

The Massa Connection: An Onomastic Link Between the Peruvian North and Far North in a Multidisciplinary Perspective

Matthias Urban

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, The Netherlands

Abstract: Cutting across the linguistic boundaries of the Peruvian Far North and North Coasts, the names of (semi-)mythological and early historical rulers show the same final element *-massa*. This is the case for the ruler implemented in the Lambayeque region, Pongmassa, his son Pallesmassa, and two lords of the Far North Coast, Cutmassa at Sechura and Chilimasa at Tumbes. Ethnohistorians, linguists, and archaeologists have noted subsets of these similarities, and several accounts regarding the nature and origin of these similarities have been made casually. Here, I present an overview of the set of names ending in *-massa*, provide new etymologies for the names of Pongmassa and Pallesmassa, review previous interpretations, and discuss different scenarios that could have resulted in the spread of this element.

Keywords: Onomastics; Peruvian North Coast; Peruvian Far North; Mochica language; Counting Systems.

Resumen: Trascendiendo las fronteras lingüísticas de la Costa Norte y del Extremo Norte del Perú, los nombres de gobernantes (semi-)mitológicos e históricos tempranos muestran el mismo elemento final *-massa*. Este es el caso para Pongmassa y su hijo Pallesmassa, gobernantes instalados en la región de Lambayeque, tanto como para dos nobles de la costa del Extremo Norte, Cutmassa en Sechura y Chilimasa en Tumbes. Etnohistoriadores, lingüistas y arqueólogos han notado subgrupos de estas semejanzas, y de paso se han sugerido varias explicaciones acerca de la naturaleza y del origen de las mismas. En el presente artículo, presento una visión de conjunto de los nombres relevantes, apporto etimologías nuevas para los nombres de Pongmassa y Pallesmassa, reseño interpretaciones anteriores y discuto los diferentes escenarios posibles de la difusión del elemento común *-massa*.

Palabras Clave: Onomástica; Costa Norte del Perú; Extremo Norte del Perú; lengua mochica; sistemas de numeración.



INDIANA 32 (2015): 179-203
ISSN 0341-8642

© Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz

Introduction¹

As far as the prehistory of the Central Andean highlands is concerned, recent years have seen a renewed interest in the interrelation between linguistic and archaeological evidence (Adelaar 2014; Heggarty & Beresford-Jones 2012; Kaulicke et al. 2010). Researchers are questioning theories on behalf of Torero (1975), commonly accepted earlier, regarding the homelands of Quechuan and Aymaran, the nature of the early interaction between the respective proto-languages, and the expansion of the language families. It is now recognized that there is neither a need nor an *a priori* justification for assuming a straightforward one-to-one correspondence between cultures and language (and genetically identifiable ‘peoples’). As summarized e.g. in Heggarty (2014), the new approaches are more dynamic and operate under the general assumption that the same extra-linguistic processes shaped both languages and have left their marks in archaeologically recoverable material culture. Under an approach that does not operate with a static and simplistic ‘language = culture’ equation (and neither under the maxim ‘pots are people’, cf. Quilter 2010), nevertheless, it is necessary to expect mismatches rather than a neat concert of evidence which points towards the same directions.

The coastal languages and cultures have so far played little to no role in the renewed interest in a multidisciplinary history of the Central Andes. Therefore, for the coast, only less elaborate theories are hitherto available, although there is no lack of questions. This certainly has something to do with the much more incomplete information available for the pre-Columbian languages of the coastal areas which makes tracing prehistory through language more difficult. Nevertheless, there *is* linguistic information; and the record of place-names and personal names available for analysis is at least equally rich as in the highlands, where both likewise play an important role.

This article is concerned with evidence from onomastics, the study of personal names, in particular. Against the general background of the renewed interest in the interplay of linguistic and archaeological evidence now under way for the Central Andes, it discusses similarities in the names of indigenous rulers on the Peruvian North and Far North Coasts who lived either before the arrival of the Spanish conquerors, during this time, or shortly thereafter.² The relevant onomastic data are presented in the following section, and the linguistic and archaeological background which reveal signals that are

1 I thank Willem F.H. Adelaar, Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino, Rita Eloranta, Anne-Marie Hocquenghem, Alejandro Diez Hurtado and Jerry D. Moore for discussing aspects of the topic discussed here with me and/or reading previous drafts of this article. They do not necessarily share the views expressed here, nor are they responsible for any shortcomings or errors of fact. This research was funded by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n° 295918.

2 Following convention, the ‘Far North’ or ‘Extreme North Coast’ is used in this article to refer to that stretch of Peru’s coast from the Ecuadorian border to the Sechura desert, while the North Coast is used for the region immediately below to and including the Moche valley.

not easily reconciled with one another, are discussed in the third and fourth sections respectively. An attempt to develop possible historical scenarios that are compatible with the history of the regions is then made in the final evaluation of the evidence in the last section, which weaves the individual threads together.

The onomastic link between Northern and Far Northern Coastal Peru

The probably most well-known names of relevance here figure in Cabello Valboa's *Miscelánea Antártica* (2011: 396). This book is largely an attempt to answer the question of the origin of the Indians, which is why Cabello Valboa was interested in indigenous accounts of their history. In the Lambayeque region, Cabello Valboa was able to record the famous story of Ñaimlap, the mythological founder of Lambayeque. Much literature is concerned with the interpretation of this account (e.g. Donnan 1990, 2011; a discussion of the linguistics of the rulers' names is in Urban & Eloranta in prep.). But Cabello Valboa has more to say: After a flood caused by the last ruler of the Ñaimlap dynasty which sealed its fate, an interregnum followed. The political vacuum was filled when a ruler referred to as Chimo Capac incorporated Lambayeque into his reign by means of his invincible army, and installed outposts in the conquered region. As will become clear later, these events almost certainly reflect the conquest of Lambayeque around 1375 by Chimor, a powerful expansive state of late pre-Hispanic Peru. In Lambayeque itself, Chimo Capac installed a new ruler called Pongmassa, of whom it is explicitly stated that he hailed from Chimor. Pongmassa ruled peacefully, and upon his death was succeeded by his son Pallesmassa. This ruler in turn was succeeded by his son Oxa, during whose rule for the first time news of the Inca expansion arrived. Oxa's son Llempissan was succeeded by Chullumpisan, of whom Cabello Valboa does not say in what, if any, consanguinal relation he stood to Llempissan. Chullumpisan was succeeded not by his son, but by his brother Cipro Marca, and then by another, younger, brother called Fallen Pissan. The final two rulers that are mentioned are called Efquem Pisan and Secfun Pisan, during whose reign the Spaniards arrived in Peru; again, the relationship between these last three rulers is not made explicit.³

If it were possible to interpret this account literally, it would provide a chronology of indigenous rulers spanning several centuries. This would be invaluable information; unfortunately such a literal interpretation is not easy. Working back in time under the assumptions of completeness and unilineal succession to establish a chronology as done e.g. by Kosok (1965) is questionable for the North Coast because of the possibility of succession from brother to brother, compression of the dynasties with canonization of

³ In a 1714 lawsuit, for Fallen Pisan and Efquem Pisan the variants Falempincial and Efuichumbi are attested; also mentioned are further sons of Falempincial: Chalan, Soltanta and Atloc (Vargas Ugarte 1987: 480; 482).

only a subset of rulers, and, more generally, by diarchy rather than monarchy as the principle underlying the distribution of power (Netherly 1990).

Farther to the north, Cutmassa is the first known, possibly mythical, *cacique* of the Sechuran *parcialidad* of Punta. Political organization differed in several ways on the Far North Coast from that on the North Coast. Saliiently, ethnohistoric records mention female rulers referred to as *capullanas*, named by the Spaniards after their distinctive dress (cf. *capuz* 'hood'). According to the reconstruction of the structure of the pre-Columbian polity of Sechura by Diez Hurtado (1988: 24), Punta was the lower-ranking *parcialidad*, subordinated to that of Sechura proper. In early information from *visitas* of the end of the 16th century, the *parcialidad* of Punta is associated with *forasteros*, groups of Indians who have not been born in the community they lived in, but moved there, having been uprooted from their original place of living by the changes brought about by the arrival of the Spanish (cf. Ramírez 1996: 39, 78). Diez Hurtado (1988: 23), however, reports not having found any other colonial document that would corroborate this.

