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The archaeologist must deal with many kinds of evidence from the past, including such obstinate creatures as mute monoliths, those single blocks of stone, usually relatively large, which have been shaped into various forms such as slabs, stelae, or statues, and were often carved with diverse kinds of motifs. These silent stones were present during the very events we attempt to reconstruct, and were created by the very people whose culture we hope to discover.

The main purpose of this article is to report fourteen monoliths, thirteen being published now for the first time. All but the last two described here were found during an archaeological reconnaissance in the altiplano (high, treeless plain) in the Department of Puno in November, 1968, by Sergio Chávez. Most of the monoliths described belong to the Pucara culture, dating to the first century B.C. They provide us with many bits of information, giving us clues about their functions and the cultures of which they were a part. Our article describes this information and includes data on provenience, form, technique, material, carved elements and their composition, stylistic comparisons, and possible culture and date.

The fact that the monoliths are of stone, a less plastic and more permanent material than, for example, ceramics, requiring more time and work to produce, leads us to believe their function was an important one, in many cases reflecting a portion of the society's ideological or belief system. It may be that the carved monoliths represented a synthesis of their religious beliefs, expressed visually in stone; that, just as one may describe culture as a symbol system, these monoliths were symbols given live meanings which were internalized and shared by members of the society, further maintaining, visually identifying, and organizing their beliefs. Even today these monoliths have supernatural meaning for the natives, still serving as visual symbols of a part of their belief system, being maintained alongside their Christian beliefs.

First Monolith from Cancha-cancha Asiruni, Puno. Height, 4.40 m.
We hope to make clear that each newly discovered monolith, whenever presented, is archeological evidence that it should provide us with new elements, new combinations of elements, or variations of known ones, and, hence, with additional evidence with which to understand the past better.

(During the exploration in Puno, Sergio was accompanied by his friend Teobaldo Yabar, whom we accord the tributes of the trip, and by our worker Julian Peraza.)

**First Monolith from Cancha-Cancha Asirini**

The site of Cancha-Cancha Asirini, located on the ranch (hacienda) of Mr. Sebastian Manrique, is situated near the Tititiri River and the Tititiri Hacienda, on the left side of the highway going from Azagaro to Muyanan, in the Province of Azangaro, Department of Puno. Dr. John H. Rowe mentions the site of Tititiri in his article "Urban Settlements in Ancient Peru," published in *Nueva Pacha*, No. 1, 1963, page 7, where he says Dr. Manuel Chavez Ballon knew about this Pucara site. During the exploration undertaken by Sergio Chávez to locate the site, it was found that Tititiri, specifically the Tititiri Hacienda, with its large irrigation church and a few houses nearby, did not contain the archeological remains sought for. Rather, it was discovered that the large ranch one where three carved monoliths were found along with typical Pucara ceramics, is called Cancha-Cancha Asirini, not Titiriri, and is located on the opposite side of the river from Tititiri. The site consists of a mound of irregular outline situated on a plain called Pampa Pucara. Structures are evident from stone foundations and from the reuse of such stones elsewhere in modern drystone walls.

According to the people who work for the Manrique Hacienda, this monolith had once been standing; later, by order of the owner of the hacienda, it was taken down so as not to attract attention. People there call the monolith "trumbi mikhetos" in the Quechua language, or "stone serpent," according to one informant. The word "Asirini," part of the site name, means "with snake" in the Aymara language, as noted by Dr. Alfred Kidder II in his work *Some Early Sites in the Northern Lake Titicaca Basin*, published in 1943 by the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard, where he describes a site by the same name located in the Pampa de Hua where much farther south in Puno.

Of the monolith is a pillar-like block or stela, thickening slightly from top to bottom. It has a step or squared notch carved out of one of the upper corners; its cross section is roughly rectangular. The carved relief is limited to only one face, the top surface, protruding 3.5 cm. in relief. The basal portion is crudely hewn and is wider, like a pedestal to support the being being imprinted in the ground about 27% of its total height. The material is a light red sandstone.

The carving was evidently an undulating snake-like animal; in this case we shall refer to all such creatures as "serpents" for the sake of simplicity and for lack of positive identification as a snake or other kind. The serpent here is in relief, with its head facing upward, as is a doughnut-like circular ring below the animal's tail; while details on the animal's body are incised. The stela was broken in two parts, and portions have been flaked off and weathered.

