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Abstract
Collections of objects wrapped in containers, called bundles, are known throughout the Americas. Drawing upon ethnographic literature, especially descriptions of bundle use in the Andes, this article unravels the social context and practices involved in the creation and deposition of an archaeological bundle. The author presents an analysis of a bundle offering excavated from within the prehispanic fortification of Acaray, located on the Central Coast of Perú in the Huaura Valley. Careful attention to the configuration of the bundle offering, the contents, and their qualities permits a sophisticated interpretation of the offering’s broader meaning. The assemblage and deposition of the bundles solidified social bonds among people and powerful spirits. Through the bundling of people and place (Acaray), the building of physical defenses, and the calling of animated selves for spiritual defense through bundle ceremonies, new identities were made, and the dangers of war could be unmade, in the Huaura Valley.
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Introduction
Bundles of items are common archaeological finds. Referred to as packets, kits, or bags, bundles of objects wrapped in cloth, fiber, or hide are documented in North America (Pauketat, 2013: 43–58; Wissler, 1912; Zedeño, 2008), Mesoamerica (Carlsen, 1997; Guernsey and Reilly III, 2006; Mendelson, 1958), South America (Reichel-Dolmatoff, 1974; Tschopeik, 1951; Zorn, 1987), and other parts of the world. When found, they are deemed to be part of that nebulous realm of ritual; special, if not odd, collections of items
that have obvious symbolic value. The study of the materials contained in bundles has been a primary focus. Yet we should be able to say more of the practices surrounding bundle-making/use, and the social implications of these practices and material compositions.

The word ‘bundle’ references not only an object, but action (Oxford English Dictionary, 2014). When it comes to bundles, what we are seeking to understand are the contexts and practices that created them: collecting, wrapping, ritual transformation, interring, or re-opening.

The assemblage and final deposition of a textile bundle from the prehispanic fortified site of Acaray on the central coast of Perú, is the focus of this article (Figure 1). This particular bundle was assembled and used in the Late Intermediate Period (LIP, ca. AD 1000–1476) during a time when the threat of war was widespread, plaguing much of the Central and South–Central Andes and adjacent Pacific coastal areas. Given the context in which this bundle was created and deployed, I argue it was central to the construction of a new community in a climate of fear, and is key to understanding the social experience of war and the complexity of warring. The purpose of this article is to unpack, literally and figuratively, bundles to reveal the social relationships and experiences that they mediate.

**Bundles in the world**

The distribution of bundles is common across the Americas. For instance, in Mesoamerica sacred bundles are sacred objects wrapped in cloth and used in ritual performances

---

**Figure 1.** Map of Andean region, with places mentioned in text. Map by author.
(Guernsey and Reilly III, 2006). In the prehistoric Maya past and among contemporary Maya communities, bundles are curated objects that are periodically taken out and ‘danced’ (Carlsen, 1997: 52, 80–81; Mendelson, 1958). They were linked to commemoration and authority among Pre-Classic and Classic period Maya, and perhaps among Olmec and other Formative Period cultures (Guernsey and Reilly III, 2006). In North America native bundles have been defined generally as items wrapped in cloth (Wissler, 1912: 92). Bundles known from North American indigenous groups were used for a variety of purposes, such as war, healing, and witchcraft (Frisbie, 1987; Murie, 1914; Pauketat, 2013: 43–58; Wildschut, 1960; Wissler, 1912). North American bundles were necessary for the creation and maintenance of larger groups (Murie, 1914: 551). Early writers and those who later synthesized aspects of native bundles recognized different types of bundles, some elaborating formal typologies which may have limited use outside of North America (McAllister, 1965; Richert, 1969; Zedeño, 2008). There is also a wealth of literature on Andean ethnographic bundles that has yet to be used to interpret archaeological bundles and their contexts.