Even further to the north, in Tumbes, close to the border of Ecuador, relevant evidence is found. Tumbes was the first port in Peru at which Francisco Pizarro's expedition that would eventually bring about the downfall the Inca empire landed in 1532. There, Pizarro was met by a *cacique* referred to as Quilimasa by Xerez (1891: 40),⁴ as Chile Masa or Chille Masa by Pizarro (1844: 218), as Chiromaça, Chirimaça, or Chirimasa by Ruiz de Arce (Stoll 2002: 75-76), as Chilimisa by Estete (1987: 286), and as Chilemaza in the anonymous 1534 *Relación Francesa* (Baldinger & Rivarola 1992: 436). A consensus transcription (not necessarily reflecting the historically most accurate pronunciation) would be Chilimasa (cf. Cerrón-Palomino 2008: 157, who suggests an alternation of Chili with Chiri as the restitution of the original form). However, Diego de Trujillo (1968: 19) has a completely distinct name: Cacalami.⁵

The linguistic landscape of the implicated regions is not homogeneous, which is why the presence of the common element *-massa* in the names of Pongmassa, Pallesmassa, Cutmassa, and Chilimasa is so striking. The following section provides the relevant background information on the indigenous languages of Peru's North and Far North Coasts, and then moves on to narrow down possible origins of the shared final element *-massa* in dialogue, and sometimes dispute, with earlier literature.

4 In Xerez (1872: 18), translated by Clements Markham from the second edition of the relación from 1547, the variant Quillimasa appears.

5 This is interesting in itself, but all the more so because this name strongly resembles the indigenous name of the Chira river, which was Turicarami (Xerez 1891: 42). Note that the initial sequence Turic- can be identified with the initial sequence in <turinap> 'sun' and <turuyup> 'river' in the data from the languages of Colan and Catacaos respectively (jointly referred to as Tallán) in Martínez Compañón (1985).

The linguistic point of view

Linguistic background

The region implicated by the distribution of the *-massa* element is far from uniform; rather, there was a mosaic of languages not evidently related to one another in Peru's Far Northern and Northern coastal regions (Cerrón-Palomino 2004; Netherly 2009; Torero 1986). The original indigenous language of Tumbes, before the Inca occupation of the area, is completely unknown. Netherly (2009: 139) speculates that a Tallán-related language may have been spoken there, and that such a language "may have served as a lingua franca in the Gulf of Guayaquil region". Bruhns (1994: 281), on the other hand, states that Tumbes was mainly a Cañari town. This people is known to have spoken another distinct language (Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 395-396).

There were at least two languages spoken in the coastal areas of today's Piura department. One is Tallán, documented in two varieties – one spoken at Colán, the other at Catacaos – in the famous 'plan' containing short samples of the indigenous languages of the diocese of Trujillo by Martínez Compañón (1985). Little can be said about the erstwhile extension of Tallán in a definite manner at the current state of research, although the evidence points to a regional language with limited geographical extent. In historical times, at Sechura a recognizably distinct indigenous language was spoken, conventionally named after the eponymous coastal town. It is likely that this corresponds to the 'Sec' language de la Calancha (1638: 550) mentions, an interpretation receiving additional support from the frequent toponymic ending *-ura /-ora* in this region. Sechura is also very poorly documented, essentially known from Martínez Compañón's 'plan', but also from a separate word-list collected in the 1860s by British botanist Richard Spruce. A facsimile of this list with accompanying analysis is in Urban (2015). From what little material there is, several shared items between Tallán and Sechura can be pointed out which have been interpreted as signs of common descent or intensive language contact (Campbell 2012: 105; Torero 1986: 532).

South of the Sechura desert, in the Lambayeque region, Mochica was spoken. This is the best documented of all languages of the North Coast. Much of what is known about the structure of the language is due to the efforts of de la Carrera Daza's (1644) colonial description, which is evaluated in modern terms by Cerrón-Palomino (1995) and Hovdhaugen (2004). Typologically, Mochica is not part of the linguistic area formed by the languages of the highlands. Instead, it exhibits several unusual features for the area, including a sixth phonological vowel, an elaborate system of numeral classifiers, possessive classification, and a considerably looser morphosyntactic structure than that of the major highland families, Quechua and Aymara. In the late 19th and early 20th century, Mochica was the object of study of various ethnographers, most importantly the Germans Middendorf (1892) and Brüning (2004), whose work results in a more extensive knowledge especially regarding the Mochica lexicon. However, the documentation

of Mochica remains incomplete and sometimes ambiguous. In particular, there is no consensus on the proper phonetic and phonological interpretation of the symbols used by de la Carrera Daza and others (Cerrón-Palomino 1995; Hovdhaugen 2004; Torero 1997). Also, gaps remain in the lexical documentation in spite of the relatively ample amount of available information.

From the Jequetepeque valley southward, yet another language was spoken, which is usually referred to as Quingnam. Until recently, there was not a single linguistic source of Quingnam, apart from a collection of local vocabulary from the Trujillo region that may partially originate from Quingnam and survive in local Spanish (Zevallos Quiñones 1975) and a collection of personal names and placenames (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a, b). This may have changed with the discovery of a short list of numerals from an indigenous language at Magdalena de Cao, i.e. a place where colonial sources indicate Quingnam was spoken, by Quilter et al. (2010). With the exception of that for 'five', which may be a loan, these numerals show no resemblance to those of Mochica, clearly representing a separate language that was not, or only distantly, related to Mochica. The Magdalena de Cao list thus supports the existence of a distinct language south of Mochica, and even though we cannot attain certainty as to what language it describes, the most likely inference is that it exemplifies Quingnam or, if such a thing ever existed, its Pescadora variety. An evaluation of all available sources for Quingnam is found in Urban (in prep.).

Between the Jequetepeque and Chicama valleys there was a narrow zone in which both Mochica and Quingnam were spoken (Cerrón-Palomino 2004: 85-87; Torero 1986: 533-534). Salas García (2010, 2012: 24) argues for the presence of Mochica speakers also in the Moche valley, which he considers to have been bilingual. Netherly (2009: 140), contrary to Salas, argues that the geographical overlap of Mochica and Quingnam "is not a question of bilingualism" and that rather, there were "groups of people speaking either Quingnam or Mochica united in what had been a pre-Inkan political unit". Quingnam's southern limits are unsure. According to de la Calancha (1638), it was spoken as far as Lima (he also notes that some words were 'corrupted' in the southern area, indicating possible dialectal variation), but it is quite possible that Quingnam was never spoken that far south; the issue is discussed in more detail in Salas García (2010: 118-120) and Urban (in prep.).

Analysis

While for the names of the earlier Ñaimlap dynasty some Mochica etymologies can be proposed (Urban & Eloranta in prep.), it is more difficult to link the names associated with the dynasty founded by Pongmassa with the lexical material from the Mochica language to the extent that it is known to us. A good piece of evidence for a presence of Mochica lexical material in the names of the second Lambayeque dynasty, however, concerns the name of Efquem Pisan. The labiodental fricative [f] is a sound supposedly

alien to Quingnam (Torero 1986: 541). In addition, in a 1596 lawsuit on the succession of rulership in the *cacicazgo* of Reque, a Francisco Tintiec from Callanca, allegedly 130 years of age, states (Zevallos Quiñones 1989: 117):

EFQUEM ZUILA era FIL CA que es bocablo yunga y en Castilla quiere decir Señor ... y ... el nombre de EFQUEM ZULA quiere decir chacarero y mozo⁶ de chacaras

Efquem Zuila was Filca, which is a Yunga word and in Spanish says as much as lord ... and ... Efquem Zula's name says as much as laird or youth of the estate ...

The form <efquem> is unknown to the lexical sources. Likewise, a widely recorded Mochica word for 'manor, estate' does not resemble any of the sequences in Efquem Zu(i)la's name. <ef>, however, is the well-attested Mochica word for 'father', and <fixllca> is known to de la Carrera Daza (1644) precisely with the meaning 'caballero' (cf. Middendorf 1892: 58: <fijka> "der Vornehme").⁷ This shows clearly that the 'Yunga' language mentioned here is Mochica. By inference, the identical element in both names, Efquem Pisan and Efquem Zu(i)la, may be a derivative of Mochica <ef> 'father', and hence unambiguously associable with Mochica.⁸ The name Efquem is further attested in the Lambayeque *cacicazgo* of Motupe, and the variants Efquen and Ef Quen occur in the Moro and Collique *cacicazgos* respectively (Zevallos Quiñones 1989: 97, 100, 119); the name Quen is attested at Jayanca in 1540 (Espinoza Soriano 1975: 264). This strengthens its association with the Mochica-speaking area. Likewise, the sequence <zula> recurs in the names Sapquen Zula, Chafu Zula, and Chancum Zula from the *cacicazgo* of Reque (Zevallos Quiñones 1989: 113).