When comparing this stela with other monoliths from the Pucara region, particularly close similarity to the slab from Asirini, the site with a similar name on the Pampa de Hua which Kidder described and illustrated in his 1943 work mentioned above. The similarity lies not in form, but in decoration, consisting also of an undulating "serpent" in relief with incised details outlining the serpent's body, a ring located above the head of the serpent here rather than at its tail. Other comparisons to monoliths from Pucara, however, hound today in the museum in Pucara, indicate that the Asirini stela belongs to the Pucara culture and style, dating to about the first century B.C. by radiocarbon measurements derived from Pucara culture refuse obtained by Kidder. In Pucara style monoliths the raised circular ring is frequently associated with a particularly undulating "serpent," and the form of stela with a notched upper corner is also common.

The function of the notch has yet to be determined, but perhaps it could have served to hold some other stone such as a linded. If this were the case, however, one would expect to find these monoliths, much like one such Pucara case is documented for the site of Taraco. The notched upper corner is reminiscent of the form of the "Tello Obelisk" and more vaguely of the "Lanzon" or Great Image of Chavin de Huantar in the northern highlands, belonging to the Chavin culture of a much earlier date. The Tello Obelisk, however, has carved designs within the notch, and in the Chavin case the decoration was not to hold a lintel or other stone which would have covered the designs. The notch could be functional, or could represent a cultural tradition for the shape of such stelae.

This stela is the tallest monolith, so far known, to have been found in the Peruvian altiplano, most of the tall ones coming from Bolivia and belonging to the Tiwanaku culture. One apparently strange detail in this respect is that the relief on top of the stela would have been secured from view because of the height. However, one possible explanation could be that the stela was placed within a semi-subterranean structure so that if one were standing above the level of the sunken court, the relief on top of the stela would be observable. Semi-subterranean structures are known from Pucara, particularly the sunken court in the temple excavated by Kidder in 1939, as well as from the site of Chinchuancos in Bolivia.

As with all of these carved monoliths, we wish to understand what the elements represent, whether they are real, imagined, abstract, or a combination of these, and what they mean to the society that built these stelae. We were a part of the discussions on these problems.

The arguments offered by Dr. Luis Valcarcel are persuasive that the "serpent" form represents the otter, either with outspread legs or without legs as though swimming, but there are some representations which are not convincing as suggesting the otter. He overlooks at least one important detail which could help in interpreting what is really represented. This detail consists of carved, usually incised, elements on the serpent's body forming two parallel lines following the length of the body, frequently a row of circles within them, and parallel lines radiating from each side of this central part.

These elements on "serpents," frequently occurring on monoliths, gave us the idea that they could represent the bony structure of a snake, its skeleton; at the same time we were able to see the possibility that the head, frequently eared or having scrolly appendages, and legs when associated with this serpent form, could represent other animals such as the otter, puma, or catfish. The radiating lines could be ribs, as Kidder too dubbed these lines "ribs," while the circles may represent the cross sections of vertebrae. From at least two sculptures in the Pucara style we know these people had an interest in representing ribs on anthropomorphic figures, so the lines and circles on the "serpent" bodies would be consistent in what was represented. On the other hand, if these lines do not represent bone structure perhaps they could be an undulating snake, particularly in those lacking circles down the "spine," like this Asirini example.

Studies indicate that the herpetological fauna (reptiles and amphibians) of the highlands, not including the montaña, are very limited; and according to Karl Schmidt and Warren Walker in an article "Snakes of the Peruvian Coastal Region," in Vol. 24, No. 27, 1943, of the Zoological Series of the Field Museum of Natural History, there are only a single species of snake above 12,000 feet, a lizard, and some frogs and toads. Though not impossible, it seems incongruous that we find a predilection of snake representations in the highlands of the body that is indeed what is represented, in a region where there are so few and such unimpressive snakes. It could be possible that the emphasis was derived from environments of lower altitudes, especially from the montaña and jungle areas where snakes are more common, more complex in number of species, and where more impressive and extremely large varieties occur. Also to be noted in this regard is the regular occurrence in Pucara-style anthropomorphic sculptures of the modest breech cloth and accompanying nudity, which would seem to be dress ill-adapted for the relatively cold altiplano climate. Again, perhaps one should look toward the jungle to explain the representation of clothing more suited to a warm climate.

