

WHAT ROLE FOR LANGUAGE PREHISTORY IN REDEFINING ARCHAEOLOGICAL ‘CULTURE’?

A CASE-STUDY ON NEW HORIZONS IN THE ANDES

David Beresford-Jones and Paul Heggarty

McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge

ABSTRACT

Just as ‘cultures’ and ‘peoples’ have fallen from grace in archaeological theory, so too have simplistic attempts to associate them uniquely with any particular language – witness the furore surrounding ‘The Celts’. Rightly so; but equally, we should beware of throwing out with this bathwater the great potential of language prehistory to inform other disciplines of the human past, not least our own. Archaeology can only be the poorer for passing over the impressive degree of certainty that linguistic data and methodology can so often provide on one core component of human ‘cultural’ make-up across time and space. Properly understood language relationships, can make for incontrovertibly clear evidence of provenience, continuity, and complex social interactions.

Above all, languages do not diverge into great families at whim. On the contrary, they do so only for very good reasons in the real-world context in which their speakers lived. The very existence of language families with vast geographical distributions is no historical accident. Indeed, they *demand* to be accounted for, and can be only in terms of whatever powerful expansive driving forces that lie behind them. These, of course, are the same driving forces that archaeology seeks to explain through its own, independent material culture record.

In this article we propose a new, principled methodology by which to converge archaeologists’ and linguists’ independent scenarios into a coherent cross-disciplinary tale of the human past. We discard spurious associations between ‘culture’ and ‘language’, but instead seek to link archaeological and linguistic data through *commensurate driving forces*. We illustrate this new methodology by a case-study in one of humanity’s ‘hearths’ of pristine civilisation development, but where precious little inter-disciplinary progress has been made hitherto: the Central Andes. The scenario that results turns on its head the traditional thinking on associations between the archaeology and languages of the region. And it duly offers archaeologists a new strand of independent data to contribute to their interpretation of precisely what the ‘cultural’ Horizons they identify in the region really were.

* * * * *

Since setting aside its youthful indiscretions of culture history, archaeology has cast about more or less continuously for more nuanced definitions of ‘culture’, and mechanisms for its transmission across space and through time. At times the discipline has seemed almost resigned in the face of the great intrinsic difficulties in extracting the prehistories of *people* from the material culture record. Yet we are not as helpless as either the puritans of New Archaeology, or the postmodern reactionaries they provoked, would pretend. For of course archaeology is not the *only* discipline that seeks to understand human prehistory. Genetics and comparative/historical linguistics offer, through their independent data and methods, their own partial windows on the past, and in recent years a so-called ‘new synthesis’ has sought to converge these various perspectives into a single, coherent, holistic picture of human prehistory. Progress has been fitful, however. All too often these attempts are plagued by the misunderstandings that

attend any cross-disciplinary enterprise. Archaeology seems willing to plunder other disciplines almost by instinct. Sadly, like most looting, this typically turns into a blundering affair that seeks nuggets of ‘value’ and is careless of context or methodology. Examples abound of linguistic neophytes hitching some wagon-load of vaguely understood language baggage to their archaeological hobby-horses, then given free rein to gallop across the empty plains of speculation. Nor have linguists been immune from the temptations of deeply dubious ‘cultural reconstruction’ on the flawed assumptions of ‘linguistic palaeontology’.

In this article we wish to set out some fresh methodological principles for how to go about linking findings from archaeology and linguistics so that together they might better inform our understanding of prehistory. We shall illustrate how these principles can be applied by means of a case-study set in a part of the world which, despite its significance as one of humanity’s rare independent hearths of agriculture and cradles of ‘pristine’ civilisation development, has been conspicuous by its absence from attempts at cross-disciplinary synthesis so far: the Central Andes. Indeed, the story of archaeology here makes for a useful vignette of the vicissitudes of archaeological theory more widely.

The great pioneers who led Andean archaeology beyond the frontiers of Inca mytho-history – Middendorf, Uhle, Tello and Rowe – could confidently distinguish ‘Horizons’ in the vast archaeological record they surveyed: periods for which that record showed some degree of unity or interaction across great expanses of the Central Andes. Each of three successive Horizons originated high in the Andes, in urban centres far inland: see Figure 1. Best known is the Late Horizon, alias the Inca Empire, stretching from Ecuador to Argentina and Chile, with its capital in Cuzco in the southern highlands of Peru. The Middle Horizon, meanwhile, had been a bipolar affair: the Wari Empire, with its heartland in Ayacucho, south-central Peru; and the more vaguely perceived sphere of influence of Tiwanaku¹, by the shores of Lake Titicaca in the Bolivian ‘Altiplano’ (high-altitude plain). The Early Horizon was centred on the monumental site of Chavín de Huantar in Ancash, north-central Peru. Between the Horizons were the so-called ‘Intermediate’ periods, for which the archaeological record is more fragmented.

Often it proved possible to impute these Horizons to expansionist conquest empires by uncritical analogy with the Inca Empire. Inevitably this ‘poetic licence’ bred a puritan reaction. Culture history, with its predilection for mapping ‘diffusion’ on grand geographical scales, fell from grace, to be succeeded by culture evolution. Rather than circles of cultural diffusion, this saw the past in terms of long autochthonous cultural sequences within tightly-defined geographical regions (see Isbell & Silverman 2008: 500).

This was not an approach that sat easily with the concept of ‘Horizons’ (Rice 1993: 362). Soon, doubts were raised about the extents and natures of the putative Horizons: the “Problems” of the Middle and Early Horizons respectively (Schreiber: 1992: 71, Willey 1951: 103). Eventually those doubts extended to the very utility of the Horizon idea itself, such that Boone Hill (1993: vii) could write that “in the end, the judgement is that the horizon concept is too broad and simple for the scholar, but that it is useful for the student”.

¹ We eschew here the popular ‘pseudo-indigenous’ spelling *Tiwanaku* as doubtless erroneous, omitting the second syllable *-ya-* suggested both by etymology and by the original Hispanicised version *Tiahuanaco*. For further discussion of nomenclature and spelling in the Andes, see the supplementary information to Heggarty & Beresford-Jones (forthcoming b).




Figure 1: Simplified archaeological chronology for the Central Andes

Yet like the concept of ‘culture’ more widely, that of the Horizon stubbornly persists in Andean archaeology. Burger (1993: 41), for instance, acknowledges that “the concept of horizon style has fallen out of fashion in North American archaeology”; but he can nonetheless go on to conclude his succinct review of the evidence by insisting that “the Chavin horizon is not a stylistic chimera as some have contended, but a real pattern” (1993: 74).

1. GREAT LANGUAGE EXPANSIONS DO NOT ‘JUST HAPPEN’

We shall argue here that the Horizon concept does indeed remain of great value in Andean archaeology, not least in how it underlies a new proposal to link archaeological and linguistic patterns in the region. This entails a radical revision of the traditional view of the linguistic prehistory of the Andes, which in turn informs the archaeological debate about the nature of the Andean Horizons.

Our new proposal for Andean prehistory is based firstly on a major reclassification, long overdue, of the relationships between the various languages and ‘dialects’ within the main indigenous language family of the region, Quechua; and secondly, on establishing a far more satisfactory correlation with the archaeological record. We have here the space to present only its bare bones; for a full elaboration see Heggarty & Beresford-Jones (forthcoming *b*). Nonetheless, this skeleton still serves to illustrate some fundamental methodological guidelines by which archaeological and linguistic visions of prehistory might be linked in a principled and more sophisticated way than has so often been the case.

Fifty years on from the demise of culture history, these first principles must start by setting aside any simplistic assumption that ‘culture equals language (equals genes)’. Here we seek to link archaeology and linguistics not through ‘cultures’, nor even populations, but through driving *forces*. As we shall shortly elaborate, our founding principle is the linguistic ‘fact of life’ that language expansions do not ‘just happen’; rather, they happen only for those very same reasons of real human demography and socio-cultural context that archaeology seeks to describe through its own, independent data: the material culture record. It follows, too, that *great* language dispersals must have been driven by real-world processes of *commensurate scale*: the great expanse of the Romance language family today, from the Black Sea to the Atlantic, is none other than the direct linguistic reflex of the strength and lasting impact of Rome. Similarly in the Andes, the dispersal of the Quechua and Aymara families cannot have happened in a social and demographic vacuum. This principle is one we can make use of to identify correspondences between archaeological and linguistic patterns on three levels: **chronology**, **geography**, and above all **causation** — or in other words, **when**, **where** and **why**?

We begin by clarifying briefly a number of principles from historical linguistics that are indispensable to an understanding of how language data can inform us of prehistory at all. Or in other words: for the purpose of archaeology, what does historical linguistics actually *say*? (For a fuller treatment of these principles than is possible here, see Heggarty 2007, 2008, and Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming *a*).

2. WHAT DOES HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS ACTUALLY SAY?

Among scholars outside the discipline, the single most common misconception about historical linguistics is that it looks for correspondences between different languages simply in order to demonstrate thereby that those languages have a common origin. Or in other words, to imagine that language correspondences necessarily indicate *relatedness*.