Regardless of where bundles are assembled and used, there are some general themes and theoretical concepts that are relevant for analyzing them. How and what bundles literally bind, their circulation and movement, bundles as animated objects, and bundles as part of the binding of the material and cosmic to create the world merit some discussion before unpacking the bundle and context that are the focus of this article.

**Tying and sealing**

Bundles involve the enclosure of items inside a container that is often sealed shut. Tying and sealing is very relevant to understanding the bundle as both created object and material process. The seal itself can be undone to reveal the contents of the bundle, or the closure can be more permanent. It is useful to distinguish between the two, since it has a bearing on understanding the social relationships that are referenced by the bundle.

Tying knots is a mundane yet important practice (Küchler, 2001: 64). Knots bind and link things, but are themselves partially hidden. Furthermore, ‘a knot is not referential but synthetic, in relating inextricably the texture of its surface to the logic of binding’ (p. 71). Tying knots is not only related as a metaphor to the binding of things, but the act itself binds things. When it comes to bundles, which contain varied items, the sealing or tying of the bundle itself also binds those items together into a new whole. Knots have been linked with magical practices (Day, 1967). Though the habitual practice of tying knots may be mundane in the sense that it seems commonplace, we can think of knots as mundane in light of older usages of that word: both earthly and cosmic (Oxford English Dictionary, 2014). That is, tying knots is a mundane practice that binds things into a new whole, and effectively binds that of this world with that of the cosmos.

Tying, knotting, or otherwise sealing an object, and opening a sealed object, changes the individual, and transforms the nature of the relationship between humans and the contained objects (Wengrow, 2008: 13). Unlike wrapped gifts that are exchanged as part of social relationships, objects enclosed in composite bundles are always contained in their wrapping. This is true whether they are sealed a single, final time, or repeatedly resealed after periodic reopening. Items that are sealed in packages not reopened are
particularly interesting, then, because there is no anticipation that the contained items will one day be revealed, even momentarily, or retrieved by humans. Because they are not meant for the ‘natural’ world, they specifically reference relationships between people and the supernatural world. Wrappings contain, but also absorb potency, as Riggs nicely states, ‘allow[ing] the wrappings to negotiate pivotal social encounters and to mediate between the quotidian and the divine’ (Riggs, 2014: 23).

Recently in the Andean region Hyland and colleagues have identified that the direction in which knots are tied on ‘khipu’ (knot records) is strongly correlated to moiety affiliation (Hyland et al., 2014). Knots not only bind the natural and supernatural worlds, but may have social organization embedded in them. We are reminded that the very order of the world emerges through the creation of enclosed or wrapped items such as bundles (Harris, 2014: 116–118).

**Exchange, circulation, and deposition**

Bundles can be considered in light of theories of exchange and gifting. According to Weiner (1985: 212) there are two kinds of inalienable possessions: those that never circulate, and those that are given with the expectation that they will be returned in kind. Weiner makes a distinction between the degree to which social identities of the givers are embedded in the object itself, giving primacy to objects given in the second kind of exchange. However, if objects are given to supernatural forces, they may not circulate in the conventional sense, but rather in a singular way between humans and the supernatural. The social identities of the givers (humans) that are embedded in objects constitute an ‘emotional lien upon the receivers’ (i.e. supernatural forces).

While aspects of social and political identities are lost in this kind of gift, it need not entail the weakening of group identity, the weakening of identities anchored in the past, or weakened hopes for new collective identities in the future (contra Weiner, 1985: 212). At the same time, because objects reserved for these supernatural kinds of exchanges can be kept out of circulation among people, the objects are nevertheless potent, charged items that have gained their sacred power from not circulating. With bundles, particularly those used in sacrificial offerings, I see the collapsing of this dual conception of inalienable possessions.

Through their removal from spheres of wide distribution, bundles become sacred, as do the practices and the relationships in which they are embedded – they are singular (Kopytoff, 1986: 73–75, see also Walker, 1995: 72). We might think of bundles as social valuables, or ‘socially valued goods’, deployed by communities and involving a variety of activities, from the procurement of the contained items to the process of the bundle’s assemblage, use, and deposition (Mills, 2004; Spielmann, 2002).

