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Mapuche ceremonial landscape, social recruitment and resource rights

Tom D. Dillehay

Recent theoretical trends emphasize models that integrate different variables in explaining the rise of monumentalism. Some models view monuments as a function of increased social and economic stratification (Friedman 1975; Renfrew 1979; Shennan 1982) and of land claims and territorial markers (Renfrew 1976). Others relate to it justifying elite control over primary resources during times of economic stress (Chapman 1981) or to super-active symbolic systems legitimizing internal social strategies (Shennan 1982; Shanks and Tilley 1982; Hodder 1982). In essence, for these and other models (e.g. Rowe 1963; Schaedel 1951, 1972; Willey 1962; Wright and Johnson 1975), monumentalism is an elite theme, more often reduced to accentuated social hierarchy and elite control of surplus non-elite labour (Kaplan 1963; Moseley 1985; Renfrew 1973) than presented as the outcome of processes that are characteristic of the changing relations and strategies between different social groups. Most models do recognize intergroup relations and class distinctions among a number of different social forms, but they do not account for the intricate social and ideological mechanisms that produce different monuments through time and space. It is only when we consider the concept, building, use, abandonment, and variability of monuments and their relation to the general population that we are forced to account for other kinds of relations, which link specific social forms to the production of monuments and determine their design, size, location, and function with respect to religious and economic institutions, as well as to technological and environmental conditions. In order to understand these relations we must study local social networks or groupings – groupings whose properties can be identified and given meaning through time and space. We must also discover and explain the kinds of linkages and strategies that bring groups together and recombine them to form more complex groupings.

The objective of this paper is to present the major findings of an ethnoarchaeological study of the changing social groupings which produced and distributed a variety of historic and contemporary ceremonial monuments in the predominantly agricultural Mapuche society of south-central Chile (Fig. 1). In this context, we have the opportunity to examine monuments as public architecture in an incipient form of development and organization, and to weigh the significance of the social and environmental variables that created them. These variables are the organization of patri-lineages and public ceremony, the regulation of marriage, residence and land use rights, and the social and territorial stability of local corporate ceremonial groups. In this paper I will focus almost exclusively on the spatial...
Figure 1. Location map of study area showing the major river valleys and areas of mound concentration.
and architectural expressions of these variables on the intra-site and inter-site levels of analysis. Due to limitations of space, I will not discuss artifact assemblages and attributes. It is hoped that this approach will provide useful correlations between specific kinds of activities and social organization and specific architectural forms and configurations.

Three other matters deserve brief emphasis. First, as background material, the Mapuche reside in a cool, temperate rainforest. Although little is known of the past millennium, archaeological and ethnohistorical evidence suggest that they lived in scattered, loosely organized communities operating on a ‘chieftain’ level of society (Steward and Faron 1959; Dillehay 1981, 1990), ranging from 500 to 8,000 members in size. Since at least the late 1400s, the Mapuche have engaged in long-term sporadic warfare, first with the Inca and later with the Spanish and Chilean governments. At the turn of the present century, the Mapuche were pacified and since have been increasingly integrated into the Chilean Republic through the establishment of reservation territories. In spite of this contact, several areas maintain much of their traditional lifestyle, especially their religious practices.

Second, many religious and architectural features of the proto-Mapuche and Mapuche societies represent aspects of an Andean–Amazonian Formative process (e.g. incipient agriculture and village formation) that began much earlier in areas further north. A comparative study between these areas is necessary to better understand the long-term prehispanic forces that influenced the appearance of ceremonial architecture in the Mapuche area. In this paper I will focus only on monumentalism in its south Andean context as revealed in sixteenth through nineteenth-century historical documentation (e.g. Coña 1973; Doseyko 1971; Gongora de Marinalejo 1969; Guevarra 1898, 1913; Housse 1940; Latcham 1915; Marino de Lovera 1970; Najera 1971; Ovalle 1972; Rosales 1972; Smith 1938), in the ‘memory culture’ of present-day elder informants (Dillehay 1986), and in archaeological and ethnographic research on the ceremonial and social vestiges of the traditional Mapuche society that survive today. I make no presumption that the model presented here is without limitations or that it is relevant to all recent time periods and to all situations. Insights into earlier periods are severely hampered by the lack of archaeological research on proto-historic and historic settlement patterns and architectural complexes. The absence of this evidence also makes it difficult to infer origins and long-term trajectories of social change, and to compare and contrast these findings with other archaeological cultures.