In fact, there are *two* processes that give rise to patterns of correspondences between languages; and not only are these processes separate, they are all but the *reverse* of each other.

- The first does indeed start out from a single original source language, which over time diverges into different ‘daughter’ languages. Given that all languages inevitably change through time, once the same original language is implanted in two or more different regions, and *contacts are lost* (or at least reduced) between the populations in each, their speech begins to change in different ways from region to region. That is, they gradually *lose* some of their original correspondences, though still retaining others.
- The second process, conversely, *begins* with multiple different source languages, which converge over time when their originally different speaker populations *come into contact* and interact with each other. These languages thereby *acquire* some correspondences which they did not originally have.

It follows that just because one can identify correspondences between two languages on its own means nothing. Everything depends on which particular **type** of correspondence one finds. The business of

comparative-historical linguistics is to compare languages to identify which type of correspondence they show (if any), and from that information to go on to work out the histories of those languages as *either* divergence or convergence.

This distinction matters for other disciplines because the two processes reflect very different real-world (pre-)histories of the human populations. Languages do not determine the external contexts in which their speaker populations live; on the contrary, languages, particularly the patterns of divergence and convergence between them, are moulded by and reflect those contexts. While it may be somewhat contrary to popular perception, it is a founding axiom of linguistics that all languages are, to all intents and purposes, effectively equal in their communicative utility. Whether certain languages succeed over time, and spread and diverge into families at the expense of others that become marginalised and extinct, is nothing to do with any intrinsic linguistic qualities of their vocabularies, grammars or sound systems. For speakers of any language to imagine the contrary is only to delude themselves as to the relationship between language and 'culture'. Any of a panoply of Quechua derivational suffixes soon makes a mockery of attempts to count a language's 'wealth' by how many 'words' it can boast. Quechua borrows Spanish words, and Spanish borrows English ones, for obvious real-world reasons that have nothing to do with the languages themselves.

Rather, language expansions are entirely a function of demographic, social, cultural and political forces, created by and acting upon the communities that speak those languages. The relationship here is one of cause-and-effect: real-world forces leaving linguistic effects. Among these forces are: the size, density and growth of a population; the degree and nature of its contact with, or isolation from, other populations; and its relative socio-cultural or political power and/or prestige. Language patterns are thus a reflection — and a valuable surviving record, a linguistic 'history' — of how those forces operated on given populations over time. And it is precisely these same forces that archaeology seeks to track and explain through its own record of the past.

And just as that archaeological record is but partial and fragmented, so too is the linguistic one: many language lineages — Pictish, Etruscan, in fact countless indigenous languages across most of the world — have gone extinct without leaving any significant traces.

In seeking to correlate these two fragmentary records, we can hope to use the strengths of each to mitigate the weaknesses of each. For an example of how to go about this, we can return to the two processes by which different languages can come to show correspondences, to set each in its corresponding real world context. Language **convergence** reflects more or less intense **contacts** between what were originally different groups. By contrast, **divergence** of a single language into a language family reflects a past **expansion** of what had once been just a single group. Our case study of the Central Andes serves well to illustrate these two different mechanisms.

Two major indigenous language families survive in the region, as mapped in Figure 2. The largest, Quechua, is by number of speakers our greatest surviving link to the languages of the New World before the European conquest. Today the various languages and 'dialects' within the family can still be heard over a patchwork of territories extending almost 4,000 km from southern Colombia to north-west Argentina, equivalent to the distance between Morocco and Moscow. The second language family of the Andes, Aymara, today dominates the vast *Altiplano*, the high-altitude plains of Bolivia, though another quite different variety is still spoken in a tiny pocket some 800 km to the north in the mountains of central Peru.



Figure 2: The two major language families of the Andes: present-day distribution

Correspondences both within and between these Andean language families make for a rich mine of information about their pre-histories. Those of the first type attest to processes of divergence. The respective linguistic records of Quechua and Aymara divergence unfailingly tell us that each family goes back to its own separate single ancestor language, each spoken only in a narrowly circumscribed geographical area. From these respective homelands, each began to *expand*, in due course coming to occupy their known ranges over vast areas of the Andes. The stage of a language lineage at the point in time just before it first diverged is known as that family's *proto-language*; stages long before divergence as the *pre-proto-language*.

There is no language divergence without geographical expansion. But the language families of the world vary greatly in both the degrees of divergence within them, and the geographical extents across which they are spoken. Furthermore, since language change and divergence tend to increase cumulatively with the passage of time, the degree of divergence across a family gives some indication of the time-depth of the geographical expansion that gave rise to it. Indeed, methods have even been proposed, including the so-called *glottochronology*, which try to derive from this approximate correlation a means of actually pinning hard dates on divergence time-depths. We discuss elsewhere the severe limitations on these methods (Heggarty 2007: 321-5, Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming a). What matters for our purpose here is that while measures of intra-family diversity certainly do not produce 'dates' that can in any sense be regarded as absolute, comparisons between different language families do at least provide a useful guide to their *relative* time-depths.

For such order-of-magnitude measures indicate that Quechua and Aymara, despite their wide geographical extents, are *not* particularly deep families in time. Each encompasses a degree of internal diversity that is distinctly limited by the standards of the six to nine millennia estimated for the Indo-European language family. Estimates for Quechua range from just 1200 to c. 2500 years of divergence, comparable with just the very 'last generation' of Indo-European, such as Romance or Slavic (see Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming a: Fig. 1).

That said, such a time-depth is nonetheless more than enough to dismiss the popular myth that attributes all Quechua's diversity and expansion to the Inca Empire of c. 1450-1535. For what drove most of Quechua's expansion, we must look deeper into the archaeological record.

As regards the Aymara family, attempts to assess its internal diversity and time-depth are somewhat hampered by how little of its former diversity now survives outside its modern *Altiplano* heartland. Within that heartland Aymara exhibits such limited variation that linguists can be all but certain that its expansion there is of relatively recent date. Again, long-established linguistic consensus serves to contradict widespread belief within archaeology, wrapped up in Bolivian national ethos, that Aymara was the language of the Tiyawanaku polity of the Middle Horizon.

Measures of diversity that include the other surviving branch of the family, the Central Aymara (alias 'Jaqaru-Kawki') of the Central highlands of Peru, suggest a time-depth of a similar order to that of Quechua. Moreover, placename studies and early Spanish colonial reports attest that Aymara was once spoken widely across many other regions, in forms now lost to us (see Figures 3 and 4), and suggest that its expansion across the region *predates* that of its now larger partner in Andean linguistic domination.

Indeed, on first impressions 'partnership' seems an appropriate term for the relationship between speakers of these two language families, for they do show some striking structural parallels, and share a great deal of vocabulary (estimated at as much as 30% for certain of their dialects in closest contact with each other: see Cerrón-Palomino 2000: 311). In the heyday of earlier, now long discredited approaches in linguistics (*glottochronology* and 'multilateral comparison'), these inter-family correspondences led some

to propose that Quechua and Aymara's proto-languages in turn go back ultimately to a single common ancestor, i.e. that they were related and their correspondences are survivals from divergence at some much greater remove (Büttner 1983, Greenberg 1987). This so-called 'Quechumaran' hypothesis is still occasionally entertained among Americanist linguists who do not specialise in the languages of the Andes, but among those who do, not one signs up to it (Torero 2002: 154, Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 35, Heggarty 2005, 2008; see also Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming a). Certainly for all practical purposes here, Quechua and Aymara can safely be taken as *not* related.

Rather, the remarkable correspondences between them are of the opposite type: those that attest to that other, all but diametrically opposed process: *convergence*. Indeed, countless languages across the Andes and Amazonia have gradually come to share in certain general, abstract, structural characteristics, though without any one language recognisable as the source (see the typological criteria in Torero 2002: 539, for instance). Such 'areal' features are of precisely the type that typically denote chains of localised




Figure 3: Current and assumed earlier distributions of Aymara, by nature and strength of evidence

interactions — over prolonged time-scales and across extensive territories — between small-scale groups speaking a mosaic of different languages. They absolutely do not denote expansions of single languages into broad families, which would leave quite the opposite linguistic signal. That is, this type of correspondences reliably denote only areal proximity and contacts, *not relatedness* (Torero 2002: 154, Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 34-6, Heggarty 2006: 185-8).

Between Quechua and Aymara in particular, however, correspondences of this type are exceptionally strong. Far beyond simply sharing in general areal characteristics, they extend to a host of identifiable

borrowings and specific structural ‘calques’ throughout both families, which denote an especially intense interaction and convergence between early stages of their lineages. Even with this type of linguistic effect, however, we remain firmly in the realm of *interactions* that bring about a degree of *convergence* between originally *unrelated* languages. Interpretations of which historical scenarios might account for this vary (see Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming *b*), but certainly this intimacy between the two language families dictates that any satisfactory explanation of the history of the one must be coherent with the history of the other, and incorporate intense contact between them (see for example Cerrón-Palomino 2000: 337). Ignoring this linguistic fact is the one failing common to all previous attempts by Andean archaeologists to synthesise linguistics into their interpretations.