Otherwise, the only explicit claim to associate the Pongmassa dynasty with the Mochica languages pertains precisely to the names of particular interest here: for Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 157), Pongmassa and Pallesmassa consist of <pong> 'stone' and <paxllac> 'lima bean' as they appear in de la Carrera Daza's (1644) grammar respectively, followed by <máca> 'custard apple', attested in Brüning (2004). Literally interpreted, the names Pongmassa and Pallesmassa would thus mean 'stone custardapple' and 'lima bean custardapple' respectively. Even though it is remarkable that two elements in the dynastic names have lookalikes in the lexicon of cultivars of Mochica, I have reservations about Cerrón-Palomino's interpretation. In fact, Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 160) himself does, because the rulers of an intrusive dynasty would have named themselves using the local language (and, we might add, in top of that spread said designation throughout their domain). Salas García (2012: 23), who, again without providing details, says that

6 Rostworowski (1961: 15) reads *majón*.

7 According to Salas García (2012: 59fn7), this is a loanword from Quechua *willka* 'holy'.

8 Another possibility would be that <efquem> is actually a form derived by the passive-causative <-quem> posited by Hovdhaugen (2004: 40) from a root <ef> 'free'. <efquem> would then mean approximately 'to be freed'.

Pongmassa is easily analyzable etymologically through the Mochica language, wonders in the same vein and suggests bilingualism as a possible explanation.

Generally, a very good formal correspondence of parts of a word under etymological scrutiny with lexical items of a certain language, other things being equal, does not necessarily entail that these lexical items are the etymological source of the word. Indeed, there are good examples from the Andes itself where researchers have previously been fooled by such correspondences: a final element *-chuco* or *-chugo* appears in local names of settlements of the Culli-speaking area, which many researchers have identified as Quechua *chuku* ‘hat’, arguing that it is based on the distinctive headdresses worn by different ethnic groups of the Central Andes. Adelaar (1988: 118), however, shows that a much more plausible interpretation is through an otherwise unattested Culli language item meaning ‘earth’, ‘land’, or ‘universe’, on the basis of the local translation of Quechua *pachamama* offered in an Augustinian chronicle being *chucomama*.

Regarding the case of Pongmassa and Pallesmassa in particular, it is first worth noting that there is some debate regarding the age of cultivation of the custard apple in Peru. Pozorski & Pozorski (1997) argue that the cherimoya (*Annona cherimolia*) was unknown in Peru before ca. 1630 AD, and the sister species guanabana (*Annona muricata*) is found only from ca. 1000 AD onwards, and that mainly at Chimú sites. Bonavia et al. (2004), on the other hand, reinforce the position that both were used in pre-Columbian Peru. They publish depictions of a Moche vessel in the shape of a guanabana and a Chimú/Inca vessel in that of a cherimoya. While this is thus not ultimately a challenge for Cerrón-Palomino’s proposal, I believe that an unexpected parallel in the Mochica quantification system, in particular its elaborate and multilayered system of numeral classification, offers a more plausible alternative. In Mochica, numeral classification is done by means of various partially interlocking subsystems (Salas García 2008, 2012: 154-176). One of these consists of a set of classifiers used for counting decimal multiples of various objects. These elements include <pong>, which is used for groups of tens of people, horses, goats, canes, and generally everything which is not money or fruits (de la Carrera Daza 1644: 183; there are other classifiers for other objects), <palæc> for groups of hundred, and <cunô> for thousands (de la Carrera Daza 1644: 184-185). Now, the classifier for tens is formally identical to <pong> ‘stone’ as well as the first element of Pongmassa’s name, and the classifier for hundreds, <palæc>, uncannily resembles <paxllæc> ‘lima bean’ as well as the first constituent of the name of Pongmassa’s successor Pallesmassa. Here, we have a difference in the representation of the lateral, which is <xll> in de la Carrera Daza’s spelling of the word for ‘lima bean’, <l> in that of the classifier, and <ll> in the name of Pallesmassa. <xll> is one of the letter combinations de la Carrera Daza (1644) employs to represent Mochica sounds foreign to European languages. It has been interpreted in various ways: as a voiceless palatal (or postpalatal) lateral (Torero 2002: 318), as [ɬ] (Salas García 2002), as a retroflex

fricative [ʃ] (Hovdhaugen 2004: 13) and as a prepalatal fricative with lateral release [ç̟] (Cerrón-Palomino 1995: 109).

I believe that these threefold similarities are no coincidence. Rather, I propose that the classifiers <pong> and <palæc> are grammaticalized versions of the free nouns <pong> ‘stone’ and <paxllæc> ‘lima bean’, in which case we would here probably be in front of linguistic remnants of an indigenous counting and/or record keeping system in which a small stone was representing a group of tens of certain objects and a lima bean a group of hundreds.⁹ Topic (2003) argues that the so-called u-shaped structures at Chan Chan, with their characteristic niches, served for the purpose of record keeping, with the niches representing kinds of things being counted and objects that would have been put into them indicating their number. Even though we cannot assume that Mochica was the language used for record keeping at Chan Chan, and the comparison is hence only indirect, it is not at all impossible that similar systems were in use in the Lambayeque region and the Moche valley. Under this interpretation, then, the initial elements of Pongmassa and Pallesmassa become interpretable as ‘ten’ and ‘hundred’ respectively.

This account is strongly supported independently by the name of Don Francisco Palarref Cononciq[ue] discussed by Ramírez (2013: 13). This individual ruled the Ferreñafe *cacicazgo* in 1560, and his name is of interest for more than one reason here. Ramírez interprets Cononcique as literally meaning ‘lord of thousand families’, a rank on the second level of the administrative hierarchy. Indeed, <cunô>, as we just have seen, is ‘thousand’, and <çiequic> is a word glossed by de la Carrera as ‘señor’ (with <-ic> being a separatable suffix). About Palarref, Ramírez says that it probably refers to this ruler’s line of descent. Indeed, as we have already seen, <ef> is ‘father’. However, the sequence *Palarr-*, although again differing somewhat in spelling, is by now familiar. If one does not wish to translate this as ‘lima bean father’, one gets ‘father of hundreds’. But what about the formal difference between *Pallar-* as it appears in the name and both <paxllæc> ‘lima bean’ and <palæc> ‘classifier for hundreds’? This is easily explainable, because Mochica makes a grammatical distinction between possessed and non-possessed stems. This manifests itself morphologically in a number of different ways. For one class of nouns, the possessed stem is formed by a suffix <-(V)r> and the non-possessed one by a suffix <-(V)c> (Hovdhaugen 2004: 20; in both cases the capital V indicates a vowel with varying quality). <paxllæc> was one of these nouns. In fact, a form akin to *<paxllær> has been posited by both Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 157fn5) and Salas García (2012: 55) to account for the shape of the form *pallar*, the Peruvian Spanish designation of the lima bean, which they hypothesize to have been borrowed from

9 This would be a system different from the Inca Yupana. Here, apparently different objects could be employed in performing calculations, without a mathematical function associated (cf. Tun 2014). Salas García (2012: 164) suggests a mythological basis for the association between stones and humans.

Mochica via Quechua to Spanish. I believe that in the name of Don Francisco Palarref Cononciq[ue], the sought-after possessed form is now actually attested, albeit in its function as a numeral classifier. It is not surprising for the possessed form to figure here, since indeed the hundreds are grammatically possessed here by Don Francisco Palarref Cononciq[ue]. What this shows is that the proposed relation between noun and classifier must have been still close enough in early colonial times that the classifier was sensitive to different possessive contexts. Essentially, were it not for the slight phonological simplification that the classifier <palæc> underwent in its grammaticalization from <paxllæc> (a common process observable in grammaticalization), i.e. the replacement of a marked sound represented by <xll> by unmarked <l>, there would be no recognizable difference between noun and classifier.¹⁰

Don Francisco Palarref Cononciq[ue] was thus the father of hundreds, and the lord of thousands. If the thousands of whom he was lord were the families of the hundreds he fathered, we would have a multiplication with 10 from one to the next generation. The same mathematical relation obtains between the numbers associated with Pongmassa and his son and successor Pallesmassa.