And third, the basic source of this study is my long-term research concerning change and development of social and religious forms in Mapuche society (Dillehay 1976, 1981, 1986, 1987, 1990; Dillehay and Gordon 1977). As part of this research, my colleagues and I have examined how regionally standardized ceremonial sites and symbols and objects of group identity have evolved and spread across the social and physical landscape by means of the exchange of women and goods and the sublimation of patrilineal groups linked through participation in public ceremony and through competition over access to primary agricultural land and other resources (e.g. forest bearing pinon nuts, fishing territories, mineral deposits). Monuments come into play through the recruitment of trade and marriage partners, the legitimization of land claims by local lineages and the regulation of access of ‘in-married outsiders’ to land use inheritance rights, and the role of chiefly authority (Dillehay 1987).
Chiefs (lonko) regulate these affairs largely through participation in public ceremony. A chief’s authority is not based on his ability to accumulate wealth, but on his ability to regulate its redistribution through ceremony and marriage alliance, and to serve as steward of lineage land use inheritance rights. What obedience he commands is derived from his genealogical position and from his ability to persuade people to follow his commands. A chief generally has no control over the affairs of lineages other than his own, except during public ceremony.

Another type of authority lies in shamanism (machi). This authority resides in the monopoly of historical, genealogical and ancestral knowledge, particularly the rules (admapu) of alliance that hold groups together.

Rules of alliance are important because, as wife-givers and wife-receivers, patri-lineages are involved in local and non-local genealogical links of marriage and trade-exchange relations (Faron 1962; Dillehay 1987). Through land inheritance rights, lineages may lose wealth with every woman who marries in, and gain wealth from every woman who marries out. Lineages must regulate marriage transactions and land-use rights in order to exclude undesirable outsiders (women and their consanguinal relatives from less wealthy or prestigious lineages). Outsiders not only threaten the social integrity and economic stability of a lineage, but also the authority of its chief. Few outsiders give allegiance to a chief of a local descent group, which can erode his power base and make it difficult for him to schedule and co-ordinate corporate projects. Outsiders may also create internal conflict by practising sorcery (Faron 1964).

I will now turn to a definition of Mapuche ceremonial monuments, and then present a synopsis of the historical and ethnographic findings discussing the factors which, I think, led to monument building and variability.

Ceremonial landscapes and monuments

For the purpose of this paper, I employ the term ceremonial landscape, meaning here culturally built and naturally occurring features (sacred streams and hills) and space which the Mapuche associate with historically significant places in their environment. Ceremonial landscape can be constituted by a single dance plaza and burial mound; by architecturally empty sacred land; by wooden statues of ancestors that serve as territorial markers; by road networks; or by a suite of functionally and historically related earthen mounds and in-between spaces that represent different use stages and life histories.

Mapuche monuments are permanent ceremonial fields and earthen mounds where public activities are spatially located and anchored, and where kinship and other lineage relations are historically and continuously formed. As viable social places, these monuments do not just emerge temporarily out of a local group, go out of use, collapse, and, after their abandonment, become part of past lineage history. They contribute to local history in a specific spatial and temporal context through the perpetual and intergenerational creation and utility of particular geographical and ceremonial locations. Participation in group activities at these locations leads to the reinforcement of pan-Mapuche social, economic, and religious institutions (e.g. alliances, public ceremony, ancestral worship). This, in turn, results in the emergence and persistence of lineage-
specific historical and social contexts at the same time that it contributes to an uninterrupted development of Mapuche architectural ideology that is etched across the landscape in the form of fields and mounds. The material and spatial continuity of this architecture and of the ceremonial activity associated with it are vital to the social and cultural persistence of lineages because it contributes to the integration and continuity of these institutions.

Ceremonialism and public architecture

The Mapuche engage in more than twenty different ceremonies ranging from the linear-level rucatun (house construction), awn (burial), and cueltun (mound construction) rites to the multi-lineage ňguillatun (fertility) rite. Although all ceremonies have some overlapping religious themes, each is associated with a different function, place, and activity. I will discuss only the ňguillatun, awn, and cueltun rites since they most directly relate to the construction and distribution of mounds and public ceremonial fields.