We are permitted to state here that the frequent occurrence of the "serpent" or long wavy body is notably lacking, to our knowledge, in Pucara ceramics. Likewise, the feline so commonly represented in Pucara ceramics, shown in its entire body, is almost totally lacking in the Pucara-style stone sculpture, although the heads of the serpent-like monoliths may be felines since most have ears of some kind. The felines in the Pucara ceramics frequently have a circular ring suspended from their necks, the same ring motif which so often occurs in
Pucara stone sculpture. Dr. Luis Valcárcel suggests this circular ring motif on sculpture may symbolize water, in the form of a bubble or concentric ripple produced by the aquatic otter as it disturbs the water’s surface. While this is a possible interpretation, it is by no means the only one.

Second Monolith from Cancha-cancha Aisrumí
This second monolith comes from the same site described above, and was found within a previously excavated pit. One informant, a worker on the Manrique Hacienda, explained that the monolith was found during excavations made upon order of the landowner in 1964; it was covering a stone-lined hole in which were found gold rings, turquoise beads, and other materials including pottery. The hole was filled in with earth and the monolith replaced over it. For preservation Sergio Chávez buried the monolith in the same place where he found it. As the owner of the hacienda, Mr. Sebastián Manrique, and his brother, Arsenio Manrique, were not on the site during this visit, information is based only on what others knew. In the future it is hoped that an interview with the owner can be arranged.

The monolith cannot really be termed a stela as it is now, since there is not enough basal portion for it to have been erected upright in the ground; the base may be incomplete, however, as it is very irregular. The form of the lower portion is straight-sided while the upper part curves slightly to the right, the carved figure conforming to this contour. There is, again, an irregular notch in the upper corner; and the top is broken off, probably including the head of the animal. The cross section forms an elongated oval as the contours are rounded. Only one face of this weathered stela is carved, though the figure uniquely continues into the notched area.

If we assume that the two remaining segments of the principal “serpent” were once connected before being broken, then this technique of combining low relief carving for one portion of the body with grooving for the other is unique.

On the other hand, perhaps we cannot make this assumption as certain inconsistencies make one suspect the stela to have been reused, by re-carving from a previously carved stela. This possibility was first pointed out to us by Dr. Bernard Waisle of the University Museum who noticed that the larger circular ring relief extended into the path of the serpent’s missing body; the only explanation could be that the body undulated at that point, or, more likely, that the relief ring was made after the segment flaked off.

Other of the inconsistencies supporting this possibility of reuse include: 1) the greater width of the upper body compared to the narrow tail portion; 2) the use of grooving for the upper portion in contrast to the technique of relief at the tail; 3) the two parallel lines along the spine of the upper portion do not continue onto the tail portion. All four of these observations suggest that the two sections of this principal “serpent” never were joined as a continuous body. A possible sequence of carving can be suggested, though the time difference need not have been great, if we assume that, first all of the serpent was in relief as the tail section is now, then flaking occurred, after which the circular ring and grooving of the upper body may have been made. It may have been that originally the monolith was a stela, erected upright in the ground, and that later it was reused as a covering slab for the hole over which it is reported to have been found, and in this reuse its basal part was removed.

Beside the central figure are two circular relief rings of different sizes, perhaps determined by the size of the “serpent” with which each is associated. A small, complete snake with plain body occurs undulating between the two rings; its head has no ears. It appears to be the only example of a more realistic representation of a snake.

This monolith belongs among the Pucara-style ones, having in common the circular ring motifs associated with the “serpents,” and the notched form, though with variations.
Third Monolith from Cancha-cancha
Airoi, Puno. Length, 1.56 m.

Third Monolith from Cancha-cancha Airoi

This pillar-like block, with rectangular cross section, is carved on one of the narrower faces; it is a reddish sandstone.

Relief is combined with incision in the representation of a "serpent," its tightly curled tail being unique in such Pucara-style portrayal. The trapezoidal head has no projections for ears as often occur, but only the blankness of the head protrudes width beyond the width of the body behind it. Two eyes are represented by circular depressions, while a mouth is lacking. The body, again like those on the two previous monoliths, has two incised, parallel lines running down the length of the spine, lacking circles within them, but having the series of incised lines on each side; the exterior form of the body is rounded in the areas between these rib-like lines. Unfortunately, the central section of the body has been flaked off so that its form in the area between the head and tail is unclear, and may have been either zigzag or straight.