**Animating forces**

Traditional, and misleading, notions of animism attribute anthropomorphic qualities to non-human, inanimate, or inert objects (Ingold, 2006: 10, Viveiros de Castro, 2002: 310). New conceptualizations of animism emphasize many people’s tendency to know the world, and themselves, by relating to ‘inanimate’ things as other selves in their own
right (Bird-David, 1999: S78). This is a key point for archaeologists, and the focus of recent efforts to reinsert animism into archaeological interpretation (Alberti and Bray, 2009; Brown and Walker, 2008; Zedeño, 2009).

We can more specifically consider animism in the Andes for the present discussion (Alberti and Marshall, 2009; Bray, 2009; Groleau, 2009; Sillar, 2009). In the Andes, there are a few terms that reference animating forces or essences, and some related concepts that merit mention. Here I briefly describe two kinds of animating essence: ‘camaquen’ and ‘sami’. I also touch on the related concepts of ‘wayra’ (wind), ‘hambi’ (medicine), ‘illas’ (power objects), and ‘huacas’ (sacred places).

The Andean concept of ‘camaquen’ refers to an animating life force or vital spirit (Bray, 2009; Brosseder, 2014: 100; Lau, 2008: 1032). It is the source of the vital force transmitted to someone (‘camaquenc’ as discussed by Taylor, 2000: 6). ‘Camaquen’ is also found in objects. This concept is known from early colonial documents, such as the Huarochari manuscript, and was likely part of prehispanic religious beliefs, especially in the central highlands of Perú (Salomon and Urioste, 1991: 16).

Another force discussed in the Andean literature is ‘sami’ (Allen, 1988: 49–50). ‘Sami’, an animating essence, is found in people, mountains, objects, or anything perceived to have an ‘inherent liveliness’ or power (p. 51). ‘Sami’ is in constant flow. Things that have ‘sami’ may lose it, regain it, and it is transferable between things.

‘Camaquen’ or ‘sami’ are in constant circulation, emanating from places, people and things. These flows are sometimes linked to the flows of airs (‘aires’) and winds (‘wayra’). In colonial period and contemporary documentation of Andean healers and shamans, healing winds are called from sacred places to infuse objects used in curing ceremonies (Glass-Coffin, 2010). At the same time, airs or winds emanating out of powerful places may be dangerous, and people must protect themselves from these flows. In these ceremonies, ‘substances with healing properties’ (‘hambi’) or ‘objects that concentrate special generative power’ (‘illas’) are employed (Allen, 1988: 53–54). These substances and objects are used on healing altars (‘mesas’) that are stored inside bundles when not in use.

Both ‘hambi’ and ‘illas’ take on new varied meanings in the early colonial period (see Brosseder, 2014, for a discussion of both). ‘Hambi’ have dual qualities, both healing and harmful, and indigenous and early colonial religious specialists were thought to have detailed knowledge of both potential uses (p. 197). Many objects, including natural or carved stones, and various foods and minerals, fall under the category of ‘illas’, which are also ‘huacas’ in and of themselves (pp. 84–85). ‘Huacas’ can be thought of as sacred locales but also living superhuman beings (Salomon and Urioste, 1991: 16–19). Thus power objects, health, and animated flows are linked to lively places.

**Entanglements, assemblages, and bundling**

Thinking about the association of items in a bundle and the broader context of their assembly is a productive starting point for their study. While assemblages of items might be ad hoc (Bennett, 2010: 23–24), the intentional placement of items inside a bundle is anything but random. However, if what we are really studying are social relationships, then a discussion of the relationships bundles tie together is necessary. These bundled
relationships might be viewed as dependencies that exist between objects and people, and people and people, as they are entangled in ways that shape and constrain, or even entrap (Hodder, 2012).