Ťguillatun

The main form of local and regional identification and unification is the large religious ceremony, the ňguillatun, which brings together a ritual community (ranging between 300 to 8,000 members) of three or more consanguinously related and residentially contiguous corporate-lineages (trokinche) to propitiate ancestors, to worship gods and celestial beings, to maintain and recruit marriage and trade alliances, and, in past times, to pray for, or celebrate, victory in battle.

The ňguillatun is a four to six day event usually held twice a year, around the planting and harvesting seasons. It is planned by three co-hosting chiefs who are heads of spatially adjoined lineages (Fig. 2), often referred to as a trokinche unit (Faron 1964). These lineages cyclically rotate the responsibility of hosting the event at a shared ceremonial field, which locks them into a public ritual focused on local agricultural activity and the re-enforcement of alliances and non-kin relations. Potential marriage partners and trade partners, who are non-affines from nearby and distant areas, are invited by chiefs or by household members (but with the chief’s approval) to participate in ceremony. Lineage members are invited to several different ceremonies each year, as a member of their own lineage and as an outsider. It is the participation of members in different ceremonies throughout the year that creates interlocking and perduring local and regional networks of individual and lineage relations independent of a centralized authoritative system.

Although sixteenth-century historical documentation mentions large religious ceremonies, it is not known when the ňguillatun ceremony began in the past nor how many ancient ceremonial fields exist. Today, ňguillatun fields exist in all communities and are standardized in form and activity structure. The larger, more numerous fields are concentrated in the river valleys and adjoining hills where the population density is highest. The less populated coastal and highland areas have fewer and smaller fields, and they have become less standardized because they are not in the mainstream of activity.

Fields are permanently designated sacred spaces ranging in size from approximately
60m to 500m in length, depending upon the number and size of participating lineages and invited persons. All fields are orientated to the east. I have estimated that there are at least 150 to 200 active fields in the region today serving a population of 150,000 to 200,000 people. Ceremonies are attended by as few as 150 and as many as 6,000 to 8,000 individuals.

The layout of a typical field is a semi-circle or U-shape, formed by individual family huts (rukas). The centre of the field is defined by a llangi-llangi altar where sacrificial animals and special goods are placed during ceremony and where shamans perform ritual acts. The residential pattern of lineages and family households in the U-shaped field is the key to understanding the integrative aspects of ceremony and of local and regional social groups. This pattern is a contraction or microcosm of the actual domestic household settlement pattern of local lineages (Fig. 3). Each lineage occupies a designated section of contiguous huts along one side of the field and each family lives in a permanent hut space. Those families from lineages located in the northern sector of the community reside along the north side, while those from the western sector situate along the west side, and so on. The amount of residential space occupied by a lineage is determined by its relative population size and the number of persons it invited. The east end of the field is always open and usually faces a stream or lake.
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Figure 3 Corresponding seating and settlement patterns of households and lineages of a trokínche unit in a U-shaped ceremonial field.
Although Mapuche lands are spatially restricted today, ceremonial fields are still created, expanded in space, and standardized in form in a few areas. The traditional process of expansion is by demographic fragmentation or by sublimation of the male line of descent. Larger and wealthier lineages may also expand public ceremony through alliance-building with neighbouring groups or fragmented lineages. In the past, warfare, shifting slash-and-burn agricultural settlements, and long distance migration also created new kinds of social groupings (Faron 1962; Stuchlik 1976).

The end result of these processes is a local and regional integrative pattern of kin-related ceremonial fields; that is, a genealogically ordered network, or family suite, of sites with related spatial, architectural, and symbolic features (the latter the design motifs on the llangi-llangi). Although each field maintains a pan-Mapuche character (e.g. U-shape, opening to the east, altar), as time passes and as fields contract or expand as a result of the gain or loss of membership due to demographic expansion or fragmentation, internal and external conflict, or political marriage, they may eventually develop their own lineage-specific social, demographic, and geographic life history and form. The most dramatic changes occur in the size of the field and in the number and type of lineage markers on altars, textiles, and other objects (Dillehay 1987).

In summary, inter-lineage integration results not only from a hierarchical or genealogical ordering of ceremonies, ceremonial fields and communities, but from individual households, fields and settlements having cross-cutting participation in different nguillatuns and membership in communities through marriage exchange and trade. It is important to understand the cross-cutting nature of public ceremony and social organization because it accounts for the numerous standardized U-shaped ceremonial fields and religious practices and symbols. Only by having standardized fields, religious beliefs, rules and practices, can the whole system overlap and persist in a non-centralized political context. Within this system, chiefs provide recruitment and regulation of marriage alliances and scheduling of ceremonial and other lineage-specific public events. Shamans complement these functions by monopolizing historical and social knowledge of multi-lineage alliances and by promoting pan-Mapuche ideological and religious beliefs.