At any rate, the final element of Pongmassa's and Pallesmassa's names, which is in fact the element they share with the rulers from the Far North, must still be considered. What is the origin of *-massa*? Cerrón-Palomino's (2008: 157) proposal that it is identical with <máça> 'custard apple', still stands. After the reinterpretation of the initial elements, it is not possible, however, to interpret the names as '10 custard apples' and '100 custard apples' respectively, because de la Carrera Daza (1644) explicitly says that <pong> is unsuitable as a classifier for fruits (the appropriate classifier would have been <çyo quixll> [de la Carrera Daza 1644: 186])! This means that either Cerrón-Palomino's original interpretation is accurate and the reinterpretation as numeral classifiers is wrong, or that another etymology for *-massa* must be sought.

10 According to Middendorf (1892: 63, 68), <pong> in the reading of 'stone' was associated with the genitive in <-iό>, but with <-ärō> as a classifier, which would suggest that noun and classifier were clearly distinct entities. Salas García (2002: 102) attributes the form in <-iio> also to de la Carrera Daza, in both readings. However, de la Carrera Daza (1644: 182) clearly has the genitive in <-æro> for the classifier and, as Rita Eloranta informs me in personal communication, also for 'stone', in an untranslated Mochica phrase: <zo çærr eiñ pong, er tæpæreiñ lactung er> (de la Carrera Daza 1644: 118). This would roughly translate as 'I am beaten with a stone, I am whipped with hide (a whip?)' The genesis of the genitive in <-iό> which Middendorf reports remains obscure. He (1892: 52-53) believed to be able to predict the allomorph of the genitive largely from the ending of the noun, with a velar nasal triggering the allomorph <-ei-ō>. However, while there is a correlation, the allomorphy cannot be entirely predicted this way (Hovdhaugen 2004: 22). It is therefore possible that Middendorf overgeneralized. In fact, Middendorf (1892: 68) himself saw the connection between <pong> 'stone' and the numeral classifier clearly.

Since Pongmassa was a ruler implemented by the Chimor in Lambayeque, and since Cabello Valboa explicitly relates that he was a “natural de Chimo”, Quingnam is the most obvious candidate language from which the element may originate. As discussed earlier, the language is virtually undocumented, and a form comparable to *-massa* is not among the traces that the language has left in various sources (Urban in prep.). Therefore, once again, it makes sense to consult the anthroponymic record of the North Coast to assess the further distribution of the ending. The cases of Pongmassa and Pallesmassa aside, the ending is attested at least one more time north of the Moche valley: Chitomayca and Chitoymaca are attested in the early 17th century in the Chicama valley (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a: 32). Another possible case, though formally more dubious, is the head of a group of fishermen named Millamisan at Jayanca, in the Lambayeque region; also a Minimixas or Mynymysas is attested (Espinoza Soriano 1975: 258, 261). It is also possible that the same element can appear initially in names or even in isolation: Masavamo (with variants Masavaman and Masaguaman) is a name attested in the Chicama valley in 1593 (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a: 50), and a Don Francisco Macxanamo, *principal* of Santiago de Cao, is attested as well (Zevallos Quiñones 1992: 71). At Magdalena de Cao, a female named Maxa is attested in 1620, and a Don Francisco Maxaguaman as the principal of Paiján in 1608 (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a: 50-51). One can note that whenever attested in initial position the intervocalic fricative is either transcribed as <x>, bona fide to be interpreted still as [ʃ] at this time, or that the <s> alternates with <x>, whereas in all instances of the element in final position, neither of this is ever the case. While it is well possible that in fact the element had a tendency towards a postalveolar pronunciation in initial position, this fairly consistent difference may also suggest that in fact these are elements to be kept apart. The element is present in the protocol of late 16th-century *visitas* to Cajamarca (Rostworowski & Remy 1987), where people of North Coast origin, betrayed by their Mochica last names containing a labiodental fricative <f>, were present (Rostworowski 1985). However, it would be premature to derive a Mochica affiliation of the element *-massa* from this data, since (i) the diagnostic segment <f> does not co-occur with *-massa* in the Cajamarcan personal names and (ii) it is possible that onomastically less well identifiable coastal groups of different linguistic affiliation were present as well (cf. the place-name San Juan de Chanchan).

Indeed, the evidence also points to the Moche valley: Chinmasa, Chicmasa and Chilmasa are names recorded in Huanchaco, albeit fairly late in the 17th and 18th century respectively (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a: 28, 30). Valladares Huamanchumo (2013: 52) has a consonant-final variant Chicmass, also attested at Huanchaco in the 18th century. Already in the ethnographic present, Gillin (1945: 31) is still able to record the name, as Chilmaza, in the same place (although questioning its provenience from Mochica or ‘Chimu’), and Rodríguez Suy Suy (1997: 54) mentions the same name Chilmaza at Huanchaquito. Most interesting, however, is the case of Juan Chenmaza, of whom it is

known explicitly that he was a “indio tributario” hailing from the village of San Esteban in the Moche valley (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a: 27). The name is attested in 1614.

The appearance of the *-massa* element in the Moche valley requires to seriously consider a non-Mochica origin. I believe that indeed a Quingnam origin for *-massa* is more plausible than seeking its etymological source in Mochica <máça> ‘custard apple’ given the distribution of this final element in geographical space. Considering that Juan Chenmaza is identified in the ethnohistorical record as a tributary Indian, that other ethnohistorically individuals with a name perhaps related to the element held offices, and bearing in mind the analogy between the names of Pongmassa and Pallesmassa and that of Don Francisco Palarref Cononciq[ue], the most appropriate solution for the meaning of *-massa* would be that it was the title of an indigenous lord on one of the middle or lower tiers of the indigenous hierarchy. Pongmassa would then finally be etymologizable as the *massa* of ten, and Pallesmassa as the *massa* of hundreds.

Salas García (2010, 2012: 24) recently argues that there were Mochica speakers as far south as the Moche valley, which is among other circumstantial evidence based on the existence of an irrigation channel in the Moche valley called la Mochica and his conviction that Pongmassa has a Mochica etymology. By this logic, Mochica must have been spoken in the Moche valley, since Cabello Valboa states that Pongmassa hailed from the Moche valley. I do not wish to discard this possibility entirely, but note that according to Espinoza Soriano (1975: 248) there was only a small number of Mochica *mitimæs* at Moche. Clearly, more ethnohistorical work must be carried out to confirm or refute the purported bilingualism of the Moche valley, and to determine with more certainty the numerical strength of Mochica speakers. This uncertainty regarding the presence of Mochica in the Moche valley makes it at present impossible to decide whether *massa* was ultimately a Mochica or a Quingnam title. De la Carrera Daza (1644) provides a great number of equivalents for ‘lord’, which probably reflect, at least in part, roles and/or ranks in the indigenous system of rule on the North Coast (Ramírez 1996). *Massa* may have been one which he did not record. However, a Quingnam origin appears plausible in the light of the completely distinct aspect of the names of the Taycanamo dynasty from whom Ocxaguaman claimed descendancy (see his self-proclaimed genealogy in Zevallos Quiñones 1992: 231-232), which strongly suggests that a language other than Mochica, most likely Quingnam, was spoken by the pre-Inca ruling elites of Chimor (Urban in prep.). Admittedly, Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 160), without committing himself to any analysis, too considers that *-massa* might as well be of Quingnam origin, reopening the possibility that Mochica and Quingnam were dialects of the same language. Importantly, the solution proposed here does not require to undo the important work commenced by Torero (1986), which discarded the possible identity of Mochica and Quingnam, a theory which has become particularly uncomfortable since the publication of Quilter et al. (2010).

Could the element also originate in the Far North? Cutmassa's name is completely unlike the other names of native Sechurans documented amply in the 1572 *Relación* of Bernardino de Loayza (Huertas Vallejos 1995); neither permutation of possible break-ups of the name recurs in other names of the Sechura area. The linguistic distinctiveness of Sechura, mirrored in the personal names, suggest that Chilimassa is a name of foreign origin. While nothing can be said about how the name Chilimassa fit into the linguistic situation at Tumbes, I suspect that it, or at least the ending in *-massa*, is just as foreign there as in Sechura, as indeed the evidence points to an origin to the south, on the North Coast.¹¹

Still another possibility to be considered is an etymology in Quechua. Relevant here is *massa*. According to the oldest available sources, this is a term mainly for an in-law. Santo Tomás (1560: 151) has <massa> 'brother-in-law, brother of husband', González Holguín (1608: 215) <massa> 'brother-in-law'. Indeed, there is some Quechua lexical influence on Mochica (Cerrón-Palomino 1989).