Again, as in many Pucara-style monoliths, a relief ring occurs in association with the "serpent," situated above the "serpent's" head; but an unusual element is the circular depression below the tail unique to Pucara-style monoliths. We perhaps have, then, a new element to the circular depression, to add to the inventory of carved motifs. Nevertheless, its position is similar to that of the relief rings on other monoliths, below the tail of the animal, and yet it occurs on the same face as does the relief ring, if we assume that the circular depression was not an error on the part of the sculptors.

The circular depression may be a variation of the ring motif, either in actual depiction or in meaning, because of its similar positioning; or it may represent something distinct from that portrayed by the ring itself. It is notable that the raised ring would require more carving than the depression alone, and this difference may indicate the greater importance of the ring element over the circular depression.

It is difficult to give a more specific name to the monolith, such as stela, construction slab, or lintel, to indicate its probable function. While the monolith does have an uncarved area at one end as though for placement in the ground, the carved face is one of the narrower ones, which seems unusual if it was used as a stela or up-right construction slab in a wall. On the other hand, as a lintel the widest faces could have been oriented horizontally in support of construction above, but the decoration would not have been in the center of the lintel. Neither does the monolith appear to have been broken on the end near the raised ring, indicating that the carving never was centered on the stone. It is difficult, then, to resolve the problem of function, but the stone probably was placed upright in the ground.

Fourth Monolith from Cancha-cancha Airoi

Upon our inquiring for other monoliths at the site, informants referred us to a stone in the form of a woman or of a "charrana." Identifying the monolith, we found that the general form was irregular but did not conform exactly to their description. The condition of the stone was extremely poor, having been badly weathered and flaked. It was reported to have been incorporated into wall foundations. The monolith is roughly rectangular, consisting at one of its extremes, and the carving, again badly weathered, is limited to one face.

The dimensions are: maximum length of portion remaining 1.82 m.; maximum width of carved face 45 cm.; maximum thickness 53 cm. Recognizable figures include a relief ring having a maximum exterior diameter of 19 cm. and an interior diameter of 8 cm.; an incomplete, small, snake-like figure below the ring about 53 cm. long; an amorphous element to one side of the ring, about 74 cm. long; and finally another relief ring with about 12 cm. maximum exterior diameter.

Three Undecorated Monoliths from Cancha-cancha Airoi

These unusual pillar-like blocks have a rock-like construction carved above the midpoint of the length, dividing the block into three sections. This construction has an oval cross section and separates the other two sections which have rectangular or sub-rectangular cross sections. It would appear that these blocks were made to be implanted into the ground at the longer end; and, according to inquiries, one of these "stakes" (not illustrated) was in fact found implanted in such a fashion. The two illustrated blocks are well consolidated pink sandstone.

The constricted areas of these three blocks are more highly polished than the other rectangular sections, but this may be merely an indication of better preservation of the incised areas. The three blocks are all weathered, and one is broken and incomplete (the left one of the two illustrated).

Because these blocks lack carved designs we cannot identify the culture to which they belong on stylistic grounds; but we assume they are a part of the Pucara stone carving inventory on the basis of their occurrence among the other Pucara-style carved monoliths from the site. For the first time, this form of block has been found with Pucara-style monoliths, though their function remains undetermined. It is possible, however, that they served as boundary-limiting stakes; or, from a rather general comparison with the form of the Caminaca stela described below, they could be simplified versions of stelae, or even general representations of, for example, the human figure, though this is less likely.
This pillar-like stela, carved on all four faces and having an almost square cross section, was encountered during the 1968 exploration in the town of Taraco, located in the province of Huancane, Department of Puno. It and the next two described below are newly recovered ones and have been erected in the plaza along with four others previously found in the town and described by Kiddler in 1943. We have published this stela in a separate article entitled “Una estela monolítica de Taraco (Puno), Perú,” in Arte y Arqueología, No. 1, 1969, pages 119-127, the Journal of the Instituto de Investigaciones Arácticas, Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, La Paz, Bolivia; this monolith is the only one of the group described in this article to have been published previously.

Alfred Kiddler described this important site of Taraco, its monoliths, ceramics, and tibique artifacts in his 1943 monograph. Thomas Patterson has indicated briefly an outline of the long sequence of occupation of the site (at least two thousand years up to Inca times) in "Current Research: Highland South America," American Antiquity, Vol. 32, No. 1, page 144.