Awn and Cuelun

The nguillatun ceremony is multi-lineage, exists in all traditional communities, and is more concerned with relations between pan-Mapuche deities and ancestors and the living. The awn funeral and the cuelun, on the other hand, are lineage-specific, closed to outsiders, and shared rituals that link the dead chief, his relatives, and local ancestors. While nguillatuns take place at large ceremonial fields, the awn and cuelun are performed at small tomb (eltun) sites.

Mapuche tombs may take several forms, including burial urns, canoes, stone-slab coffins, log chambers, and earthen burial mounds. Mounds are associated only with the interment of special chiefs, shamans (macht), and wealthy men (ulmen). The Mapuche name for mounds is cuel, meaning a rise or to lift.

Since no systematic archaeological survey has ever focused on the mounds, little can be said about their exact number and distribution. None the less, enough information is available (Gordon 1985, personal communication; Latcham 1926; Dillehay 1986) to
estimate that no more than 100 to 150 prehistoric and historic mounds exist in an area approximately 30,000 square km in size. Most mounds are situated on low bluff tops overlooking large fertile river valleys. These structures occur as isolates or as clusters. A typical cluster consists of eight to twelve mounds, with an average size of about 20m in diameter and 5m in height. The largest are about 12m in height and 35m in diameter. Mounds appear in various forms. Most often, they are elliptical or conical in design, although a few semi-rectangular forms are present. One actively used mound (*nache-cuel*, meaning the bloodletting mound) in the Lumaco Valley is built on top of a low earthen platform structure located in the base of a *ñguillatun* field (Fig. 7). This is the only site I know where this type of architectural and ceremonial integration and complexity occurs. Special attention will be given to this site later.

Archaeological and ethnographic data suggest that mound-building is quickly approaching the end of its battleship-curved history, a history that probably began in the twelfth or thirteenth century AD and survives today in one area of the Lumaco Valley. Of particular interest is the continued use of mounds in the present-day *cueltun* curatorial rite, and the ‘memory culture’ shamans and elders have of their functions. Enough ethnographic information has been gathered to reconstruct the use of mounds and to infer their broader social and religious meaning.

Several mound clusters and isolates exist in the Lumaco Valley. The largest cluster is characterized by fourteen individual or paired mounds arranged in an archipelago-like fashion along a low line of bluffs bordering the floodplain (Fig. 4). Oral tradition, surface ceramics, and genealogical accounts of the named chiefs and other persons reportedly buried in these mounds suggest that their construction began 300 to 400 years ago, and that their clustering represents a local dynasty of dead chiefs who once ruled over a single patrilineage (e.g. Colipi). (Since no mounds have been systematically excavated, we cannot determine if they contain single or multiple burials, although both are mentioned by informants.) The largest mounds are located to the north and appear to be the oldest. The younger mounds are located to the south, including the *nache-cuel* site.

On the basis of ethnographic interviews (Dillehay 1986) and historic documents (Houssé 1940: 320–33; Jeronimo de Quiroga 1979: 293; Piñeda y Bascuñan 1973; Coña 1973: 395–415; Truettter 1861), we can reconstruct four sequential phases of mound construction, curation, and abandonment. First, the deceased is placed in a shallow *elten* grave and covered with soil. Second, after one year, the grave becomes lineage architectural property and is maintained and eventually built up by periodic soil capping, or *cueltun*, rites. These rites are administered by a corporate social group, headed by a shaman and made up of all the chief’s consanguineal and affinal relatives. During this rite, shamans and relatives dance around the tomb, perform animal sacrifice and bloodletting rituals on it, and cap it with soil layers to symbolically lift the spirit of the corpse into the upper world (*wenu mapu*) of the ancestors. All of these activities sustain links between the living and the dead and transform the chief into an authentic ancestor. Third, upon the death of the next lineage ruler, or successor of the interred chief, the *awn-cueltun* cycle is repeated at a new grave site. This site is located a few hundred metres in distance from the ‘old’ mound of the preceding dead chief. (It is not understood why periodic soil capping rites occur and why mounds are spaced so far apart along the bluffline, although paired and closely spaced mounds exist (see Fig. 5). Local lineages have historically expanded south
Figure 4  Location of the cluster of mounds in the Lumaco area.
along the Puren River. Perhaps the north to south and older to younger trending Lumaco mounds reflect this pattern.) Upon abandonment, the old mound becomes a public historic monument and joins the growing family, or suite, of earthen structures stretching along the bluffs. This sequential construction of mounds continues as long as the local patrilineage is politically secure and territorially stable in the same area. And fourth, in areas where the original mound-building lineage has been uprooted and separated from its homeland by population displacement, assimilation, warfare, or other means, old, abandoned mounds simply become sacred architectural memorabilia to new occupants.