The concept of ‘meshwork’ highlights that human and non-human forces (bundles included) are entangled in relationships that make up the world (Ingold, 2006). A bundle can be conceived of as the convergence of items and forces within a meshwork. Bundles and bundling might also be used as metaphors to highlight the associations, connections, and assemblages that form the world (Latour, 2005: 1–2). A bundle, à la Latour, is a concept that permits an appreciation of the network of changing relationships between things and people that comprise the world.

Building on the concepts of meshwork and metaphorical bundles, Pauketat’s (2013) treatment of bundling and religion provides guidance for considering a bundle as both object, and ‘node’ in a ‘web of relationships’. As Pauketat points out, most things, people, and places are bundled with other things, people, and places (p. 27). Bundles contain the intersection of a number of items used to invoke forces and build new social and cosmic connections. But the process of making and using the bundle builds new connections through the intersection of people, objects, and animated forces. Together, the bundle and the bundling of social relationships create places of significance such as Acaray.

These theoretical considerations provide a framework for approaching the study of bundles as more than objects. For heuristic purposes, however, it is fruitful to disassemble bundles, momentarily, to identify their component parts. Doing so helps to reveal the forces and qualities that form part of the entanglement. In considering bundles as ‘things’, we can turn to some specifics on South American bundles.

Andean bundles: Ethnographic examples

In South America, rituals associated with bundles are best documented ethnographically in the Central and South-central Andes, among Aymara and Quechua groups (see Figure 1). Bundles are referred to in Spanish as ‘bultos’ or ‘atados’. In Quechua, the word ‘q’ipi’ (also ‘q’epi’) refers to a bundle of disordered things (‘bulto de cosas revueltas’), a bulky item of anything (‘volumen de cualquier cosa’), or simply a bundle (‘lío’, ‘bulto’) (Laime Ajacopa, 2007: 98).

Since bundles are quite variable in the Andes, I focus on those that consist of multiple items enclosed in a textile wrap. These ethnographically documented offerings provide an analogy for examining the prehispanic contexts of the creation, use, and deposition of similar bundles. The examples discussed are from the 20th century. However, similar objects and associated items were used in rituals in the Colonial Period (as early as the late 1500s), and have their roots in prehispanic times (Brosseder, 2014: 166–167).

Among the Aymara and Quechua peoples of the Peruvian, Bolivian, and Chilean Andean highlands bundles are employed in healing and divining activities, and herder’s ceremonies (Fernández Juárez, 1995). There are general categories of bundles in the Andes: curated bundles used periodically for ceremonies, and bundle offerings burned or destroyed in the offering process. Burnt offerings (‘despachos’) are common. In contrast to bundles that are not burned, ‘despachos’ are smaller, consisting typically of small food items and herbs that are burned to ash. ‘Despachos’ are components of larger, complex...
rituals that also include the use of other bundles. Ceremonies that involve the assembly and use of bundles often incorporate more than one type of bundle, which are deposited in various ways (buried, curated, or burned). The ethnographic data remind us that complex rituals may involve both the assemblage of bundles and the burning of smaller bundle offerings.

For example, ‘señal q’epi’ among Macusani herders are ‘a complex of very valued objects that form a special textile tie’ used in offering ceremonies to Pachamama (Zorn, 1987: 489). These bundles (‘señalakuy’) are used in ceremonies, carried out once or twice a year, related to the fertility of flocks. The ‘señal q’epi’ have an outer carrying cloth that doubles as a ‘misa’ (or ‘mesa’), an altar formed from the cloth opened up and spread on the ground on which the other items used in the ceremony are placed, and on top of which the ceremony is performed and ultimately contained (p. 493). ‘Mesas’ are widespread throughout the Andean region (see also Brosseder, 2014; Delgado de Thays, 1968; Flannery et al., 1989; Sharon, 2006). Shells, miniature and regular size ceramic vessels for food and liquid offerings, stone items, raw fibers, or any ritual items considered to bring good luck may be included in the outer bundle (Zorn, 1987: 496). The outer bundle also contains smaller textile carrying cloths (‘unkhuña’) that envelop items. These smaller nested bundles may contain miniatures, usually small versions of the animals for which the ceremony is done (alpacas, llamas, or sheep) (p. 494). The bundles may also include foods seen as relating to the animals in question, such as maize kernels for llamas and alpacas, ‘tarwi’ beans for sheep, and other kinds of beans for cows and bulls (p. 496). ‘Coca’ leaves are used to represent pasture, and are laid on top of both the larger ‘misa’ cloth and some of the smaller ‘unkhuña’ cloths.