Figure 4: Chavinoid ceramic (c. 750 BC) excavated by the author (DBJ) in Ullujaya, Ica — the periphery of the Early Horizon.

3. LINKING ARCHAEOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS IN THE ANDES: THE TRADITIONAL MODEL

What, then, is the traditional model for linking the linguistics to archaeology in the Andes, and how does it fare when we apply our proposed methodology for linking the two? We shall review it briefly and draw attention to certain infelicities in the associations it proposes.

There is some consensus that the homelands of the respective separate ancestor languages of the Quechua and Aymara families lay somewhere in Central Peru, although considerable uncertainty remains as to more precisely where within this rather broadly defined region. Proposals from the two key authorities in the field — Alfredo Torero, generally supported by Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino — have acquired at least the status of the most convincing expounded so far.

For Aymara, both authors argue for a homeland in the Nazca region on the south-central coast, whence it is imagined to have expanded during the Early Intermediate into its highland hinterlands, including the Ayacucho region (see Figure 3). Some time later, that region was to become the heartland of the Wari Middle Horizon, to which they attribute the spread of Aymara more widely across southern Peru, including to the Cuzco region. Finally, during the Late Intermediate, Aymara expanded further south into the Altiplano, where it survives most strongly today, perhaps by the so-called ‘Aymara Kingdoms’ of the Lupaqa and Qulla (although some of these, like their predecessor Tiyawanaku, may in fact have spoken Puquina).

The two main authorities differ, however, as to the likely location of the Quechua homeland. Torero places it on the central coast, immediately to the north of his Aymara, while Cerrón-Palomino prefers to set it inland in the central highlands. Torero (2002: 42) even entertains the suggestion that much earlier, during the Late Preceramic period, i.e. long before its expansion, the pre-proto stage of the Quechua lineage was spoken in the Norte Chico area (see Figure 5a); although this is generally regarded as extremely speculative (see Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 22, and Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming a).

In the traditional view, the details of the earliest Quechua expansions remain rather unclear. What the linguistic data do show unequivocally is that certain of its secondary expansions (to Bolivia, Argentina and arguably Ecuador too) date to the relatively recent past – the Inca Late Horizon and Spanish Colonial periods (Heggarty 2007, 2008). Once these are ‘peeled back’, the picture left, as in Figure 5a, shows that long before them, Quechua had *already* come to be spoken across a great swathe of Peru: the central and southern coasts, and from the north-central through to the southern highlands, from Ancash to Cuzco. It is also clear that the greatest degree of divergence within Quechua is between the northernmost and southernmost extremes of this broad territory of its earlier expansion. The traditional model would have this divergence explained by a series of vaguely defined migratory expansion stages, not least a first radical split into two separate branches: alias QI and QII, in Torero’s (1964) terminology. These putative expansion stages stretch from the Early through to the Late Intermediate.

Whichever homeland they started out from, the first stage is seen as an expansion which left Quechua spoken on the central coast and through the north-central highlands of Peru, from Ancash south to Huánuco (but in the traditional view, not yet as far south as the Ayacucho region, associated at the time with Aymara instead). This expansion is taken to have given rise to the Central Quechua or QI branch. The remaining QII or North-South Quechua branch, meanwhile, is taken to have formed out of a later expansion to the south coasts and highlands of Peru.

What is unclear in the traditional model, however, is exactly what particular demographic and/or cultural driving *forces* in the archaeological record might account for this initial major expansion. Torero (2002: 124) identifies no particular driver for the first stage at all, though he imagines the split into central (QI) and north-south (QII) subgroups to have begun with an expansion of QII-speakers southwards, culminating in the foundation of the city of Cajamarquilla, at the southern extremity of his proposed proto-Quechua homeland in the Lima Valley, around the 4th century AD (Torero 2002: 127). QII is imagined to spread further south first during the Middle Horizon, along the south-central coast and its immediate highland hinterland, an expansion attributed to cult and trading influences of the great oracle, Pachacámac in the Lurín Valley near Lima. Next, from here and driven by the Chíncha culture that flourished on the south coast during the Late Intermediate, Torero (2002: 127) posits that QII then encroached into the *highlands* of the south (overwriting the Aymara imagined to have been spread there earlier by Wari).




Figure 5a: Assumed expansions of Quechua prior to and since the rise of the Incas

Figure 5b: Extents of Wari or Tiwanaku direct control or influence during the Middle Horizon

This relatively late spread of Quechua into the southern highlands is invoked to explain the linguistic evidence that until quite late in prehistory the Cuzco region, including the Incas themselves, spoke not just (nor even predominantly) Quechua, as popular perception would have it, but Aymara. Strong evidence for this emerges from a number of linguistic and Spanish documentary sources (see Heggarty 2007). Certainly, as Quechua spread southwards it picked up increasingly heavy influences from Aymara, especially by the stage that it eventually reached into the Cuzco region, at around the time that the Inca state was beginning to form.

How does this traditional model fulfil our criteria for establishing correspondences with archaeology, on the three levels of geography, chronology and causation? Firstly, on the level of chronology, there are at least some linguistic indications that Aymara began its expansion *before* Quechua, including Torero's own lexicostatistical measures of divergence across each family (see Torero 2002: 88 and the discussions in Cerrón-Palomino 2000: 287, 2003: 333-4). The traditional model does not account for this; indeed Torero effectively discards this inconvenient datum entirely (see Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 331). Moreover, his chronology of the various migratory expansions behind Quechua's initial and greatest expansion is defined in particularly vague terms (Torero 2002: 124).

Secondly, on the level of geography, the traditional model is uncomfortable on a number of counts. It posits Ayacucho as the source of Aymara's most significant expansion during the Middle Horizon; but today Ayacucho is the heartland of Quechua, not Aymara. Furthermore, of Southern Quechua's regional varieties today, that of Ayacucho is the one that shows the *least* specific influence from Aymara. Torero's model also locates the original, pre-expansion homelands for both Quechua and Aymara on the coast. Yet the entire prehistory of the Central Andes seems to present *no* instances of coastal societies expanding to dominate their highland hinterlands over any significant territory. As Julio C. Tello long since observed, *major* expansions clearly visible in the archaeological record all proceeded the other way around, *spreading out of* the highlands.

But it is on the third level for linking archaeology to linguistics — that of causation — that we find the most serious objections to the traditional model. For it imputes *major* stages of the language family expansions not to the Horizons but to the *smaller-scale* polities of the so-called 'Intermediate' Periods: Nazca, Cajamarquilla and Chíncha. Torero's model is particularly implausible on driving forces invoked for the main expansions of Quechua — so far as one can understand his often vague and inconsistent presentation.

Torero locates the starting point of Quechua expansion on the Central coast, in the closely-spaced valleys between Chancay and Lurín. These were indeed densely populated during the Early Intermediate, with a major urban centre at Cajamarquilla in the Rímac Valley. But the archaeological record for this period here shows nothing that might correspond with a major language *expansion*, and in fact Torero never offers clear explanation for the expansion of his QI, Central Quechua. He does, however, invoke a period of intense commercial interaction between Cajamarquilla and a number of other, independent regional polities during the 6th and 7th centuries AD (Torero 2002: 48). In this he follows an interpretation of the archaeological record for this period which effectively disputes its characterisation as a Middle 'Horizon' at all (see Shady 1982, 1989). The widespread dissemination of a material culture style at the time, which led to this 'Middle Horizon' being identified in the first place, is for Shady just the result of a *trading* network, and Torero invokes this to account for intense contact between Quechua and Aymara speakers. But few of the 'urban centres' Torero lists show any coherence with the geography of Quechua's expansion at this stage; moreover, no sooner did the Wari Middle Horizon first extend into the Rímac Valley but Cajamarquilla was abruptly abandoned (Shady 1989, Mogrovejo & Sugura 2001).

Torero is clearer in setting out his explanation of the driving forces (Pachacámac and Chíncha) for the southwards expansion of his QII; though these turn out to be even less compatible with any evidence presented by the archaeological record. Pachacámac was founded early in the first epoch of the Middle Horizon. So similar is its material culture style to that of Wari that it prompted Uhle's first recognition of a Middle Horizon (even if the precise relationship underlying those styles is still debated: Isbell 1988, Schreiber 1992, Kaulicke 2001). During the Middle Horizon the Pachacámac style became widely distributed along the coast as far south as Nazca, and into its immediate highland hinterland to Huancayo (Menzel 1967: 151). But during the subsequent Late Intermediate the extent of this influence collapsed, back to just the immediate vicinity of the oracle itself. There is no evidence in the way of material culture remains for major population movements into the Wari heartland following its collapse, as required by Torero's model. Nor is there any archaeological evidence that the influence of the rich Chíncha society of the Late Intermediate period extended much into its sierra hinterlands — certainly not as far as the Cuzco region. On the contrary, in the south this was a time of intense, small-scale conflict and tension, and a breakdown of pre-existing networks. We will argue that what forces the traditional model to perform these serpentine and unhappy pastiches with the archaeological record is a flawed model of divergence relationships within the Quechua language family.