This stela, unique among the other Taraco monoliths, has elements in low relief of about 1 cm, and lacks grooving or incision. The material is either quartzite or sandstone, greenish-gray in color, with the relief being yellowish-brown to brown, perhaps the result of painting. The stela was found during one of the recent excavations made for sewers and house foundations in the town.

We feel the stela to be of particular archaeological importance in that it appears to combine elements similar to those of the Pucará culture, early Tiahuanaco (not classic), and Paracas (or early Nazca).

The elements we compare to Paracas ones are the curvilinear motifs, perhaps representing stylized heads with scroll-like appendages, which occur above the "serpents" on faces A and C and ventrally on the anthropomorphic figures on faces B and D. Similar motifs occur on Paracas or early Nazca textiles found on the south coast of Peru, uncertainly dating from perhaps 700 B.C. to the time of Christ. It is notable that on Pucará-style monoliths relief rings occur in the same context or position as these "stylized heads," above serpents (and other animals, or below them) and ventrally as a navel on anthropomorphic figures. It may be that this stylized figure substituted for the frequently occurring relief ring, or vice versa; and if it was...
a symbol, perhaps it symbolized the same thing as did the relief ring, or some variety of it.

Elements similar to those of the Pucara style, other than the one of analogy of the positioning of the stylized figures noted above, include the elongated zigzag and the double-headed "serpent" motif seen on faces A and C. The ears on the "serpents" could indicate some other animal's head, such projections do occur in Pucara-style "serpents." Another element similar to Pucara ones is the checkerboard relief cross which occurs here as a waist band on faces B and D, and which continues around the stela, serving to connect all four faces and the rounded corners.

The closest similarity in general form and in elements and their composition lies with several monoliths from the Bolivian altiplano at sites south of Lake Titicaca, particularly with Stela 15 found in the semi-subterranean temple at Tiwanaku. Stela 15, so designated by the Centro de Investigaciones Arqueológicas de Tiwanaku, was found by Wendell C. Bennett in his excavations there, alongside a classic Tiwanaku-style one. Dr. Carlos Ponce Sanginés gives a date of Epoch II for Stela 15, perhaps about 100 B.C. to A.D. 100 or even later. Stela 15, also carved on all four faces and having a pillar-like form, has a principal face with a very similar anthropomorphic figure in relief on its principal face; each of the two contiguous faces has an undulating "serpent" with the single, eared head pointing upward.

We cannot be certain at this point whether these similarities indicate historic relationships among the peoples having these styles; nevertheless, this stela provides additional evidence for determining the nature of and relationships between the altiplano cultures of Pucara and Tiwanaku and their possible connections with other non-altiplano groups such as those of coastal Paracas.

Second Monolith from Taraco

This monolith, similarly found in the town during excavations for sewage canals and house foundations, is a pillar-like block, dark green in color. Its cross section is rectangular, having rounded edges, and the upper plane surface inclines. It is well preserved and was probably a stela, as it has been carved with broad incision or grooving on all four faces. Unfortunately we lack information about the base which is implanted at an unknown depth beneath the ground. Each of the two narrower faces, not shown here, has a vertical groove centered along its length. The principal wider faces have what appear to be extremely stylized representations of the "serpent" figure, one of which has a humanoid head connected to the grooved zigzag body line. On the other wider face, the zigzag body line terminates in an "arrow" form; apparently the stylization of the eared serpent. Both figures seem similar to those on faces A and C of the first stela from Taraco.

Because of its simplified style, it is difficult to compare this stela with typical Pucara stone carvings. The closest comparison is with the first monolith from Taraco, as already suggested, the widest faces apparently being very much simplified versions of faces A and C; too, the general pillar-like form, carved on all four faces, with the upper plane surface inclined, is similar. However, the technique of relief is lacking here. It is only more remotely of the Pucara style; then, if we assume the zigzags represent the wavy serpents found on Pucara-style monoliths.

Third Monolith from Taraco

This block stone block, similarly found in the town during excavations for canals and foundations, is stepped, or notched, in one upper corner. The sides of the block are not straight, but rather tend to be inclined to one side in a subtle curve; the cross section is sub-rectangular. Relief is combined with grooving on one of the principal faces, while relief alone was employed on the other.