While I believe the above discussion makes some progress in etymologizing the names of Pongmassa and Pallesmassa, it is still unclear what historical factors are behind the spread of the title *massa* to the Far North, and that across linguistic boundaries. The early dates of attestation of the names Cutmassa and Chilimasa, and that Sechura did not suffer major administrative restructuration after conquest (Huertas Vallejos 1995: 97) effectively rules out the possibility of diffusion of this final element under the influence of post-conquest population movements in the wake of the Toledan reforms or other resettlements in historical times, which also clearly took place as revealed both by ethnohistorical information (Huertas Vallejos 1995: 102-104) and anthroponymic evidence such as the names Lachere and Guaylupo, attested early in Sechura and Catacaos (Huertas Vallejos 1995: 135; Ramos Cabredo 1950: 23), in the Moche valley in the 18th century (Zevallos Quiñones 1993a: 42, 46). To approach this question, therefore, what is known about the prehistory of the regions from outside linguistics must finally be taken into consideration.

11 Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 157) suggests that the other constituent of Chilimassa is not Quechua *chiri* 'cold', but Mochica <chelli>, registered by Middendorf (1892) with the meaning 'kraus, uneben'; this would be a borrowing via Quechua from Puna Aimara *chbilli* 'curly, crimpy'. There would thus have been a fully Mochica name at Tumbes, literally 'crimpy custard apple'. However, there is no evidence for Mochica having been spoken that far north. An alternative to this scenario would be either that *Chili-* reflects a word originating from an unknown indigenous language spoken at Tumbes about whose meaning nothing can be said, or, as already discussed, that the name is in fact identical with the well-attested name Chilmaza at Huanchaco.

The archaeological point of view

Peru's North Coast has seen turbulent times in prehistory. Within only few centuries, polities arose, expanded their influence, only to collapse or be conquered by other expanding states soon thereafter. Severe disruptions and upheavals shook the Moche peoples in the sixth and seventh centuries AD, with a variety of possible causes (Bawden 1996). Building artistically and probably religiously on Moche antecedents, the Sicán culture developed in the Lambayeque region from ca. 750 AD onwards. After the collapse of the flourishing Middle Sicán polity (ca. 900-1100 AD), with its capital at Batán Grande in the Lambayeque valley, the successor polity during Late Sicán times (ca. 1000-1375 AD) was centered at Túcume (Shimada 1990, 2000). This was conquered in the early 14th century AD by Chimor, which thus extended the domain of their highly centralized state northwards from the heartland in the Moche valley, where the capital Chan Chan was located (Moore & Mackey 2008). Chimor was the largest polity to have fallen prey to the equally expansive Inca Empire, which intruded the North Coast around 1470, balkanized the Chimor state, and redirected both Chimor's wealth and artisans to their capital at Cuzco. The sons and daughters of people who have witnessed Late Sicán as an independent polity would have found themselves at old age under Inca rule after having spent much of their lives under the aegis of Chimor.

It is so vital to keep the Mochica and Quingnam languages separate because of the possibility that they are associated with the Sicán and Chimor polities respectively. Netherly (2009: 140) suggests that linguistic heterogeneity “go[es] far to explain why the cultural trajectory of Lambaeque [sic!] and Jequetepeque differed even in Moche times from that of the Moche and Chicama valleys and why there was a late Moche center in each region”. For both Sicán and Chimor, there are reasons from the reconstructible linguistic geography of the coast alone to lend some support to this idea (Cerrón-Palomino 1995: 44-45; Espinoza Soriano 1975: 247; Salas García 2008: 106). One may speculate that the overlap of Mochica and Quingnam between the Jequetepeque and Chicama valleys is a result of Chimor's northward expansion, with Quingnam intruding in an originally Mochica-speaking area.¹² Nevertheless, great caution must be exercised in making such inferences, in particular regarding Moche, much farther removed from the earliest observations on the linguistics of the North Coast than either Sicán and Chimor.

According to an anonymous 1604 document (published by Vargas Ugarte 1936), Chimor's expansion proceeded in two stages: the first, due to the ruler Ñançenpinco, extended Chimor's rule to the area between the Jequetepeque and Santa valleys, and

12 The language exemplified in the classical paper on Chimor by Rowe (1948) is not Quingnam, but Mochica, and Rowe's conclusion that Quingnam, “to judge from the few names that are all we have left of it [...] was a dialect of Muchic” (Rowe 1948: 33), is mistaken. This is important because Rowe, at a number of instances, provides Mochica words as possible names for Chimor institutions, and even ventures to provide a rough analysis of the kinship system (1948: 48).

the second from Tumbes to Chillón.¹³ The archaeological evidence fits reasonably well with the anonymous history, although territorial growth may well have proceeded internally by a series of smaller additions rather than by single strokes. In addition, that the expansions were the achievement of one ruler each is impossible, especially as far as the last expansion is concerned (Lange Topic 1990). Concomitantly, this suggests that some of the persons mentioned are more likely “composite figures” (Conrad 1990: 230), to whom feats actually accomplished over a significantly larger time period are attributed in a compressed version of history (Conrad 1990; Moseley 1990). More recently, Hiltunen (1999: 227) suggests to date the Taycanamo dynasty between 1100 and 1470, with 20 to 22 kings having ruled during this period and of which only a subset were canonized as part of the dynastic tradition.¹⁴ On the other hand, there appears to be a common, though not universal, consensus that the closer the events narrated in the dynastic lore come to historically attested times, the closer they reflect actual historical person and events. This point was already made by Kosok (1965: 80), and indeed Lange Topic (1990) considers Chimor rulers from Minchancaman onward as likely historical.

The anonymous history has been very influential in the interpretation of Chimor, and, in fact, must have been used indirectly as background for the interpretation of the appearance of *massa* in the Far North. Diez Hurtado (1988: 27) suggests casually that Cutmassa may be a Chimor-implemented ruler. Indeed, oral traditions of their northern Tallán neighbors has it that the Sechurans were intrusive to the region, having arrived during the period of Chimor control of the region (Cruz Villegas 1982: 54), consistent with the similarity of Cutmassa’s name with those attested in more southerly regions. Similarly, Cerrón-Palomino (2008: 157) suggests that Chilimasa was the descendant of local dynasties originally implemented by the Chimú at Tumbes. Noting the common final element with Pongmassa, the first ruler of the second Lambayequean dynasty implemented by Chimor according to Cabello Valboa, a Chimor origin of the onomastic similarities immediately suggests itself as the most obvious account.

But how does this evidence fit with what is known about Chimor presence in the Far North from archaeology? Generally, the Far North has not received the same amount of archaeological attention as the Lambayeque and Moche regions, so that inferences regarding the nature of the presence of Chimor and other polities originating from the south are frequently based on short-term exploratory research and analysis of ceramic and metal objects rather than dedicated long-term research projects involving extensive excavation (Montenegro Cabrejo 2010: 81). Richardson et al. (1990: 420) note “extensive evidence of Chimor influence in extreme northwestern Peru” after 1400 AD but do not

13 In his 1592 genealogy, Pedro Ocxaguamán claims that it went south as far as Lima (Zevallos Quiñones 1992: 231-232). See Salas García (2010: 118-120) for an overview of further conflicting statements in this regard.

14 Compare also Netherly’s (1990) structural reading of the Taycanamo account.

specify the nature of the Chimor presence (Richardson et al 1990: 439). Hocquenghem (1993) argues for a Chimor occupation at Tumbes, which is assumed to have been the major port where *Spondylus* traders from the north unloaded their precious cargo, and where it would have been worked (Hocquenghem & Peña Ruiz 1994) and distributed to the south onward via a new coastal trade route established by the Sicán at Batán Grande around 900 AD (Hocquenghem 2012). Other accounts (Mackey 2009; Moore & Mackey 2008) point out a lack of archaeological evidence for direct Chimor control in the north beyond the La Leche valley, arguing hence for a more indirect presence that manifested itself through exchange with local elites and trade of artifacts such as *Spondylus* and/or affinity relations.¹⁵ For the Tumbes valley specifically, it is now clear that the center at Cabeza Vaca pertains to the Late Horizon (Moore & Mackey 2008: 796), and Moore (2008) argues on the basis of extensive excavations that the Tumbes valley was never incorporated into the Chimor state (Moore 2008). Thus, archaeology paints a more nuanced picture regarding the Chimor presence on the northern margin. Moore's (2008) negation of Chimor occupation in the Tumbes valley is in fact incompatible with the idea that Chilimasa was a ruler implemented by the Chimú.