4. LINKING ARCHAEOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS IN THE ANDES: A NEW PROPOSAL

The traditional model, then, betrays multiple flaws on the various levels of chronology, geography and causation. To overcome them, we propose instead a strong, straightforward new model starting out from the logic that it is the *Horizons* in Andean prehistory, not the Intermediate periods, that offer by far the best evidence of significant geographical expansions of people and ideas — and thereby also the best candidates for drivers to account for the major language expansions too. This broad-scale observation stands, regardless of one's position on the many important debates within archaeology as to what were the driving forces behind these Horizons, and their exact extents.

The Andean archaeological record shows three Horizon epochs, while its linguistic record reflects just two major language dispersals. For the reasons already discussed, however, we can rule out the Late Horizon as too late to account for either the Aymara or Quechua expansions, which thus leaves us with a strikingly straightforward picture of two Horizons and two language dispersals. Our proposal overturns the traditional model's vision of Wari as Aymara-speaking and associates it with the dispersal of Quechua instead, leaving the Aymara spread to be accounted for by the Chavín Early Horizon.

We see the simplicity of this proposal as its great strength: it satisfies Occam's injunction by providing the most parsimonious match between the relative strengths and timings of the key socio-cultural and demographic driving forces in Andean prehistory, and their effects in propelling language expansions. We are of course aware that the instinctive reaction of archaeologists familiar with the not inconsiderable debates on Andean chronology may well be that our proposed match is more simplistic than simple. We shall argue, however, that under the methodology for linking archaeology and linguistics put forward here, our proposal in fact stands up far better than the traditional model also in its *detail*, on all three levels of geography, chronology and causation.

4.1 CHRONOLOGY

Firstly, associating Aymara with the Early Horizon is in line with those indicators we do have that suggest that Aymara expanded earlier than Quechua. More significantly, the chronology of our proposal would have Aymara dispersing widely with the Early Horizon, out of its Chavín homeland. Its associated prestige would, in the Ayacucho region, exert on the pre-*proto*-Quechua language spoken there at the time a powerful ‘superstrate’ influence (whereby speakers of a lower-status language refashion aspects of it on the model of a higher-status one). Yet in due course Quechua would undergo its own expansion driven by the Middle Horizon, ‘overwriting’ the earlier Aymara spread, to leave it surviving only in small isolated highland pockets across its original range in Central Peru.

This pattern of a heavy Aymara superstrate impact on the ancestor language of the entire Quechua family, which then in turn expanded across Aymara’s previous extent, in fact far *better* explains the particular form and strength of the convergence between the two families than does the traditional model’s vaguer proposal of ‘adjacent’ homelands for ancestors of both families on the Peruvian coast. Their convergence is often explicitly described in terms of one of the two being ‘remodelled’ in the image of the other (e.g. Cerrón-Palomino 2000: 337), though with different views on which was which (Itier and Muysken, personal communications).

4.2 GEOGRAPHY

Secondly, on the level of geography, the linguistic data are, as Adelaar & Muysken (2004: 263) put it, “not incompatible with the alternative hypothesis of an original Aymaran homeland further north, in the heart of central Peru itself”. Our association of Aymara with the Early Horizon would put that homeland in the central highlands of Ancash, centred on its core site of Chavín de Huantar. Furthermore, Cerrón-Palomino (2000: 378) reports ‘significant’ Aymara toponymy across precisely this region of central Peru. As he observes, these placenames and other linguistic evidence provides “indirect evidence of the presence of a prior Aru [Aymara] substrate [in Ancash]” (Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 333, our translation). His mapping of Aymara toponymy extends even further north in Peru, though here characterised only as “tenuous” (“tenué”), over an area that would correspond well with the known extent of the Cupisnique material culture style, forerunner to the Chavín Early Horizon. See Figure 3.

Outside its Ancash heartland, the frontiers of the Early Horizon (so far as they existed) remain to be precisely determined. On the coast, distinctively ‘Chavinoid’ material culture certainly extends as far south as the Ica and Nazca river drainages: e.g. Ullujaya, see Figure 4. In the highlands, meanwhile, a major Chavín site is currently being excavated near Vilcashuamán, 60 km south-east of Ayacucho (Burger, personal communication). This southern limit of the Early Horizon is thus entirely consistent with an Aymara superstrate ‘remodelling’ the language ancestral to the Quechua family, as per section 4.1 above. It also takes Aymara far enough south to be at least ‘within range’ of what would become its southernmost regions, Cuzco and eventually the Altiplano.

Strikingly, on the level of toponymy, several of the placenames just mentioned — Ullujaya, Vilcashuamán and Cuzco itself — lend themselves to convincing Aymara etymologies (Cerrón-Palomino 2008, and personal communications). Indeed, Cerrón-Palomino’s (2003: 292-3) inspection of toponymic dictionaries “indicates the presence of such elements diagnostic of Aymara in the departments of Lima, Junín, Pasco, Huánuco, Ancash, and to a lesser degree, in La Libertad, Piura and Cajamarca” — respectively, we note, the core and periphery of the Early Horizon.

For the Middle Horizon the correlation on the level of geography between archaeology and the historical linguistics of Quechua is even stronger. As we shall shortly see, archaeologists have put forward several starkly contrasting interpretations of the archaeological record for the Middle Horizon. But for our purposes here, at least a partial consensus has been established: “most researchers agree that Wari was an expansive state, an empire that consolidated power rapidly”, as Cook (2004: 146) puts it.

The Wari heartland was the Ayacucho highlands of the south-central Andes, centred on the eponymous urban centre there. The consensus would have Wari expanding rapidly out of this region during its so-called Epoch 1B, to control directly the central and southern coast between Chancay and Acarí, and the Peruvian highlands over an even greater extent, from Ancash to Sicuani: see Figure 5b and Menzel (1967: 147). At its apogee around 800 AD, its capital at Wari was vast, covering some 15 km². It remains to this day the largest archaeological site in South America (Isbell *et al.* 1991: 24).

We have not the space here to review in any detail the evidence or associated controversy behind this model of a Wari Empire. Suffice it to say that it includes the identification of permanent Wari administrative architecture (see Figure 6); distributions of mobile Wari material culture; evidence that




Figure 6: Aerial view of Pikillaqta, a Wari outpost south-east of Cuzco: “such incredibly regimented planning ... is not otherwise known in the world history of human environments” (Conklin 1991: 287). Courtesy of the *Servicio Aerofotográfico Nacional*, Peru.

much of the Inca road network was rehabilitated from an earlier Wari system, and that the Incas' *kipu* knotted-string accounting device likewise had Middle Horizon antecedents; and even fragmentary hints in ethnohistory (Lumbreras 1974, Isbell 1987, Schreiber 1992, 2001, McEwan 1991, Hiltunen & McEwan 2004, D'Altroy & Schreiber 2004). Such evidence is deployed to support a model of 'direct control' by Wari of the vast area of central and southern Peru defined above. Further north, beyond Ancash and into La Libertad and the Cajamarca basin, evidence for that direct control becomes fragmentary. There are scattered sites here with tantalising hints of Wari administrative architecture, but they are still to be fully investigated (Schreiber 1992: 96). On the densely-populated north and north-central coasts, meanwhile, with their own long, independent prehistoric trajectories, evidence for Wari's presence is still more ambiguous – limited to mobile material culture and mortuary remains, leading archaeologists to infer only 'indirect control' or influence (D'Altroy & Schreiber 2004).

South of the Cuzco region, Wari confronted the other major pole of the Middle Horizon: Tiyawanaku in the Titicaca basin. The archaeological story behind the Wari–Tiyawanaku relationship is another subject of considerable complexity. So similar is their iconography that both were initially conflated under the label 'Tiahuanacoid'. Clearly both partook of a shared ideological tradition widespread across the southern Andes and which dates to the Early Intermediate or even before (Isbell & Knobloch 2008), and at times the two appear to have interacted intensely. Yet in all other aspects of their economy and society they show entirely distinct prehistoric trajectories (Conklin 1991, Schreiber 1992, Isbell & Vranich 2004); indeed their 'interactions' often took the form of open military conflict (Moseley *et al.* 1991, Isbell 2001, Williams & Nash 2002). And, importantly for our purpose here, their influence extended over mutually exclusive territories (see Figure 5b).

How does this geographical extent of the Wari Middle Horizon compare with that of the Quechua language family? We observe a remarkably fine correlation between them. As already discussed, linguistics can reliably identify those parts of the Quechua expansion that occurred in more recent time periods: into Ecuador during the Late Intermediate or Late Horizon; into Bolivia and north-western Argentina with the Inca Late Horizon and early colonial period; down the eastern flanks of the Andes into the Amazon during colonial times; and so forth. It has long been appreciated, meanwhile, that other parts of Peru where today only Spanish is spoken were, and had long been, Quechua-speaking at the time of Spanish conquest, in particular the south-central coast. Once these later expansions and disappearances are respectively stripped away from and added back to the map of Quechua's current distribution, we are left with a map bearing a strikingly close resemblance to the extent of the Wari Middle Horizon. Quechua dominates the highlands of Peru from Ancash in the north towards Cuzco in the south. Further north in the highlands it persists only in isolated pockets in Cajamarca and highland Lambayeque, within wider regions where a patchwork of non-Quechua languages were previously spoken. Quechua also dominated the south-central coast, but north of Lima never gained much foothold among the densely populated valleys of the north coast.