It also is noteworthy that there seems to be little, if any, correlation between the size of a mound and the political power of its interred chief. Instead, mound size and growth seem to be related to the duration of office of a dead chief’s successor and to the number of relatives participating in capping episodes during this period. One elder informant reports that capping rites took place every four to eight years. If this is true, then, hypothetically speaking, a lengthy period of chiefly rule would result in more layering rites and in greater vertical accretion of a dead chief’s mound; and, vice versa, a shorter term would build a smaller structure. It also is reported that during a capping rite every adult relative is obligated to place one container (e.g. basket, bottle, bucket) of soil on a mound. If so, the
size of an individual layer is also determined by the size of the dead chief’s kin base. (These findings make some sense because we know from written records (see Bengoa 1985) that the Lumaco chiefs often held political office for thirty to forty years, and they had polygynous marriages and exceptionally large extended kin groups.) Lastly, horizontal accretion, or mound clustering, results from the sequential construction of individual mounds for dead chiefs of a territorially stable dynastic patrilineage.

While these factors may determine the actual size of individual mounds, they are not the primary variables that led to mound building, which is the next topic of discussion.

**Primary conditions for monument building**

So far, I have presented ethnographic and archaeological information on the form and function of ceremonies and ceremonial monuments, and the kinds of social systems associated with them. I will now attempt to infer and correlate specific social forms and their spatial and architectural expressions with four necessary conditions which, I think, led to monument-building over the past three to four hundred years in the study area. (For a more detailed discussion of these conditions, see Dillehay 1987).

The first necessary condition is that a contiguous assemblage of interacting lineages must possess stable kinship links. (I do not refer to a sedentary agricultural lifeway, but to the establishment of social continuity and the sedimentation of specific lineages within an extended network of territorially-fixed and residentially contiguous corporate kin groups that form co-hosting *trokincbe* units at ceremonial fields; they must also interact on a regular and predictable basis.) Ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological data suggest that in the specific areas where mounds and mound clusters exist, patri-lineages have not been uprooted by the kinds of internal and external forces described earlier. This does not mean that these lineages were not exposed to any disruptive forces, but, if they were, they probably were not for a sufficient period of time or with sufficient intensity to break up local institutions. Groups establishing perduring social and trade-exchange relations in a fixed territory, especially in the more productive fertile river valleys, managed to compete successfully with other stable, contiguous groups for resources and partners, and eventually developed land claims through chiefly burial in lineage-owned tombs and through the participation in *ñguillatu*n ceremony. Only ceremonial fields are associated with this condition. (As an aside, I should note that the reservation system of this century has accelerated this whole process by legally forcing groups to settle down in one area.)

Second, once that condition is met, lineages must secure their land use rights by regulating marriage alliances while, at the same time, making economic gains through strategically placed out-married women. If regulated advantageously, marriage alliances can protect one’s own land and be conducive to far-reaching geographical and genealogical links of marriage, exchange, and dominance. If not, lineages may lose their integrity as a descent group, and fragment. As a result, local ceremonial fields may expand, contract, or disappear.

Third, as a result of the first two conditions, a greater number of affines and non-affines are added to local groups, possibly leading to the erosion of local chiefly authority and forcing lineages to validate claims to land use rights. Lineage claims are legitimized 1) by
referring to long-term occupation in a particular area; 2) by marking territories with lineage architecture (e.g. mounds, earthworks, wooden statues, and other features); and 3) by transforming chiefs from land stewards to land patrons, and upon their death, from local lineage ancestors to special regional ancestors. When chiefs are recognized as patrons of land and as special ancestors, they represent a gentry level of society that links lower ranking lineage members with higher ranking ancestors through the shared ſiguillatun, awn, and cueltun ceremonies. Mound building is associated with this condition.