In the light of Mochica etyma for the names of the Pongmassa dynasty in Lambayeque, it is important to at least consider an even earlier origin for the distribution of the *-massa* ending. Cultural contacts and exchange between the Far North and the Lambayeque region during Sicán times are well attested: the *paleteada* utilitarian pottery was widespread from Piura to Chicama by Middle Sicán times, and sporadically present even at Moche and Virú. It is suggested that the techniques were imported from the Piura region by (forcibly) migrating individuals (Cleland & Shimada 1998). Cordy-Collins (2001) identifies representations of women with attributes typical for the Far North, such as labrets, head shape and dress, and particular kinds of drums in late Moche and Sicán art. Sicán influence is visible in northernmost Peru in the archaeological record as well (Cárdena, Huapaya & Deza 1991; Guffroy, Kaulicke & Makowski 1989: 132-133; Hocquenghem 2011: 59-64; Richardson et al. 1990: 439), and ceramics in Middle Sicán style were imported as well as made locally with some stylistic differences (Cleland & Shimada 1992: 212; Shimada 2000: 60). Shimada et al. (2004: 372, 384, 386) speak of "dominance" of the Middle Sicán polity from the Chira, and perhaps Tumbes, valleys in the north to Chicama in the south, incorporating several ethnically and linguistically distinct groups, including the Tallanes, from ca 1000 AD. Hocquenghem (2011: 60) interprets objects made from a copper-arsenic alloy found at the cemetery of Reventazón as evidence for a Middle Sicán occupation, who, she says, from their capital at Batán

15 In addition, it is now becoming clear that *Spondylus princeps* in fact does occur in Peruvian waters, the southern boundary of occurrence being located at Cabo Blanco. This calls for a redirection of attention on behalf of archaeologists regarding the possibility of local *Spondylus* production back to Far Northern Peru (Carter 2011).

Grande, controlled the Piura, Chira and Tumbes valleys until 1100 AD. She (2011: 64) posits a regional administrative center, tributary to Batán Grande, from 900 AD onwards at Chinirriche in the lower Piura valley. The presence of the Middle Sicán polity, at least in the Upper Piura valley, appears to have been peaceful and cooperative (Montenegro Cabrejo 2010: 455).

On the basis of the linguistic evidence alone one cannot specify the nature of the interaction between the Far North and North Coast polities, but one can note, independently from other lines of evidence, that they existed. Chilimasa's and Cutmassa's ancestors may have been installed or co-opted into the Sicán or Chimor administrative hierarchy at Tumbes and Sechura respectively, perhaps to control Spondylus trade and/or extraction. This would be a scenario consistent with occupations and control of the respective polities in the Far North. Alternatively, the title *massa*, originating from the languages of the dominant North Coast polities before Inca expansion, may have been adopted by Tumbes and Sechura rulers. This would be consistent with an 'indirect' influence of the North Coast polities in the Far North. Then, the element would still bespeak influence from the North Coast, but not of a direct political nature in the form of implemented rulers, but of a cultural nature. Local rulers may have adopted this designation by free will, imitating nomenclature of North Coast rulers, just like later the names of Chimor rulers show evidence for the intrusion of Quechua material such as the title *guaman*. An analogy that is perhaps useful for this interpretation is that of Caesar (or variants adapted to the phonology of individual languages) as a title in Europe. Originally a Roman cognomen of disputed etymology, it evolved into a title after the de-facto installation of monarchic rule by the bearer of the name, Caius Julius Caesar. We do not know whether *-massa* was at its very origin (part of) a personal name of the North Coast, but the relevant point of analogy is that Caesar became the title of a monarchic ruler (i) in use even long after the demise of the Roman empire and (ii) in areas that were never directly, or even indirectly, by the Romans such as Russia in the form of the *tzar*. The reason was the name's association with ancient cultural grandeur and power that allowed local rulers to place themselves into a cultural tradition perceived as venerable and daunting. Such an interpretation would also be consistent with the date of attestation of Chilimasa and Cutmassa at a time when the area was clearly under Inca control, persisting after the demise of Chimor for a considerable time, as well as with the attestation of a distinct name for Chilimasa by Diego de Trujillo (1968: 19), which may have come from the local language spoken at Tumbes. Even if it were not evidence for a direct occupation of the Far North, the onomastic evidence would be historically significant in showing asymmetric prestige relations between polities of the Far North Coast and those to their south.

Conclusion

In this article, I have shown that the onomastic element *-massa* transcends linguistic boundaries of Peru's Far North and North Coast. Via a new interpretation of the etymologies of the names Pongmassa and Pallesmassa, ethnohistorically known rulers installed by Chimor in the Lambayeque region, I have suggested that *massa* may be a title for an indigenous lord which was adopted by rulers of the Far North Coast, and that this may either reflect occupation of the Sicán and/or Chimor cultures in the Far North or may reflect the prestige associated with them. As archaeological knowledge of the Far North advances, it will become possible to decide between these options. Apart from this, the account provided here can be challenged and refined in many ways. A particular desideratum would be to identify the precise origin of the *-massa* element, both in terms of language as well as of polity. From the linguistic point of view, it could be demonstrated that *-massa* as an element in anthroponyms also occur widely in areas not known to have been under the influence of Sicán or Chimor influence at some point of time. If this is the case far inland, then Quechua etymologies would need to be reconsidered. Another way of falsification, in line with Cerrón-Palomino's (2008) theorizing of a link for *-massa* with Mochica 'custard apple', would be to provide a coherent argumentation for why this meaning should figure in names of individuals at all, and in areas where Mochica was for all we know never spoken.

On a more theoretical level, the case reinforces the idea that linguistic evidence, even if restricted to surviving personal names and in the virtually complete absence of linguistic data proper, can open up a new perspective on late prehistory which is independent of other disciplines, but needs to be interpreted by adducing evidence from other disciplines to become fully informative. As is now generally recognized, multidisciplinary evidence can, but need not converge. It is important to let the evidence from the independent disciplines, and the possible contradictions and conflicting pictures they paint, stand in their own light, without attempting to fit them into the procrustean bed of a unified history where the discrepancies are too great for such a proceeding to be warranted. The mismatch between the presence of titles associated with polities from the North Coast in the Far North and the absence of clear evidence for imperial control of these polities at the relevant locations is a good example of how mismatches between interdisciplinary evidence can be thought of as an indication of more complex scenarios that triggered their existence and as an incentive to theorize these. Against this background, I hope not to have invoked the impression of having provided definite answers to a question that crucially depends on the evolving understanding of the region from archaeology, ethnohistory, and linguistics.

References cited

Adelaar, Willem F. H.

1988 Search for the Culli language. In: Jansen, Maarten, Peter van der Loo & Roswitha Manning (eds.): *Continuity and identity in Native America. Essays in honor of Benedikt Hartmann*. Leiden/New York/København/Köln: E.J. Brill, 111-131.

2014 La historia lingüística andina: una visión canónica en transformación. In: Malvestitti, Marisa & Patricia Dreidemie (eds.): *III Encuentro de Lenguas Indígenas Americanas (ELIA). Libro de actas*. Viedma: Universidad Nacional de Río Negro, 13-21.

Adelaar, Willem F.H. with the collaboration of Pieter C. Muysken

2004 *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baldinger, Kurt & José Luis Rivarola

1992 Nouvelles certaines des Isles du Peru (Lyon 1534). Edición, traducción y notas. *Revista de Filología Española* 72(3/4): 429-454. <<http://revistadefilologiaespañola.revistas.csic.es/index.php/rfe/article/view/578/645>> (15.12.2015).

Bawden, Garth

1996 *The Moche*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bonavia, Duccio, Carlos M. Ochoa, Óscar Tovar S. & Rodolfo Cerrón Palomino

2004 Archaeological evidence of cherimoya (*Annona cherimolia* Mill.) and guanabana (*Annona muricata* L.) in ancient Peru. *Economic Botany* 58(4): 509-522.

Bruhns, Karen Olsen

1994 *Ancient South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brüning, Hans Heinrich

2004 *Mochica Wörterbuch. Diccionario Mochica. Mochica – Castellano / Castellano – Mochica*. Ed. by José Antonio Salas García. Lima: Universidad de San Martín de Porres/Escuela Profesional de Turismo y Hotelería.

Cabello Valboa, Miguel

[1586] 2011 *Miscelánea Antártica*. Ed. by Isaias Lerner. Sevilla: Fundación José Manuel Lara.

Calancha, Antonio de la.

