, room 1 appears to be directly associated with corridor 1B and is associated with direct access into the plaza, and also continues on elsewhere.
in the compound. Room 2 also appears to be a corridor like area, and may or may not be associated with corridor 2B2 based on location and wall association.

Room:

Rise 1:

Stratum 1 (Superficial); (131.33m ASL at top of rise, 130.17m toward bottom) MUNSELL 2.5Y 6/3 Above 2.5Y 6/1: In Rise 1, there was a very superficial layer of rubble fill and alluvial deposit which is interpreted to be associated with a destroyed floor context, given the location in relation with floor contexts in platform 1 and 1A. As a result, the fill layer was also excavated as strata 1 in an effort to clean the extent of architecture which was not destroyed at surface level. This cleaning unveiled a “rise” type plastered area in the entrance which was later interpreted as a seal of the entrance in a later construction level. As a result, it appears that this entrance area was blocked, with a huge layer of trash placed on top to create the top platform level associated with platform 1 and 1A floors.

Stratum 2: 29 cm. top step 47 cm. middle step (D13); (130.17-129.88m ASL); 2.5Y 4/1 Small Ash Lens; 2.5Y 5/2 Fill With 2 2.5Y 5/3 or 6/3 Plaster “Floor” Levels: After breaking levels as the plastered area denoted as a rise previously, further excavation revealed a destroyed staircase with a seal in the entrance in rise 1. The soil matrix continued to be a gray sandy layer of fill with heavy artifact assemblages. In this layer, there were a few areas of shallow but very destroyed plaster surfaces which may have been associated with floors associated with this destroyed staircase level, but were reduced to chunks in the sidewall profile.

Stratum 3: 30-67 cm. (129.87-129.50m ASL) 2.5Y 5/2 above 2.5Y 7/3 Floor: This layer went further down in the gray sandy fill past the destroyed staircase level in an attempt to document a more preserved floor level. The level went down even with the retaining wall area into a possible floor which was only intact in a very small portion.

Rise 2:

Stratum 1 (Superficial); (131.33m ASL at top, 130.17m ASL at Bottom) MUNSELL 2.5Y 7/3: The area of rise 2 consisted initially of a very brief layer of rubble fill and loose silt with partial areas of plaster possibly associated with a superficial rise. Below this superficial level is a gray sandy fill layer that was stopped at as stratum 2. The location of this possible rise altitude is not in line with corridor 1, and indicates that the two may not be directly affiliated with one another. In addition, initial cleaning of this area revealed a wall which appears to block access from rise 2 into plaza A.

Stratum 2: (Superficial-105 cm.) D13; (130.17-129.12m ASL) 2.5Y 5/3 Trash Layer above 2.5Y 5/2 with 2.5Y 7/3 Plaster Chunks: Strata 2 consisted of the gray sandy trash layer mixed with heavy amounts of broken plaster possibly associated with previous architecture in the area.
Some of these broken plaster chunks were sculpted with niches and bold white paint. Excavation halted when level was reached with modern ground level in room 1 which was interpreted as being associated with the floor of the previous construction phase. In addition, since a wall appears to block the area from direct association with access into the plaza, the decision was made not to excavate further.

Room 1:

Stratum 1 (Superficial) MUNSELL 2.5Y 7/3: Strata 1 in room 1 was only briefly brushed and scraped with trowel as the area was at a compact layer of clay plaster which was interpreted as a possible floor at modern ground level. This may or may not be the case since room 1 is located immediately in the area of a modern road with heavy trisele zone in center / east area of the room. In the area leading to corridor 1B, there was a chunk of possible higher superficial floor with fill beneath it which may be associated with a completely destroyed construction phase.

Stratum 2 (Superficial-108 cm.); (130.17-129.09m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 5/3 Fine Grained Fill with Trash (Cane/Shells); 2.5Y 6/3 (Floor 2); 10YR 6/3: Possible floor from 95-108 cm. sloping up to corridor 2B floor. This is the possible floor level which was associated with ground level also delimited in strata 1. The difference in strata 2 is that the higher floor level nearer to C1B was taken down through fill below this level and no floor was found, indicating a possible destroyed context. In this area broken area leading to C1B, a slightly lower possible destroyed floor level was located about 30 cm. below the sloping ground level “floor”. Comparing these floor contexts from profiles and elevation data is necessary to connect floor contexts.

Stratum 3 (108-214 cm.); (129.09m ASL-128.03m ASL) MUNSELL 2.5Y 5/3 Fill Layer With Plaster Chunks; 2.5Y 6/3 Compact Alluvial Deposit where Level was broken: For stratum 3, the room was broken into a 2.5 x 2m. portion to go deep down to sterile to see all sequence of building phases down to the base of the wall. Strata 3 consisted almost entirely of construction fill with heavy artifact assemblages in gray sandy fill soil. There was a compact sediment layer located at 214 cm. below datum which broke this stratum, although we are unsure if this sediment layer is associated with floor context before the usage of the entrance area.

Stratum 4: 5Y 5/3 Above 2.5Y 5/1 (Sterile) 214-410 cm. below D13 (128.03-125.9m ASL): Stratum 4 extended past this compact layer down to sterile soil revealing the base of M1 and M12.

Room 2:

Stratum 1: (104 cm. below D13): Aeolian sand Above Compact Silty Sand Layer 2.5Y 7/3. This layer consisted of superficial brushing of a surface level floor which is probably modern, given its location in the middle of a modern road.
Stratum 2: (104-202 cm. below D13): Wall fall and Rubble fill 2.5Y 7/3. This layer cleared below the modern surface level and revealed that M12 forms a retaining boundary for access between the plaza and surrounding sub-compound areas.
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