And fourth, as more non-agnates join the ceremony and marry into a local kin group, there is a greater need for knowledge of the rules of alliance-building and historical relations between local and non-local groups, and between ancestors of both. Although a local chief may have knowledge of the affairs of his own group, he usually knows little or nothing about broader cross-cutting linkages and relations among groups, or about pan-Mapuche ancestral affairs. Shamans, who control this type of knowledge, come into play here. They legitimize a local chief’s power by affirming his genealogical position and his claim to land in the name of his lineage (Dillehay 1985).

On the whole, mound building is a vital process to lineage identity, because it contributes to the continuity of local social groups and institutions. This continuity does not rest merely on the persistence of formal rules, norms, and regulations that perpetuate a particular patrilineage or a trokinche group of related lineages. It also depends 1) upon a dynastic succession of chiefs and ceremonial fields and mounds located at key places across the landscape whereby lineages interact periodically; 2) upon the physical memory and traces of previous religious experiences and relations between the living and the dead; and 3) upon the knowledge employed by individuals, chiefs and shamans when they reconstitute the practices and social relations layered into mounds and ceremonial fields.

It is also important to emphasize that the scant presence of mounds in the region suggests that there were very few times and places throughout the late prehistoric and historic periods when these conditions actually crystallized. It also suggests that mound building apparently did not occur during the first or second generation of chiefs; if so, we would find mounds in all areas. Where isolated mounds or small clusters are found, individual chiefdoms were probably relatively short-lived, perhaps lasting no more than a few decades. For reasons that I cannot detail here, mounds appear to have evolved during the reign of the third, fourth and later chiefs, suggesting that a generational (and possibly a demographic) threshold was reached before these conditions were met and triggered monumentalism. In a few areas (like Lumaco), where mound clusters exist, dynastic chiefdoms probably endured for no more than 300 to 400 years.

Synchronization of ceremonial forms and paramount chiefs

My last topic of discussion is the previously mentioned naché-cuel site where a platform mound and ceremonial field are spatially and functionally integrated (Figs 6 and 7). The architectural distinctiveness of this site indicates that it is related to activities different from those in other areas. The platform mound is the fourteenth, or last, structure in the Lumaco cluster. It was built near the turn of the last century and is still in use today. This mound is uniquely important because it is the only one I know where 1) a ſiguillatun field
was built around it; 2) the ñuillatun, awn, and cuelum rites and their associated architectural components were integrated; and 3) a succession of paramount chiefs of one lineage has emerged to administer the annual ñuillatun, instead of the traditional three co-hosting chiefs of a corporate ceremonial trokinche group; it also regulates non-ceremonial events (e.g. harvest, sport events, road building) involving members of local and non-local groups.

What is the reason for the complexity of this site and for the emergence of a centralized dynastic chieftomship? I think that the answer to this question lies in the previously discussed conditions that led to the rise of dynastic patrilineages, as manifested architecturally by mound clusters. Moreover there was another condition that distinguished the Lumaco area from others and gave it the political clout to transcend the constraints of its own descent group; it was able successfully to extend its domain of influence over non-affines beyond its own territory, and to negotiate larger aggregations of people in ceremony and the exchange of goods and services. This leverage was gained by controlling two highly valued and integrated commodities that were, and still are, much in demand – time and the scheduling of public events. I will elaborate briefly.
The Mapuche live in a cool, humid environment that limits the agricultural production cycle to a six month period. This is also the time span when most ceremonies take place, including the *nqueñuilan* to coincide with planting and harvesting. Participating in both public and private ceremonies is very time consuming. (Our figures show that adults average about thirty-one days during the six month agricultural cycle preparing for, participating in, or travelling to and from ceremonies.) In the past, ceremonies coincided with warfare, raiding, trade-exchange, and other events. Participation in these events is accentuated even more in larger river valleys where higher population densities are found and where greater numbers of activities take place. If we take all of these events, in which members of more than one lineage participate, and consider them from the viewpoint of sets of relationships which are manipulated and scheduled for the purpose of maintaining reciprocal relations, for the selection of marriage and trade partners, and for decisions about entering an alliance, we see different patterns of participation, around which individuals, families, and lineages are dispersed. Such participation is not possible unless one leader makes decisions about the allocation of time and the assignment of roles.