The only part of the map that shows uncertain correspondence with the Wari Middle Horizon is that area of the southern sierra towards the Titicaca basin that is Quechua-speaking today but lies somewhat beyond the southern limits of where archaeology would define Wari's influence, and its abutment with the Tiyawanaku sphere (see for instance Williams & Nash 2002, Tung & Owen 2008). Yet here too linguistics tells a revealing tale, for the region is seen as a 'linguistic battleground' where Quechua's predominance over Aymara came rather late in prehistory, perhaps only during the Inca Late Horizon and early Spanish control.

4.3 CAUSATION

Though the correspondences in chronology and geography may well be striking, they are but circumstantial evidence for our core case. Its real strength lies on the level of causation. We reiterate the axiom of our methodology: language expansions do not ‘just happen’, they happen only for those very same reasons of real human demography and socio-cultural context that archaeology seeks to perceive through the material culture record. And great language dispersals like those of Quechua and Aymara can only have been driven by processes of *commensurate scale*.

For our proposal to stand we need not attempt to link the expansions of these language families in the Andes to particular ‘cultures’, nor indeed infer their association with the spread of a particular people (genes). Under our proposed methodology we seek to link them through *driving forces*; and the only ones of *commensurate scale* evident in the archaeological record of the Andes are those associated with the Horizons.

Quechua has long replaced Aymara throughout all but southernmost Peru and the tiny enclaves of Jaqaru-Kawki. All other indigenous languages are extinct from the highlands. Quechua’s early expansion closely matches that of the ancient Wari Empire. (Even today the most heavily Quechua-speaking region is that of Ayacucho, the heartland of Wari.) And while archaeologists have proposed very different interpretations to explain the material culture record left by the Middle Horizon, all have in common an agreement that the period was characterised by major social change and upheaval.

The size, complexity and poor state of preservation of the site of Wari itself have defied comprehensive archaeological survey to date (see Isbell 1988: 167). Speculative population estimates for the city range between 50,000 to 100,000 (Benavides 1991: 56), or 20,000 to 34,000 (Isbell 1988: 173). Whatever, it was by any measure an enormous ancient city: even half a millennium later, Venice, the largest city in Europe, had a population of under 50,000 (McEvedy 1992: 75). Survey data indicate how the populations in surrounding areas gradually became drawn into the vast agglomeration that was Wari (Schreiber 1992: 88, Isbell & Vranich 2004: 177).

Mobile material culture indicative of Wari influence is distributed throughout the highlands and along the coast of Central Peru, but for the very far south (see Figure 5b and Menzel 1967). Sites in the Cuzco region, meanwhile, and Wari itself, have yielded significant quantities of ceramics from Cajamarca, almost 1,000 km to the north. As Menzel (1967: 152) observes, “their abundance [at Wari itself] is such as to suggest that there were colonies of northerners established at the imperial capital”. Furthermore, for Isbell (1987: 86) “perhaps the dominant feature of Wari architecture” is that of “barracks-like residential facilities”, interpreted as housing for mobile labour or military personnel (see also McEwan 1991: 117). As D’Altroy & Schreiber (2004: 274) summarise: “it is now clear that these sites were occupied by large numbers of people, both foreigners from Wari and local peoples”. And some of these sites were huge. Pikillaqta, for instance, shown in Figure 6, is but a part of the intense Wari occupation of the Cuzco region (McEwan 1991, Glowacki 2002). Yet this single component of the Wari periphery is larger than the later Inca imperial *capital* of Cuzco (see McEwan 1991: Fig. 2). All told, the Middle Horizon archaeological record indicates *much* larger-scale movements of people across the Andes than do those of the Intermediate Periods that preceded and succeeded it.

There is strong evidence also that the Wari Middle Horizon was, in large part, based upon the intensification of food production in the intermontane valleys of the highlands: the ‘quichua ecozone’. The extent of Wari direct control seems intimately associated with this zone – the same area over which Quechua saw its first major expansion, and from which, incidentally, it acquired its very name. (See Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 33-49), however, for a path through the minefield of popular myths surrounding

the etymologies of the terms *Quechua* and *Aymara*.) Such evidence includes large-scale shifts in settlement, and in subsistence regimes from tubers to maize cereals; massive terracing construction (Schreiber 1992, 2001); and the introduction of new maize varieties (Grobman *et al.* 1961, Bird *et al.* 1984). All appear to have been instigated by the ‘state’ in order to supply distant urban populations. Isbell (1988: 182) credits the Wari Middle Horizon with the development of a uniquely Andean form of ‘state finance’ — what Godelier (1977: 188) had called the “Inca mode of production” — whereby long-standing local traditions of reciprocal exchanges of labour were elaborated into a system of labour-taxation, in exchange for food and drink provided at state-sponsored feasts. Much Wari iconography, particularly that of gigantic ceramic vessels linked with feasting, reflects an apparent preoccupation with agricultural themes (see for instance Shady 1989: 13). Indeed, some see the innovations wrought by Wari in these respects as so fundamental and enduring that they defined the course of subsequent Andean civilization (Isbell 1988: 182), and settlement patterns still today (Schreiber 1992: 260, Williams & Nash 2002: 255).

We argue here that so too did they define language patterns. Indeed, that Quechua was later adopted by the Incas as the language of administration for their empire, was not because it was their own original tongue. Rather, there are strong indications that the Incas themselves may well originally have spoken Aymara, and switched their ‘official’ language of empire to Quechua only relatively late in their trajectory of imperial expansion, during the reign of Tupac Inca Yupanqui (1471-1493). Their reason may have been an entirely pragmatic one: that most northern lands that fell to the Incas were already speaking it, precisely because the earlier Wari Empire had so dramatically spread it there. It even appears that the form of Quechua the Incas selected for this purpose was not that ultimately spoken in the Cuzco region, but a more northerly ‘Chincha’ version. For details on all these issues, see Cerrón-Palomino (1998, 1999, 2004).

As for the longevity of the Wari Middle Horizon, Menzel’s original relative ceramic chronology would have us believe that its rise and fall were swift. As Schreiber (1992: 276) puts it: “each phase of the Middle Horizon 1B, 2A and 2B, is estimated to have lasted only about 50 years ... If this accurate, the Wari Empire lasted only about 150 years”. Yet in the face of mounting C¹⁴ evidence (see for instance Williams 2001), this view has now been abandoned. As Cook (2004: 158) summarises: “instead of a 200-year span (approximately AD 650–850) during which time the empire flourished, the time frame has doubled (approximately AD 550–1000)”. This relatively recent understanding that the time-depth of the Middle Horizon approached half a millennium is far more compatible with the dramatic linguistic impact that our proposal would attribute to it.

For the Early Horizon, both the archaeological signature and linguistic traces are naturally far fainter. In linguistics, no language expansion has to date been explicitly attributed to the Chavín Early Horizon. It is true that Cerrón-Palomino’s (2003: 22) reflections on a homeland in the central highlands, not the coast, might at least hint at Chavín as a possible candidate homeland for Quechua. His reluctance to formalise such a claim, however, is based on the same objection that most other writers see: the Early Horizon seems just too far back in time to correspond with the expansion of so shallow and compact a family as Quechua. On this last point we could not agree more, but it remains deeply problematic in the traditional thinking that such a defining archaeological signal as the Early Horizon is left without any significant linguistic correlate, when the linguistics is crying out for a driver for Aymara.

Elsewhere (Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming a), we have drawn attention to the correspondences in broad scale and timing between: the first major language family expansion in the Andes; the “real pattern” (Burger 1993: 74) that the archaeological record of the Early Horizon represents; and the first point in time for which we can unequivocally assert that maize has ‘suddenly’ become *ubiquitous* in the

archaeobotanical record. We have also argued that it was only at this point in Andean prehistory that a number of gradual processes in the development of food production in the Andes finally intersected to tip agriculture here across an *expansive* intensification threshold. We hypothesise that it was the significant incorporation at last of a true cereal, maize, that was crucial to this coalescence of a geographically expansive agricultural package — a “mobile food chain”, to use Jones’ (2007: 144) term.

In the end, however, given its far fainter traces, our association of the Early Horizon with the expansion of Aymara on this level of causation relies also on reductive reasoning. If our proposal to ascribe Quechua to the Middle Horizon stands, then our axiom associating major language family expansions with Horizons leaves us left with one major Andean language family expansion to explain, and only the Early Horizon to explain it with. It fits, moreover, with the clear indications that over almost all its core range in Peru, Quechua seems to overlie an *earlier* Aymara spread.

We also explicitly associate both the Early and Middle Horizons with step-changes in food production: two different agricultural intensification thresholds (see Pearsall 2008). What we do not advocate, of course, is a simplistic argument that the spread of the major language families of the Andes is to be sought *uniquely* in agriculture (see Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming a). Both Horizons were unquestionably much more than merely intensifications of maize agriculture. We shall return shortly to the debate in archaeology about the nature of each of the Andean Horizons, and what our proposed ‘new synthesis’ of archaeology and linguistics here might mean for those debates.