1638 *Coronica moralizada del orden de San Augustin en el Peru, con sucesos egenplares en esta monarquia*. Barcelona: Pedro Lacavalleria.

Campbell, Lyle

2012 Classification of the indigenous languages of South America. In: Campbell, Lyle & Verónica Grondova (eds.): *The indigenous languages of South America: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 59-166.

Cárdenas Martín, Mercedes, Cirilo Huapaya & Jaime Deza

1991 *Arqueología del Macizo de Illescas. Sechura-Piura. Excavaciones en Bayóvar, Nunura, Avic, Reventazón y Chorrillos*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP).

Carrera Daza, Fernando de la

1644 *Arte de la lengua Yunga de los valles del obispado de Truxillo del Peru, con un confessorario, y todas las oraciones Christianas, traducidas en la lengua, y otras cosas*. Lima: Joseph de Contreras.

- Carter, Benjamin P.
 2011 Spondylus in South American prehistory. In: Ifantidis, Fotis & Marianna Nikolaidou (eds.): *Spondylus in prehistory. New data and approaches. Contributions to the archaeology of shell technologies*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 63-89.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo
 1989 Quechua y Mochica: lenguas en contacto. *Lexis* 13(1): 47-68. <<http://revistas.pucp.edu.pe/index.php/lexis/article/download/5371/5370>> (15.12.2015).
 1995 *La lengua de Naymlap (reconstrucción y obsolescencia del Mochica)*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP).
 2004 Lenguas de la costa norte Peruana. In: Estrada Fernández, Zarina, Ana V. Fernández Garay & A. Álvarez González (eds.): *Estudios en lenguas amerindias: Homenaje a Ken L. Hale*. Hermosillo: Unison, 81-105.
 2008 *Voces del Ande. Ensayos sobre onomástica andina*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP).
- Cleland, Kathryn M. & Izumi Shimada
 1992 Sicán bottles: marking time in the Peruvian Bronze Age – a five-part typology and seriation. *Andean Past* 3: 193-235.
 1998 Paletada potters: technology, production sphere, and sub-culture in Ancient Peru. In: Shimada, Izumi (ed.): *Andean ceramics: technology, organization, and approaches*. Philadelphia: Museum Applied Science Center for Archaeology (MASCA)/University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 111-150.
- Conrad, Geoffrey W.
 1990 Farfan, general Pacatnamu, and the dynastic history of Chimor. In: Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The Northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 227-242.
- Cordy-Collins, Alana
 2001 Labretted ladies: foreign women in northern Moche and Lambayeque art. In: Pillsbury, Joanne (ed.): *Moche art and archaeology in ancient Peru*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts/National Gallery of Art, 247-257.
- Cruz Villegas, Jacobo
 1982 *Catac Ccaos. Origen y evolución histórica de Catacaos*. Piura: Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado.
- Diez Hurtado, Alejandro
 1988 *Pueblos y caciques de Piura, siglos XVI y XVII*. Piura: Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado.
- Donnan, Christopher B.
 1990 An assessment of the validity of the Naymlap dynasty. In: Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The Northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 243-274.
 2011 *Chotuna and Chornancap: excavating an ancient Peruvian legend*. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology/University of California, Los Angeles.

- Espinoza Soriano, Waldemar
 1975 El valle de Jayanca y el reino de los Mochica, siglos xv y xvi. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* 4(3-4): 243-274. <<http://www.ifeanet.org/publicaciones/boletines/4%283-4%29/243.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
- Estete, Miguel de.
 [1545] 1987 El descubrimiento y la conquista del Perú (de los papeles del arca de Santa Cruz). Ed. by Miguel Alberto Guérin. In: Salas, Alberto M., Miguel A. Guérin & José Luis Moure (eds.): *Crónicas iniciales de la conquista del Perú*. Buenos Aires: Plus Ultra, 254-319.
- Gillin, John
 1945 *Moche, a Peruvian coastal community*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- González Holguín, Diego
 1608 *Vocabulario de la lengua general de todo el Perú llamada lengua Qquichua, o del Inca*. Ciudad de los Reyes: Francisco del Canto.
- Guffroy, Jean, Peter Kaulicke & Krzysztof Makowski
 1989 La prehistoria del departamento de Piura: estado de los conocimientos y problemática. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* 18(2): 117-142. <<http://www.ifeanet.org/publicaciones/boletines/18%282%29/117.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
- Heggarty, Paul
 2014 Prehistory through language and archaeology. In: Bown, Claire & Bethwyn Evans (eds.): *The Routledge handbook of historical linguistics*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 598-626.
- Heggarty, Paul & David Beresford-Jones (eds.)
 2012 *Archaeology and language in the Andes: A cross-disciplinary exploration of prehistory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press/The British Museum.
- Hiltunen, Juha J.
 1999 *Ancient kings of Peru. The reliability of the chronicle of Fernando de Montesinos; correlating the dynasty lists with current prehistoric periodization in the Andes*. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Hocquenghem, Anne-Marie
 1993 Rutas de entrada del mullu en el extremo norte del Perú. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* 22(3): 701-719. <<http://www.ifeanet.org/publicaciones/boletines/22%283%29/701.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
 2011 A propósito de las investigaciones de Mercedes Cárdenas en el Macizo de Illescas. In: Vetter, Luisa, Sandra Téllez & Rafael Vega-Centeno (eds.): *Arqueología Peruana. Homenaje a Mercedes Cárdenas*. Lima: Instituto Riva Agüero de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP)/ Centro Cultural de la Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (UNMSM), 53-84.
 2012 How did Quechua reach Ecuador? In: Heggarty, Paul & David Beresford-Jones (eds.): *Archaeology and language in the Andes: A cross-disciplinary exploration of prehistory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press/The British Museum, 345-371.
- Hocquenghem, Anne-Marie & Manuel Peña Ruiz
 1994 La talla del material malacológico en Tumbes. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* 23(2): 209-229. <<http://www.ifeanet.org/publicaciones/boletines/23%282%29/209.pdf>> (15.12.2015).

- Hovdhaugen, Even
2004 *Mochica*. München/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Huertas Vallejos, Lorenzo
1995 *Sechura: identidad cultural a través de los siglos*. Sechura: Municipalidad de Sechura.
- Kaulicke, Peter, Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino, Paul Heggarty & David Beresford-Jones (eds.)
2010 *Lenguas y sociedades en el antiguo Perú: hacia un enfoque interdisciplinario*. *Boletín de Arqueología* 14, special issue.
- Kosok, Paul
1965 *Life, land and water in Ancient Peru*. New York: Long Island University Press.
- Lange Topic, Theresa
1990 Territorial expansion and the kingdom of Chimor. Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 177-194.
- Mackey, Carol
2009 Chimú statecraft in the provinces. In: Marcus, Joyce & Patrick Ryan Williams (eds.): *Andean civilization. A tribute to Michael E. Moseley*. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles, 325-349.
- Martínez, Compañón, Baltasar Jaime
[1782-1790] 1985 *Trujillo del Perú en el siglo XVIII*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica.
- Middendorf, Ernst W.
1892 *Das Muchik oder die Chimú-Sprache, mit einer Einleitung über die Culturvölker, die gleichzeitig mit den Inkas und Aymaràs in Südamerika lebten, und einem Anhang über die Chibcha-Sprache*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Montenegro Cabrejo, Jorge Antonio
2010 *Interpreting cultural and sociopolitical landscapes in the Upper Piura valley, Far North Coast of Peru (1100 B.C. - A.D. 1532)*. PhD thesis, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. <<http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1238&context=dissertations>> (15.12.2015).
- Moore, Jerry D.
2008 El Periodo Intermedio Tardío en el Departamento de Tumbes. *Revista del Museo de Antropología, Arqueología e Historia* 10: 155-175.
- Moore, Jerry D. & Carol J. Mackey
2008 The Chimú empire. In: Silverman, Helaine & William H. Isbell (eds.): *Handbook of South American archaeology*. New York: Springer, 783-808.
- Moseley, Michael E.
1990 Structure and history in the dynastic lore of Chimor. In: Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The Northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1-41.