The animal on face A, occupying almost its entire length, is almost identical to one on a stepped stela described by Kidder in 1943 in a Peabody Museum paper and shown there in plate IV, 1 and 2, also from Taraco and presently erected in the plaza there. The animal, difficult to identify, closely resembles similar animals on two monoliths found at Tiwanaku; it does not look like an otter, however, because of the broad tail.

The figure on face B appears as a coiled, ear-headed animal, perhaps a tadpole. Similar figures have been said to represent the native catfish, the sacha, with the projections on the head being its long barbels; a sacha, however, would not be long and coiled. The other carved face of Kidder's stela has a frog or toad-like representation between two circular relief rings, one above the head and one below the feet. If we can carry our comparison to these second faces, then the tadpole (?) figure here is not far removed from the frog representation in Kidder's stela. The similarity to tadpole to frog may be a more significant association, suggesting metamorphosis of a tadpole into a frog. The relief rings vaguely suggest eggs.

The stela Kidder described and this one are extremely similar, not only in the figures represented and their size, but also in material, in form, being stepped and slightly curved, and in overall size. These close similarities suggest that the monoliths formed a pair at the site. If we propose the possibility that stepped stelae functioned to support lintels, for example, then such monoliths ought to be found in pairs. This Taraco pair may represent a unique example in support of this hypothesis. If they had been set up with the notches facing inward, then the matching animal figures (face A here) would be on reverse sides from one another. On the other hand, pairs could have been made for other purposes, so our case is still not clearly resolved.
The monolith is Pucara-like in its stepped form; the secondary faces of both this one (face B) and Kidder's have Pucara motifs, while the figures on the principal faces (face A here) are not clearly Pucara-like.

Plain Slab from Taraco
Although undecorated rectangular slabs or blocks are present at many sites in the Puno area, particularly related to Pucara constructions, this slab was notable in its dimensions. The slab, probably sandstone, is rectangular in all faces and in section with well controlled form, the edges closely approaching right angles. Its dimensions are: length 4.72 m., width 85 cm., and thickness 22 cm. Other plain, cut blocks from Taraco were illustrated by Kidder in 1943.

Traveling from Taraco to Saman there is a site, near a bridge, called Juchichu Kori. Here were found ceramics of Pucara and other styles along with similar plain stone slabs but of smaller dimensions (about 1.50 m. by 70 cm. by 15 cm.), some of which were fragmentary.

Stela from Caminacca
This monolith is now erected in the central plaza of Caminacca, capital of the district of Caminacca, province of Azangaro, Department of Puno. On the highway from Juliaca to Saman, near the bridge of Juchichu Kori, there is a trail that leads westward to Caminacca.

Although no archaeological site was located in the village itself, nearby there is a hill called Miscolla; here, according to the former mayor of Caminacca, Mr. Faustino Huarauchi M., once there had been an anthropomorphic monolith about 1 m. high, but it had been taken to Puno. It is possible, therefore, that this hill is the archaeological site from which this stela was derived.

During his office as mayor and his supervision of road and bridge building, Mr. Huarauchi observed that among many large stones being used was this carved one. He ordered that it not be employed in such a manner and that it be brought to Caminacca to be erected in the plaza.

Face B, not shown here, has a relief inscription in block letters 4 cm. high, now almost completely worn so that only individual letters can be read. Is said to have been carved in Latin, possibly in Colonial times, and to tell about the founding of Caminacca. The fact that it was reused after its original pre-Conquest use by another, different culture is notable. The people of the village believed that the figure on face A was a wreath until the actual meaning was pointed out to them. The new mayor felt, therefore, that it should be removed from the plaza since animals, which he felt to be supernatural, were represented instead of a "harmless" wreath.

The stela is a rectangular block with a rectangular cross section, having a neck-like constriction in the central portion, comparable in form to the "stakes" from Cancha-cancha Astrumi. Originally only one face must have been carved until the time of its later reuse.

The raised border surrounds a sub-rectangular depression which contains two snake-like animals as though in motion, head of one behind the tail of the other. These relief animals, encircling a raised circular ring in the center, have incised body markings similar to those on many Pucara-style monoliths and to the "serpent" on the first stela from Cancha-cancha Astrumi. The bodies, however, are very much shorter than those already described above as "serpents." The position of the animals around the ring in the center is unique.

Because of the motifs and their design details the stela is related to the Pucara style.