The ceremony is carried out in a corral and in the home, accompanied by libations of alcohol, music, and culminates in the bundle’s burial until the next time the ritual is performed. The textiles used are typically used for storage, and in this case might be thought of as ritual storage cloths (p. 508). Using various items in these ritual containers, which have the initial appearance of being disordered and random, the ritual specialist (‘paqo’) recreates the world writ-small in this ceremony (p. 519), and simultaneously orders and reasserts social and natural relationships of the world in which Macusani herders live. These family bundles may vary in their contents, but are similar to herders bundles documented in other areas.

In Choquecancha, families keep ‘fardo q’epi’ bundles (Seibold, 2001: 446). In the household, women feed them with offerings at the same time that men feed Pachamama in outdoor community-scale agricultural rituals. Family bundles are given offerings so that the family and physical space of the home are blessed. The bundles contain an item related to the establishment of the household that is wrapped in special cloth made of counterspun yarn (in this case, twisted to the left, or z-spun), and with intentional color patterning, thought to be associated with Pachamama. The yarn is then plied to the right (s-plied), so that the cloth has both left and right twist elements. Color duality (black and brown) is also embedded in the cloth itself (pp. 449–450). The bundle is opened and then resealed by tying the four corners of the cloth together in a knot.

‘Fardo q’epi’ can also represent ancestors. Tracht (1984, cited in Seibold, 2001) argued that the prehispanic practice of keeping mummy bundles has been maintained by keeping ‘ancestor bundles’ that represent communal identities. In Bolivia this practice no
longer entails the curation of actual bones of ancestors, but rather the essence of dead ancestors (Tracht, 1984). They are periodically brought out and redressed in cloth. They are treated as seeds that with additional cloth wrapping continue to grow (Seibold, 2001: 452, see also Lau, 2008).

In Coroma, Bolivia, 10 ‘q’epi’ bundles represent 10 local lineages. Known as ‘bridges to the ancestors’ (UNESCO, 2002: 79), the bundles have souls, and in fact are grandparents that guide living community members in decision-making events (Bubba Zamora, 1997: 40). Composed of fine curated textiles passed down through time, the bundles are brought out once a year on All Saints Day (1 November). The rest of the year they are fed with bags of cooked food, and offerings of alcohol and ‘coca’ leaves (p. 41). The Coroma bundles are materializations of social organization, representing two moieties (‘ayllu’). Two lineages form the upper ayllu, while eight lineages form the lower ‘ayllu’.

In Mollomarco, healing bundles represents the inverse of normal bundles (Greenway, 1998). Rather than containing items that represent health and bounty, they contain items lacking in animus. These bundles are used to call the spirit of someone who has lost theirs. They do not contain many foodstuffs. If they do they are not the sweet items that might normally be included. The ceremonies employing their use do not involve careful selection of perfect ‘coca’ leaves, or the careful pouring of libations. The items must reflect the defective quality of the person’s soul.