5. NOT SEEING THE WEB FOR THE TREES

There have been two partial precedents for our proposal: Isbell (1974) and Bird *et al.* (1984). Isbell suggested that the expansion of Quechua was associated with that of maize agriculture, though at a time-remove too great to be reconciled with linguistic data (see Cerrón-Palomino 2003: 336-8). Bird *et al.*, meanwhile, recast Torero’s original language data alongside a biogeography of maize varieties — data radically different to our own here, but arriving at a conclusion in part the same: linking the expansion of Quechua to the Middle Horizon. Neither linguists nor archaeologists have engaged meaningfully with this proposal beyond merely citing it, except for Cerrón-Palomino (2001) and Isbell (1984), respectively, both of whom are highly critical. We too disagree strongly with Bird *et al.*’s unorthodox vision of the linguistics, not least the disconcerting methodological liberties they take with ‘linguistic dating’; nor does their proposal take into account the deep correspondences between Quechua and Aymara that any model needs to explain.

Certainly there were serious flaws in the linguistic argumentations of these previous proposals, then. But why is it that Andean linguists themselves have never yet entertained such a straightforward proposal of Quechua as driven by the Middle Horizon, and Aymara by the Early Horizon? The key obstacles, in our view, have been two: the traditional view of the classificatory structure of each language family as a branching tree; and the assumption that since they attest to deep contacts between each other early in their histories, they must have their origins in territorially neighbouring homelands.

Here is not the place to go into the linguistic arguments in depth (for which see Heggarty & Beresford-Jones forthcoming b), but only to summarise them. The traditional classification of the relationships between the different regional ‘dialects’ and languages within the Quechua family envisages a series of binary branches: first the original Proto-Quechua ancestor is imagined to have split into so-called ‘QI’ and ‘QII’ branches; then QII split into QIIa vs. QIIb/c; the latter then split in turn into QIIb and QIIc, and so on.

This tree model seeks to explain the various degrees of difference between modern Quechua varieties primarily in terms of greater or lesser time-depths since their respective ancestral lineages separated from each other.

In real world terms, this concept of a language ‘split’ typically corresponds to a stark division of an original population into two groups, thereafter no longer in contact and whose speech thus develops separately into different varieties. So to link his branching-tree view of Quechua prehistory with the archaeological record, Torero is compelled to seek a whole string of separate population splits and expansions by ‘migration’. The result is an over-extended chronology which needs to invoke polities from multiple periods through Andean prehistory, and assign major roles to relatively minor regional polities in the Early and Late Intermediate Periods. Moreover, assuming that the Quechua and Aymara homelands must be placed near each other pushes Torero to hypothesise that Aymara’s origins were on the south coast of Peru, and requires the Wari Middle Horizon to be a key second-stage driver of its expansion, ruling out a role for it in spreading Quechua instead. There are a great many infelicities in the complexities of these multiple expansion stages, and in attributing major linguistic impacts to minor polities in the archaeological record; but they are forced on the traditional model by its insistence on a branching tree as the classificatory structure of the Quechua, and also Aymara, language families.

True, as an intellectual model, binary branches may seem more ‘elegant’ – for which however read ‘simple’, indeed ‘simplistic’, in linguistic and indeed real-world terms. For the tree is by no means the only pattern in which languages diverge in practice. On the contrary, for many language families it is well known that no family tree classification is viable, and a quite different model is needed: the ‘dialect continuum’. This applies to large swathes of all four major language families of Europe (Romance, Germanic, Slavic and Celtic), as well as to Arabic, Bantu, Turkic, the languages of northern India, China, and elsewhere. Great swathes of human linguistic diversity cannot be represented by family trees, but only by dialect continua.

For Quechua too, the initial family-tree classification has fallen increasingly into disarray as our knowledge of the geographical diversity across the family has grown over recent decades, especially with the documentation of dialects intermediate between the supposed two main branches, or that classify well with neither (Adelaar 1977, 1987; Taylor 1984a, 1984b). As early as Landerman (1991) it was demonstrated that the two-way QI-QII split is untenable; but because he still kept faith with the tree idealisation in principle, he remained unable to offer any alternative.

To propose and justify one, more radical steps were required. Heggarty (2005) applied new network-type phylogenetic analyses to Torero’s own measures of divergence across the family, and to new data-sets and quantification methods of his own. All of these consistently revealed the shape of Quechua not as a branching tree at all, but as a ‘network’ or ‘web’ of cross-cutting linguistic relationships, the signal typical of a dialect continuum. We have called, then, for the traditional family tree classification to be abandoned altogether, in favour of a dialect continuum model instead. It remained then to set this new view of Quechua’s origins in a real-world context that might explain how and why the family diverged into such a pattern, if not by Torero’s sequence of migrations.

In dialect continua, the respective degrees of difference between language varieties within a family are typically explained not by chronological differences in the stages at which their lineages diverged, but by degrees of coherence across a wide ‘speech community’, themselves set in large part simply by geographical distance. Romance – and we argue also Wari – provide a classic examples. Typically, a single ancestor language – in our cases Proto-Romance (i.e. Latin) and Proto-Quechua – is spread in what is effectively a single, contemporaneous expansion, across a continuous geographical area. If extensive

enough, the speech in different sub-regions will naturally diverge, and all the faster after the collapse of ‘political’ unity across it (the fall of Rome; and of Wari). Nonetheless, local-level contacts continue, allowing new linguistic developments to spread by ‘waves’, overlapping across different parts of the overall region, so that the original ancestor language at length turns into a dialect continuum. From one village to the next, minor differences do not disrupt mutual intelligibility, but between the distant poles of the continuum so many differences accumulate that they speak what are effectively different languages, albeit related. A useful analogy is a colour spectrum, where colours contrast starkly at the extremes, even if between them there is never a sharp break in the shading from red to orange to yellow to green, etc.. Portuguese is most similar to Spanish, then to Catalan, then Provençal, and so on the further one travels eastwards. But all these territories were settled by Latin-speakers at more or less the *same* time: a single, all but contemporaneous expansion with no ‘splits’.

As what best accounts for the core structure of the Quechua language family, we propose a similar process: an initial major expansion propelled *only* by the Wari Middle Horizon. The increasing differences in Quechua from Ancash in the north to Cuzco in the south go back not to a chronological sequence of separate migrations, but merely to the greater geographical distance between them across this Quechua continuum. The intermediate varieties of Yauyos are in their due place, in the middle of that continuum; while the ‘unclassifiable’ north Peruvian varieties such as Cajamarca reflect the isolated northernmost Wari outposts beyond the continuous zone, developing more independently of the wave changes spreading across it (the closest Romance equivalent is Romanian).

Certainly, a dialect continuum picture can be complicated by later disruptions: political frontiers draw fault-lines within it; intermediate dialects die out or are ‘standardised’ towards others (especially in modern western nations). Indeed, later expansion episodes can emerge from just points within it: late Medieval Spanish to the New World, for instance; or Cuzco Quechua to Bolivia. Nonetheless, for the core of Quechua’s divergence history, our vision of a single Horizon expansion in practice makes for a far more economical and straightforward explanation in real-world terms than the supposedly ‘elegant’ binary tree with its need for a string of successive migrations, first in one direction and then in others. For more on this issue, see Heggarty (forthcoming).

6. WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR ARCHAEOLOGY?

Finally we turn to the archaeological debate about the nature of each of the Andean ‘Horizons’. It is one thing, of course, to identify a ‘Horizon’ (alias “stylistic coherence over a broad region”, as Rice 1993: 9 puts it) and to describe its extent and variation in time and space as culture history wished to (difficult tasks in themselves). It is quite another to tease apart and explain, as archaeology now aspires to do, those cultural *forces* — economic, political, ideological, and so forth — that shaped that archaeological record.

We have so far presented the Middle Horizon as a military, expansionist empire — the partial consensus within Andean archaeology. We have also alluded to how archaeologists have nonetheless read from the same material culture record stories of the Middle Horizon that can be very different. Various primary driving forces have been invoked to account for that record, which Schreiber (2001: 443) usefully summarises as: (i) political expansion/conquest; (ii) religion; and (iii) commerce.

The idea that the mainspring of the Middle Horizon was a religious movement has a long pedigree in archaeology, dating back to Menzel herself, and is still advocated in several forms, with considerable archaeological evidence marshalled in its support (see for instance Topic & Topic 2001). Certainly, there is

little doubting the significance of religious ideology in its material culture record. Another alternative model envisages a number of independent regional polities, but linked by a substantial *trading* network (e.g. Shady 1982, 1989). As we have seen, it is this model that seems to underlie part of Torero's scenario for Quechua expansion, but confusingly also that of Aymara (see also Isbell 1984 for criticism).

For the Early Horizon, meanwhile, sunk in far deeper recesses of Andean prehistory, speculation is lent an even freer rein. Most archaeologists see the Early Horizon as the expression of little more than a proselytizing cult, radiating out from (or in towards) the monumental site of Chavín de Huántar (Burger 1993, Kembel & Rick 2004). Some would even deny its very existence as a 'Horizon' (e.g. Pozorski & Pozorski 1987).