There is historical evidence from the past century to show that, in this context, strong leaders to local *trokinche* units emerged and gained political leverage by constraining an already socially and environmentally limited cycle of private and public projects. By scheduling major events for people at key ceremonial places, the Lumaco chiefs heightened the period of activity, accentuated scheduling conflicts, created links between landscapes, public projects and different groups, and inhibited and regulated the direction and input of corporate labour. Such scheduling and regulation allowed chiefs to transcend local authority, to regulate the affairs of non-locals, and to base their authority, not so much on genealogical affiliation and power of persuasion, but on jural rights and
obligations tied to tightly scheduled public events and to pan-Mapuche ancestral laws (admapu). By scheduling and regulating local ñguillatuñ, awn, and cueltun ceremonies, the chiefs of one lineage controlled both local and regional opportunities for alliance-making, ancestral worship, trade, and exchange, and appealed to the deities for productive harvests. Such control placed his lineage at a competitive advantage, for it was in a better position to negotiate more potentially productive and secure trade and marriage alliances with desirable non-local groups.

These changes are directly reflected in the multi-ceremonial nache-cuel ceremonial field. The platform mound is located in the base of the U-shaped field, changing the whole complexity and orientation of public ceremony. At other ceremonial sites the llangi-llangi altar in the central plaza is the locus of activity and power; at the nache-cuel site, it is the top of the mound where most activity takes place, including animal sacrifice and bloodletting rites in the name of celestial ancestors and deities. In combination, the U-shape and mound platform are the best design for offsetting principal leaders and their lineage. A commanding view and administrative position are afforded those seated in the base. The dual wings house local and non-local groups and maximize contact and exchange between them.

Lumaco represents a community, not defined by kinship or descent, but by a dynastic patrilineage that derives its identity from public ceremony laid out in a particular configuration, and from a succession of single chief rule, all of which is expressed in the mound cluster and in the form of the nache-cuel site. By controlling the ceremonial itinerary and involving as many groups as possible in as many local and non-local events as possible, it is scheduling and location that formed the basis of a jural corporate grouping in Lumaco, and not just descent and ceremony. This is a simple finding but it seems to have architectural, temporal, and spatial expressions that are important for understanding complex changes in social linkages.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted to explain the kinds of social forms and relations that account for the appearance and spread of ceremonial monuments in the south-central Andes. Much more archaeological and historical work is needed on this model before it can be fully understood and accepted. There are also several questions that need to be answered before archaeologists can recognize and utilize these findings on the assemblage and attribute levels.

Some archaeologists will question the utility of these data as a source of inference about past behaviour from archaeological data outside the south-central Andes. For the inter-site level of analysis presented here, I think that the value of this study is the suggestive ways that different variables and relations interact to produce social groupings and their corresponding public architectural and spatial forms. In reviewing these variables, there is little doubt that environmental diversity, population density, and agricultural potential are important selective factors favouring the special, interdependent, and economic development of more complex social and architectural forms. There also is some evidence to show that a strong correlation exists between monument building,
territorial claims (Renfrew 1973), legitimization of internal social strategies (Shennan 1982; Hodder 1982), especially in regard to the development of particular lineages (Hodder 1982), and centralized scheduling of major public events. Also important is the influence of such historically contingent factors as warfare, kinship sedimentation, and local religious institutions. However, there is no secure correlation between land scarcity, primary agricultural land and monument building. In fact, most large fertile valleys are void of mounds, and some mound clusters even exist in agriculturally marginal areas. Moreover, I cannot argue that the scale of organization and standardization involved in the construction and spread of the U-shaped ceremonial fields was such that they must have depended on a centralized political system. Within the Mapuche system leadership was multi-dimensional and malleable and, depending on the context, often shared with shamans, elders, and other chiefs.
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**Abstract**

*Dillehay, Tom D.*

**Mapuche ceremonial landscape, social recruitment and resource rights**

A summary of the main variables accounting for the construction and distribution of historic and contemporary ceremonial fields and earthen burial mounds in the Mapuche society of Chile is presented. This study reveals that monument building is related to the changing social relations between different groups and to a set of historically contingent factors – i.e., long-term kinship sedimentation, residential contiguity of related lineages, protection of land use rights, and profitable alliance-making and trade-exchange affairs. Increased social and political complexity are achieved by a few local chiefs when they regulate the annual itinerary of multiple ceremonial events at special ceremonial sites. The corresponding spatial and architectural expressions of these relations are discussed, as well as their broader implications.