Anthropomorphic Statue from Mallacassi
This carved statue comes from near the site of Mallacassi, northwest of Pucara in the Province of Lampa, Department of Puno; the site and other monoliths from there were described by Kidder in 1943. The Tiocha brothers from Pucara took us to the site in 1967; they knew of the existence of the monolith because they had been requested by a man in Pucara to bring it to the village several years ago. Apparently it had originally been erected on top of a hill; however, the brothers had left it halfway down the hill, where we found it, they having abandoned the project because of its weight and association with a sudden and frightening rain. They were sure that if they moved it again it would rain; and it did, frightening them once more. We removed the statue to Cuzco in 1967.

The much weathered and flaked condition has obliterated detail so that only the pronounced features remain. The eyes are circular rings, not very common in Pucara-style anthropomorphic sculptures where eyes are usually solid oval reliefs. An oval ring forms protruding lips, while ears are represented by circular relief rings. Hair or some kind of head covering is represented from the top of the head down to about the waist in buck where it takes on a trapezoidal shape with a horizontal incision across the back of the head. The position of the arms is unclear, but the right hand appears to overlap the left arm slightly; it is possible that the hands hold something, as in other Pucara anthropomorphic sculptures in which trophy heads are held in the hands. The head and body are connected without indication of neck, only the mandible protrudes in relief from the chest.

No shoulder blades are represented, although the upper arms stand in relief. The waist of the standing, not squatting, figure is slightly constricted. The type of breech clout worn differs from ones represented on other anthropomorphic statues in lacking the squared flaps on each side. The general form, crudely executed, then, is neither so blocky nor so realistic as most other Pucara sculptures.

Another standing human (male) statue and a stela from Mallacassi, described by Kidder in 1943, are also crudely executed and differ from most Pucara monoliths. This Mallacassi group seems to stand out in its stylistic differences, as Kidder noted, and could represent local, temporal, or functional variations from the Pucara and Pucara-like monoliths themselves.
During a visit we made in December 1969 to the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago we 'discovered' this statue in one of the archaeology store rooms. Dr. Donald Collier, Chief Curator of Anthropology there, kindly allowed us to photograph and publish it.

The statue, so called because it is less than one foot high, belongs to the Emilio Monte collection, having the catalogue number A 2732. This "carved stone figure," as it is described, collected by Monte in 1959, was purchased from him by the newly formed unincorporated Field Museum on September 9, 1893, together with many other objects he collected from Cuzco and Ayacucho. The Monte collection, presumably including this piece, was displayed in the World's Columbian Exposition from May to October 1893.

The provenience given for the statue is Cuzco, which might mean either the city or the department. This monolith is most like Pucará style statues from Peru, however, such as those Kidder illustrates, and for this reason we feel the statue came originally from Puno. Furthermore, no Pucará materials have been found in Cuzco itself; although some Pucará-style monoliths have been reported from inside the department of Cuzco near its southern border with Puno, such as in Chumbivilcas and Iñacús. While the possibility that it comes from the Department of Cuzco cannot be ruled out, it seems highly probable that the statue is from Puno. We have no information about how Monte collected the piece; perhaps he did go to Puno, or, he could have obtained the statue in Cuzco after it had been brought there.

This piece is unique among the Pucará statues in its blockiness and very much flattened profile, but in other characteristics its similarities are outstandingly Pucará-like. The statue, like many other standing Pucará statues, has a very small pedestal-like base to be set into something, such as the ground. Pucará standing statues sometimes have an open space between the legs as this one does. Unique, however, is the representation of the ankle bones (?). The bicep clout, again, is a familiar Pucará element. The positioning of the hands over the chest is very similar, while the representation of what appear to be the shoulder blades and spine also occurs in Pucará statues. The oval eyes and mouth are Pucará-like, as is the protruding chin, although here it is more pointed. The headband, perhaps twisted, with an animal ornament in front, sometimes a frog but here a coiled "serpent," is also common in Pucará statues, as is the raised area on the forehead below the headband and surrounding the face, suggesting a cap.

The monoliths we have described and illustrated are surely indicative of the presence of sites of the Pucará culture or related cultures. With the exception of Taraco and Mallacarri, all the sites are new to archaeologists. They offer many opportunities for the further study of Pucará culture in southern Peru, and we hope that architecture, ceramics, and more stone monuments will add greatly to our knowledge of the still little known archaeology of that part of the world.