Here, our proposed synthesis between archaeological and linguistic data proves instructive in making an explicit claim: that whatever our interpretations of the Early and Middle Horizons, each should include one or more forces capable of driving a *major* language expansion. This leads us in turn to question an archaeological model for either that "places the vital motor of cultural change in ideology rather than in the material realm", as Willey (1999: 86) puts it. For despite popular impressions to the contrary, on closer inspection history offers surprisingly few, if any, precedents for major language expansions driven by religion.

To understand this, one must avoid confusing two utterly different linguistic realities: on the one hand, the territorial expansions of natural, changing, native-tongue language families (such as Quechua, Aymara, Romance or Indic); on the other hand, the use of a particular 'fossilised' language as an 'élite' medium of religious discourse (such as Church Latin or Classical Sanskrit), often among communities speaking various different native languages. Certainly, across Europe a fossilised form of Latin was once widespread in liturgical and scholarly uses; but even by early mediaeval times it was a learned code, the native tongue of no-one, and restricted to contexts which, for all their status, were always sociolinguistically highly marked, marginal, and ultimately largely doomed.

Such language uses are but an artificial side-show to the vast real-world expansion and lasting survival of the Latin (i.e. *Romance*) lineage as living, native tongues. The populations of much of modern Europe speak Romance languages not because of Christianity, but because of the very temporal, *pre-Christian* powers of Rome; so too do those of 'Latin' America and much of Africa, because of the later power of imperialist European empires. Christianity may have *accompanied* these later language expansions, but it did not *drive* them. On the contrary, both Romance expansions were driven together by other, much more material forces. Notwithstanding Europeans' appeals to Christianity to 'legitimise' their conquests, it was not religion that made those conquests possible, nor provided the primary incentive in practice. Similarly, the continued use of fossilised Sanskrit for religious and administrative purposes pales alongside the spread of the Indic family of native languages, with almost a billion native-speakers across Pakistan, Northern India and Bangladesh, derived instead from the living *Prakrits*.

The net linguistic effects of religions *per se*, even proselytizing ones, have been very modest. The one oft-cited case of a major language dispersal apparently in step with a religious one, that of Arabic and Islam, similarly turns out to be a chimera which only reinforces this principle. For again, the lasting spread of Arabic as a native language across parts of the Near East and North Africa was driven far less by religion than by one of the most crushing military conquests in history. Elsewhere, wherever the Arabs' military conquest did not reach, and even across Persia where it did, their language failed to make headway except as a medium of religion discourse, and a source of loanwords into the regions' native languages. From Senegal to Sulawesi, Islamic populations continue to speak African, Indo-European and Oriental tongues — not Arabic.

Religious ideology doubtless was an important trapping of both the Chavín Early Horizon and Wari Middle Horizon; it is certainly conspicuous in the archaeological record. Yet for all that, it signally fails as a “vital motor” to drive major language expansion. Perhaps archaeology has been misled by the all-too visible representation of ideology in the Andean material culture record; up-ending, it would appear, Hawkes’ (1954) (in)famous ‘ladder of inference’.

More generally, prior to the transformations brought about by the rise of the nation state and associated language standardisation, mass education, literacy, transport and (tele-)communications, mechanisms of language dispersal have through most of human history been radically different to those we observe in the modern era.

In this light, and as with religion, a strong case can be made that trade too is altogether too weak a driving force to explain Quechua’s expansion. Until these modern transformations (and indeed arguably even since then), the sorts of contacts made through trade and exchange had surprisingly little linguistic impact. The Phoenicians, for instance, may have dominated trade for over a millennium in the Mediterranean, but they have left precious little linguistic trace (Ostler 2005: 45-6, 68-78). Trade, like religion, has through history had far less linguistic impact than many would like to believe. As a stock explanation to invoke for archaeology–linguistics links, trade too is all too facile, and smacks of instincts from our context of the modern world, rather than those that prevailed through most of human history.

A synthesis of linguistics and archaeology has considerable implications, then, for how we interpret what the Andean ‘Horizons’ really were. For if Wari spoke Aymara, as proposed by the traditional model, the modesty of its linguistic legacy across the Central Andes — toponymy and a few scattered pockets of speakers — is *incompatible* with the model of a military expansionist empire establishing direct control over vast territories, in the manner of the Incas or the Romans. On the other hand, if our new proposal is correct and Wari spoke Quechua, then the model of direct control Empire is almost *required* in order to account for its linguistic impact. The fainter surviving trace of Aymara’s expansion across the Central Andes is then accounted for by the greater time-depth of the Early Horizon.

7. CONCLUSIONS

By their very nature, interdisciplinary syntheses run a risk of circularity. One model, weakly substantiated in one discipline, is invoked to bolster its counterpart model in the other; which then, by definition, feeds back to support the first. Such dangers lurk in the forests of phylogenetic trees proposed for human genetic and linguistic lineages — not least the linguistically infamous, simplistic and invalid match for all of humanity proposed by Cavalli-Sforza (1997: Fig. 3). Many of the trees, moreover, turn out to be ‘rooted’ in archaeological manure.

The distinction between a coherent picture between the disciplines, and a ‘just-so’ story based on circular argument, can lie ultimately only in judgements passed independently in each discipline on the strength of the data and their interpretations. Here this includes the case for abandoning outdated and inappropriate tree models of how each of the major language families of the Andes diverged, and replacing them with dialect continuum scenarios.

The risks can be mitigated also through the principled new methodology we propose: seeking to correlate the disciplines independently on each of our three levels of chronology, geography and causation. Nonetheless, in setting sail for any new synthesis goal, it is *causation* that stands as mast and sail, with the other levels adding little more than ropes and rigging. Links between our archaeological and linguistic

records of the past should first and foremost be cast in terms of those same *forces* that affect human populations, to which both those records attest; and they must be coherent above all in the *commensurate scale* of their impacts in each.

As culture history fell out of favour and the material record came to be viewed through the processual lens of culture evolution, archaeology lost some of its perspective on those appropriate scales. Unfortunately so, for a principled synthesis of the archaeological and linguistic stories has great potential to enrich our understanding of prehistory. Moreover, for all the elaborations in semantics of more recent archaeological theory, in the case of the Andes the current leading model of the Wari Middle Horizon turns out to be no different in essence to that founded by the culture-historical work of Menzel and Rowe (see for example Rowe 1956 and Menzel 1967). The Wari 'Empire' fell only for the 'state' to be built upon its theoretical ruin. Our own proposal strengthens still further this interpretation of Wari as an expansionist, military conquest empire, akin to the Incas. To the many elements of 'Inca' statecraft that archaeology has gradually revealed to have had their roots in the lost empire of the Middle Horizon, we now propose to add one more: the expansion of the greatest surviving language of the New World, Quechua.

REFERENCES

Adelaar, Willem F.H. & Pieter C. Muysken. 2004

Languages of the Andes.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adelaar, Willem F.H. 1977

Tarma Quechua, Grammar, Texts, Dictionary.

Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

Adelaar, Willem F.H. 1987

Morfología del Quechua de Pacaraos.

Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.

Benavides, Mario. 1991.

Cheqo Wasi, Huari,

in *Huari Administrative Structure*, eds. William H. Isbell and Gordon F. McEwan, 55-70. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks.

Bird, Robert MacK., David L. Browman & Marshall E. Durbin. 1984

Quechua and maize: mirrors of Central Andean culture history,

Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society 15(1 & 2), 187-240.

Burger, Richard L. 1993.

The Chavin Horizon: stylistic chimera or socioeconomic metamorphosis?,

in *Latin American Horizons*, ed. Don S. Rice, 41-82. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks.

Büttner, Thomas Th. 1983

Las lenguas de los Andes centrales.

Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica.

Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi Luca. 1997

Genes, peoples, and languages,

Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 94, 7719-24.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1998

El cantar de Inca Yupanqui y la lengua secreta de los incas,
Revista Andina 32, 417-52. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1999

Tras las huellas del aimara cuzqueño,
Revista Andina 33, 137-61. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2000

Lingüística aimara.
Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2003 [1987]

Lingüística quechua.
Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2004

El aimara como lengua oficial de los incas,
Boletín de Arqueología PUCP 8, 9-21.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2008

Voces del Ande: Ensayos sobre onomástica andina.
Lima: Fondo Editorial de la PUCP.

Conklin, William J. 1991

Tiahuanaco and Huari: architectural comparisons and interpretations,
in *Huari Administrative Structure*, eds. William H. Isbell and Gordon F. McEwan, 281-292. Washington:
Dumbarton Oaks.

Cook, Anita G. 2004

Wari art and society,
in *Andean Archaeology*, ed. Helaine Silverman, 146-166. Oxford: Blackwell Press.

D'Altroy, Terence N. and Katerina Schreiber. 2004

Andean empires,
in *Andean Archaeology*, ed. Helaine Silverman, 255-279. Oxford: Blackwell Press.

Glowacki, Mary 2002

The Huaro archaeological Site Complex: rethinking the Huari occupation of Cuzco,
in *Andean Archaeology I: Variations in Sociopolitical Organization*, eds. William H. Isbell and Helaine
Silverman, 267-286. New York: Plenum.