Bolton and Bolton (1976) compare two types of rituals, the Enclosure Ritual and the Earth Payment Ritual, involving bundles in Canchis. Their analysis highlights the difficulty of isolating one meaning for bundles, since they often serve a number of purposes, and may be similarly structured despite their use to achieve different ends. Two bundles employed in the Enclosure Ritual are buried in holes dug into the ground at the ceremony’s closure. This ritual is a form of sorcery aimed at an enemy, or at someone who has done harm to the sponsor of this ritual. The bundles used in the Earth Payment Ritual, however, are requested by a sponsor seeking protection and blessings from supernatural forces, and the accompanying ritual is described as a ‘multi-purpose ritual’ (p. 101). The bundles and associated bundles benefit the sponsor or the sponsor’s family (p. 104). The bundle used in the Earth Payment Ritual (‘k’intusqa’) is burned. Similar burnt offerings are documented from the southern parts of Perú and Bolivia (Dalle, 1966; Flores Ochoa, 1976; Mayorga et al., 1976).

Girault (1988) distinguishes between different kinds of bundles (mesas) and their contents. Generally, bundles are beneficent or maleficient (p. 162). Based on work among Bolivian traveling healers, Girault provides general rules which he states apply to all offerings: (1) if they are not buried they should be placed on the ground; (2) destruction of the offerings must be by natural means when they are not burned; and (3) at no time may items be removed from the bundle if it is left to be destroyed by natural means (p. 147). Breaking any of these general rules will anger the spirits to which the offering is aimed, or redirect negative magic back at the person who assembled the bundle.

Archaeological bundles in the Andes

Given the previous discussion of ethnographically documented bundles, what are the characteristics of prehispanic Andean bundles? There is great antiquity to bundles in the
Andean region. At the Late Preclassic Period (ca. 3000–1800 BC) site of El Paraíso, a miniature knotted bag (‘shicra’) filled with a white material (possibly lime) and wrapped in leaves was excavated (Quilter, 1991: 423). The Late Preclassic site of Cerro Lampay yielded several ‘offering sets’ contained or wrapped in textiles that were burned (Vega-Centeno, 2005: 183). A small textile bundle was found associated with a burial at the Early Horizon site of Cerrillos (Splitstoser, 2014: 49). Mummy bundles are commonly reported from the coastal areas of Peru and Chile, sometimes accompanied by separate bundle offerings inside, or alongside, them (Frame et al., 2004; Ravines and Stothert, 1976). Isolated offering bundles from late prehispanic contexts are reported as well (Cutright, 2013; Eeckhout, 2006; Montoya Vera, 1998). Attention has been paid to the textiles and their technological details from such contexts, though detailed provenience data or details of the non-textile items may be limited (see Rowe, 2014, for an example). While bundles are common in prehispanic contexts, there have been few systematic studies that seek to explore their materiality or the practices in which they were embedded (though see Splitstoser, 2014).

Archaeological bundles are referred to as dedicatory, foundational, votive or sacrificial offerings (Benson, 2001:2–3). These kinds of deposits involve the removal from circulation of certain objects. Some bundles were deposited in a way that suggests they were meant to be returned to. Thus they might have been pulled out and used periodically. These would be removed from circulation for periods of time, and then reintroduced before being put away again. Others might be ‘permanently’ removed from circulation among humans. This could be achieved through final burial, burning, or both. This distinction helps orient the interpretation of not only a bundle, but the practices and people involved in making, using, and depositing bundles. With this distinction in mind we can examine the archaeological bundles from Acaray.

Acaray bundle offerings

Acaray is an extensive archaeological complex located in the Huaura Valley, Perú. Within the complex is a large fortification located on a ridge (Brown Vega, 2008). The fortification comprises three hilltops, each ringed with two to three defensive walls (Figure 2). Inside the uppermost defensive walls on all three hilltops are summit structures. Acaray was built in the 8th century BC during the Early Horizon (ca. 900–200 BC) and abandoned sometime in the later part of that period. Around AD 1100, in the LIP, the fortress was rebuilt. Massive defensive walls were rebuilt using an expedient construction technique, and bear military architectural elements such as parapets and bastions along with abundant slingstones. Acaray’s early occupation and the architecture itself shaped the remodeling of the site (Brown Vega, 2015).