- Netherly, Patricia J.
 1990 Out of many, one: the organization of rule in the North Coast polities. In: Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 461-487.
- 2009 Landscapes as metaphor. Resources, language, and myths of dynastic origin on the Pacific Coast from the Santa Valley (Peru) to Manabí (Ecuador). In: Christie, Jessica Joyce (ed.): *Landscapes of origin in the Americas. Creation narratives linking ancient places and present communities*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 123-152.
- Pizarro, Pedro
 [1571] 1844 Relación del descubrimiento y conquista de los reinos del Perú, y del gobierno y orden que los naturales tenían, y tesoros que en ella se hallaron: y de las demas cosas que en él han subcedido hasta al día de la fecha. In: Fernandez Navarrete, D. Martín, D. Miguel Salvá & D. Pedro Sainz de Baranda (eds.): *Collección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, vol. 5. Madrid: La Viuda de Calero, 201-388.
- Pozorski, Thomas & Shelia Pozorski
 1997 Cherimoya and guanabana in the archaeological record of Peru. *Journal of Ethnobiology* 17(2): 235-248. <<https://ethnobiology.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/JoE/17-2/Pozorski1997.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
- Quilter, Jeffrey
 2010 Moche: Archaeology, ethnicity, identity. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines* 39(2): 225-241. <<http://www.ifeanet.org/publicaciones/boletines/39%282%29/225.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
- Quilter, Jeffrey, Marc Zender, Karen Spalding, Régulo Franco Jordán, César Gálvez Mora & Juan Castañeda Murga
 2010 Traces of a lost language and number system discovered on the North Coast of Peru. *American Anthropologist* 112(3): 357-369.
- Ramírez, Susan Elizabeth
 1996 *The world upside down. Cross-cultural contact and conflict in sixteenth-century Peru*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 2013 Alternative ways of knowing: place names and personal titles as indigenous voice, an Andean optic. *Perspectivas Latinoamericanas* 10: 1-24. <<https://www.ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp/LATIN/kanko/PL/2013PDF/1-Ramirez.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
- Ramos Cabredo, Josefina
 1950 Las lenguas en la región Tallanca. *Cuadernos de Estudio del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas* 3(8): 11-55.
- Richardson, James B. III, Mark A. McConaughy, Allison Heaps de Peña & Elena B. Décima Zamecnik
 1990 The northern frontier of the Kingdom of Chimor: The Piura, Chira, and Tumbes valleys. In: Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 419-445.

- Rodríguez Suy Suy, Víctor Antonio
 1997 Los pueblos pescadores Muchik de ayer y siempre. In: Rodríguez Suy Suy, Víctor Antonio: *Los pueblos Muchik en el Mundo Andino de ayer y siempre*. Moche/Lima: Centro de Investigación y Promoción de los pueblos Muchik 'Josefa Suy Suy Azabache'/Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinos, 43-90.
- Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, María
 1961 *Curacas y sucesiones*. Costa norte. Lima: n.e.
 1985 Patronyms with the consonant F in the Guarangas of Cajamarca. In: Masuda, Shozo, Izumi Shimada & Craig Morris (eds.): *Andean ecology and civilization. An interdisciplinary perspective on Andean ecological complementarity*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 401-421.
 1999 *History of the Inca realm*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, María & Pilar Remy (eds.)
 1987 *Las visitas a Cajamarca 1571-72/1578. Documentos*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP).
- Rowe, John Howland
 1948 The kingdom of Chimor. *Acta Americana* 6(1-2): 26-59.
- Salas García, José Antonio
 2002 *Diccionario Mochica – Castellano*. Lima: Escuela Profesional de Turismo y Hotelaría/ Universidad de San Martín de Porres.
 2008 Formas ligadas en los numerales del mochica. *Lexis* 32(1): 147-158. <<http://revistas.pucp.edu.pe/index.php/lexis/article/view/2208/2138>> (15.12.2015).
 2010 La lengua Pescadora. *Boletín de la Academia Peruana de la Lengua* 50: 83-128.
 2012 *Etimologías Mochicas*. Lima: Academia Peruana de la Lengua.
- Santo Tomás, Domingo de
 1560 *Lexicon, o vocabulario de la lengua general del Perú*. Valladolid: Francisco Fernandez de Cordoua.
- Shimada, Izumi
 1990 Cultural continuities and discontinuities on the Northern North Coast, Middle-Late Horizons. In: Moseley, Michael E. & Alana Cordy-Collins (eds.): *The Northern dynasties: Kingship and statecraft in Chimor: A symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, 12th and 13th October 1985*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 297-392.
 2000 The late Prehispanic coastal states. In: Laurencich Mincelli, Laura (ed.): *The Inca world. The development of pre-Columbian Peru, A.D. 1000-1534*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 49-120.
- Shimada, Izumi, Ken-ichi Shinoda, Julie Farnum, Robert Corruccini & Hirokatsu Watanabe
 2004 An integrated analysis of pre-Hispanic mortuary practices: A Middle Sicán case study. *Current Anthropology* 45(3): 369-390. <http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=anthro_pubs> (15.12.2015).
- Stoll, Eva
 2002 *La memoria de Juan Ruiz de Arce (1543). Conquista del Perú, saberes secretos de caballería y defensa del mayorazgo*. Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Topic, John R.
 2003 From stewards to bureaucrats: architecture and information flow at Chan Chan, Peru. *Latin American Antiquity* 14(3): 243-274. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3557559>> (15.12.2015).
- Indiana 32 (2015): 179-203

- Torero, Alfredo
- 1975 Lingüística e historia de la sociedad andina. In: Avalos de Matos, Rosalía & Rogger Ravines (eds.): *Lingüística e indigenismo moderno de América (trabajos presentados al XXXIX congreso internacional de americanistas)*, vol. 5. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP), 221-259.
- 1986 Deslindes lingüísticos en la costa norte peruana. *Revista Andina* 4(2): 523-548.
- 1997 La fonología del idioma mochica en los siglos XVII-XVIII. *Revista Andina* 15(1): 101-129.
- 2002 *Idiomas de los Andes: lingüística e historia*. Lima: Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos (IFEA)/ Editorial Horizonte.
- Trujillo, Diego de.
- [1571] 1968 *Relación del descubrimiento del reyno del Perú*. Biblioetca Peruana. Primera Serie, 2. Lima: Editores Técnicos Asociados, 1-103.
- Tun, Molly
- 2014³ Yupana. In: Selin, Helaine (ed.): *Encyclopaedia of the history of science, technology, and medicine in non-Western cultures*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1-9.
- Urban, Matthias
- in prep Lost languages of the Peruvian North Coast.
- 2015 El vocabulario Sechurano de Richard Spruce. *Lexis* 39(2): 395-413 <<http://revistas.pucp.edu.pe/index.php/lexis/article/view/14606/15204>> (15.12.2015).
- Urban, Matthias & Rita Eloranta
- In prep Ñaimlap, the birds, and the sea: a view at the legend through the lens of the Mochica language.
- Valladares Huamanchumo, Percy
- 2013 El apellido Quingnam en Huanchaco. *Perspectivas Latinoamericanas* 10: 47-55. <<https://www.ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp/LATIN/kanko/PL/2013PDF/4-Huamanchumo.pdf>> (15.12.2015).
- Vargas Ugarte, Rubén
- 1936 La fecha de la fundación de Trujillo. *Revista Histórica* 10: 229-239.
- [1939] 1987 Los Mochicas y el cacicazgo de Lambayeque. In: *Actas y trabajos científicos del XXVIII congreso internacional de Americanistas*, vol. 2. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 475-482.
- Vega, Garcilaso de la.
- [1609] 2006 *Royal commentaries of the Incas and general history of Peru*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Zevallos Quiñones, Jorge
- 1975 Algunas palabras indígenas de la región de Trujillo. In: Avalos de Matos, Rosalía & Rogger Ravines (eds.): *Lingüística e indigenismo moderno de América (trabajos presentados al XXXIX congreso internacional de americanistas)*, vol. 5. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP). 261-268.
- 1989 *Los cacicazgos de Lambayeque*. Trujillo: Grafica Cuatro.
- 1992 *Los cacicazgos de Trujillo*. Trujillo: Fundación Alfredo Pinillos Goicochea.
- 1993a *Onomástica Chimú*. Trujillo: Fundación Alfredo Pinillos Goicochea.
- 1993b *Toponimia Chimú*. Trujillo: Fundación Alfredo Pinillos Goicochea.
- Xerez, Francisco de.
- [1545] 1891 *Verdadera relación de la conquista del Perú*. Madrid: Juan Cayetano García.
- [1547] 1872 A true account of the Province of Cuzco, Called New Castille, conquered by Francisco Pizarro, captain of His Majesty the Emperor, our Master. In: Markham, Clements R. (ed.): *Reports on the discovery of Peru*, 1-74, 94-109. London: Hakluyt Society.