Godelier, Maurice. 1977

The concept of 'social and economic formation': the Inca example",
in *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Grobman, A., W. Salhuana and R. Sevilla, with P. Mangelsdorf. 1961

Races of Maize in Peru. National Research Council Publication 915. Washington: National Academy of
Sciences.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1987

Language in the Americas. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hawkes, C. 1954

Archaeological theory and method: some suggestions from the Old World. *American Anthropologist* 56:
155-68.

Heggarty, Paul. 2005

Enigmas en el origen de las lenguas andinas: aplicando nuevas técnicas a las incógnitas por resolver,
Revista Andina 40, 9-57. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Heggarty, Paul. 2006

Interdisciplinary indiscipline? Can phylogenetic methods meaningfully be applied to language data – and to dating language?,

in: Forster, Peter & Colin Renfrew (eds.):

Phylogenetic Methods and the Prehistory of Languages, 183-94. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Heggarty, Paul. 2007

Linguistics for archaeologists: principles, methods and the case of the Incas,
Cambridge Archaeological Journal 17(3), 311-40.

Heggarty, Paul. 2008

Linguistics for archaeologists: a case study in the Andes,
Cambridge Archaeological Journal 18(1), 35-56.

Heggarty, Paul. forthcoming

Splits or Waves? Trees or Webs? Network Analysis of Language Divergence, *Proceedings of AHRC Conference on Cultural and Linguistic Diversity*.

Heggarty, Paul and David Beresford-Jones. forthcoming a (2009)

Agriculture and language dispersals: limitations, refinements, and an Andean exception?,
Current Anthropology 50 (3/4).

Heggarty, Paul and David Beresford-Jones. forthcoming b

Rewriting the history, redrawing the map: a radical new vision for linguistics and archaeology in the Andes,
in: Beresford-Jones, David & Paul Heggarty (eds): *Archaeology and Linguistics in the Andes*.
London: British Academy (with Oxford University Press).

Hill Boone, E. 1993

Preface, in *Latin American Horizons*, ed. D.S. Rice, vii-vii. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks.

Hiltunen, J. and G.F. McEwan. 2004

Knowing the Inca Past,
in *Andean Archaeology*, ed. H. Silverman, 237-254. Oxford: Blackwell Press.

Isbell, W.H. and P.J. Knobloch. 2008

Missing links, imaginary links: staff god imagery in the south Andean past,
in *Andean Archaeology III: North and South*, eds. W.H. Isbell and H. Silverman, 307-351. New York: Springer.

Isbell, W.H. and H. Silverman. 2008.

Rethinking the Central Andean co-tradition,
in *Andean Archaeology III: North and South*, eds. W.H. Isbell and H. Silverman, 497-518. New York: Springer.

Isbell, W.H. and A. Vranich. 2004

Experiencing the cities of Wari and Tiwanaku,
in *Andean Archaeology*, ed. H. Silverman, 167-182. Oxford: Blackwell Press.

Isbell, W.H. 1974

Ecología de la expansión de los quechua hablantes. *Revista del Museo Nacional* 34: 143-197.

Isbell, W.H. 1984

Andean linguistics and culture history: and examination of competing interpretations. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 15: 241-258.

Isbell, W.H. 1987

State origins in the Ayacucho Valley, central highlands, Peru,
in *The Origins and Development of the Andean State*, eds. J. Haas, S. Pozorski and T. Pozorski, 83-96.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Isbell, W.H. 1988

City and state in Middle Horizon Huari,
in *Peruvian Prehistory*, ed. R.W. Keatinge, 164-189. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Isbell, W.H. 2001

Represando el Horizonte Medio: el caso de Conchopata, Ayacucho, Perú,
in *Huari y Tiwanaku: Modelos vs. Evidencias*, 9-68. *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 4 (Lima).

Isbell, W.H., C. Brewster-Wary and L.E. Spickard. 1991

Architecture and spatial organization at Huari,
in *Huari Administrative Structure*, eds. W.H. Isbell and G.F. McEwan, 19-54. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks.

Jones, M.K. 2007

Feast: Why Humans Share Food. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kaulicke, P. 2001

La sombra de Pachacamac: Huari en la costa central,
in *Huari y Tiwanaku: Modelos vs. Evidencias*, 313-358. *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 4 (Lima).

Kembel, S.R. and J.W. Rick, 2004

Building authority at Chavín de Huántar: models of social organization and development in the Initial
Period and Early Horizon,
in *Andean Archaeology*, ed. H. Silverman, 51-76. Oxford: Blackwell Press.

Landerman, Peter N. 1991

Quechua Dialects and their Classification (Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA).
Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I. Dissertation Services.

Lumbreras, L. G. 1974

The Peoples and Cultures of Ancient Perú, trans. B.J. Meggars. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

McEvedy, C. 1992

The Penguin Atlas of Medieval History. London: Penguin.

McEwan, G.F. 1991

Investigations at the Pikillacta site: a provincial Huari centre in the Valley of Cuzco,
in *Huari Administrative Structure*, eds. W.H. Isbell and G.F. McEwan, 93-120. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks.

Menzel, D. 1967

Style and Time in the Middle Horizon,
in *Peruvian Archaeology: Selected Readings*, eds. J.H. Rowe and D. Menzel, 146-164. Palo Alto: Peek.

Mogrovejo, J. and R. Sugura. 2001

El Horizonte Medio en el conjunto arquitectónico Julio C. Tello de Cajamarquilla, ,
in *Huari y Tiwanaku: Modelos vs. Evidencias*, 565-582. *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 4 (Lima).

Moseley, M.E., R.A. Feldman, P.S. Goldstein and L. Watanabe. 1991

Colonies and conquest: Tiahuanaco and Huari in Moquegua,
in *Huari Administrative Structure*, eds. W.H. Isbell and G.F. McEwan, 121-140. Washington: Dumbarton
Oaks.

Ostler, Nicholas. 2005

Empires of the Word: A Language History of the World. London: Harper Collins.

Pearsall, D. 2008

Plant domestication and the shift to agriculture in the Andes,
in *Handbook of South American Archaeology*, eds. H. Silverman and W.H. Isbell, 105-20. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Pozorski, S. and T. Pozorski. 1987

Early Settlement and Subsistence in the Casma Valley, Peru. Univ. of Iowa Press.

Rice, D.S. 1993

The status of Latin American horizons,
in *Latin American Horizons* ed. D.S. Rice, 357-64. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks.

Rowe, J.H. 1956

Archaeological explorations in southern Peru, 1954-55. *American Antiquity* 22: 120-137.

Schreiber, K.J. 1992

Wari Imperialism in Middle Horizon Peru. Anthropological Papers 87. University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology (Ann Arbor).

Schreiber, K.J. 2001

Los wari en su contexto local: Nasca y Sondondo,
in *Huari y Tiwanaku: Modelos vs. Evidencias*, 425-448. *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 4 (Lima).

Shady, R. 1982

La cultura Nievería y la interacción social en el mundo andino en la época Huari. *Arqueológicas* 19: 5-108.

Shady, R. 1989

Cambios significativos ocurridos en el mundo andino durante el Horizonte Medio,
in *The Nature of Wari: a Reappraisal of the Middle Horizon*. BAR International Series 525: 1-22.

J.R. Topic and T.L. Topic. 2001

Hacia la comprensión del fenómeno huari: una perspectiva norteña,
in *Huari y Tiwanaku: Modelos vs. Evidencias*, 181-218. *Boletín de Arqueología PUCP* 4 (Lima).

Taylor, Gerald. 1984a

Yauyos, un microcosmo dialectal quechua,
Revista Andina 3, 121-46. Lima: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Taylor, Gerald. 1984b

Estudios de dialectología quechua (Chachapoyas, Ferreñafe, Yauyos).
Chosica - Lima: Universidad Nacional de Educación.

Torero, Alfredo. 1964

Los dialectos quechuas,
Anales Científicos de la Universidad Agraria 2, 446-76.

Torero, Alfredo. 2002

Idiomas de los Andes - Lingüística e Historia.
Lima: Editorial Horizonte / Institut Français des Études Andines.

Tung, T.A. and B. Owen. 2008

Violence and rural lifeways at two peripheral Wari sites in the Majes Valley of southern Peru,
in *Andean Archaeology III: North and South*, eds. W.H. Isbell and H. Silverman, 435-467. New York: Springer.

Willey, G.R. 1951

The Chavin problem: a review and critique. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 7: 103-144.

Willey, G.R. 1999

Styles and State Formations. *Latin American Antiquity* 10: 86-90.

Williams, P.R. and D.J. Nash. 2002

Imperial interaction in the Andes: Huari and Tiwanaku at Cerro Baúl,
in *Andean Archaeology I: Variations in Sociopolitical Organization*, eds. W.H. Isbell and H. Silverman, 243-266.
New York: Plenum.

Williams, P.R. 2001

Cerro Baúl: a Wari centre on the Tiwanaku frontier. *Latin American Antiquity* 12: 67 -83.