Warfare was pervasive in the Central Andes during the LIP (Arkush, 2008, 2009, 2011; Arkush and Tung, 2013; Brown Vega, 2009, 2010; Covey, 2008; Dulanto, 2008: 776; Earle et al., 1987; Parsons et al., 2000). The earlier part of the LIP may have been characterized by localized conflicts between small polities, but by the 14th century conflict may be related to a series of imperial expansions that impact the region. The Chancay people of Huaura were in the process of being conquered by the Chimú Empire, who conquered the Casma Valley to the north of Huaura as late as AD 1350 (Moore and
Mackey, 2008). It is reasonable to suggest that the people of Huaura contended with imperial forays into their territory after this date, though there is no clear indication that they were ever conquered by the Chimú. Later, the people of Huaura were incorporated into the Inca Empire when the Chimú were conquered in AD 1470. During the LIP, Acaray was used as a refuge where people gathered periodically when they were threatened (Brown Vega, 2009). Excavations suggest people did not live there permanently, but rather converged at the fort when necessary.

Excavations revealed two textile bags, or bundles, that were interred during the remodeling of one summit structure (Figure 3). This remodeling took place approximately AD 1104–1304 (850 ± 70 BP), the early part of the LIP. These bags were placed intentionally in architectural fill during the period of fortress rebuilding. There are two important aspects of this offering to note: this deposit showed no signs of burning, unlike the other offerings made in the structure. Also, these offerings were made while rebuilding the summit structure, and many of the burnt offerings were made periodically, subsequent to the rebuilding activity.

A detailed review of the organization of the bundles and the qualities of their contents helps to interpret the nature of this special deposit. Considered within their larger context the bundles permit interpretations of practices that have bearing on our understanding of prehispanic warfare and social life.
Unpacking/unwrapping the bundles

A schematic of bundle structure helps to visualize the relationships between bundle contents (see Figures 4 and 5). Bundles, their contents, and certain attributes of those contents were coded by the layer, or tier, of the bundle in which they were placed. Details of how the bundles and sub-bundles were sealed, by knot, tie, or not at all, were recorded. Instances where sub-bundles were physically attached to other bundles were also noted. Potential correlations were assessed among attributes, and between attributes and order.

Bundle 1 items

The outer wrapping of Bundle 1 was a striped cloth bag. This bag (Figure 6) contained unspun fiber in three colors: dark brown, reddish brown, and yellow. They are similar in color and disposition to rolls of fiber, identified as probably ‘Furcraea andina’ (native maguey), contained in an offering bag placed within a mummy bundle from a Late Horizon central coast context (Frame et al., 2004: 836, Fig. 11). In the Acaray offering, loom holders contained in the bundles were made of this material. In addition this bag contained white and brown cotton skeins, all undyed yarns. They were loosely gathered and secured on each end with cotton yarn of the opposite color, or with ties made of maguey fiber. That is, the white skeins were tied with brown cotton yarn, and the brown skein was tied with white cotton yarn and fiber. Object 19 is a brown and white cotton skein knotted together, bundled with another loose white cotton skein.

Two loom holders and three seed necklaces were placed among the unspun fiber and cotton materials. They were looped and secured by wrapping the end around the looped part. The necklaces are ‘Pachyrhizus tuberosus’ (‘jíquima’) seeds strung on either a coarse maguey fiber or cotton. It is worth nothing that ‘jíquima’ seeds are toxic (Brack Egg, 1999: 360). Today among the Aguaruna Jivaros of the Peruvian Amazon ‘jíquima’ seeds are used as an abortifacient (Berlin, 1985: 134).
Two ‘lúcuma’ fruits were placed at the base of the bag (the end opposite the sealed end of the bag). Lúcuma is ubiquitous at late prehispanic coastal sites (Towle, 2007: 76–77), and was found in other contexts at Acaray associated with ritual activities. In a prehispanic central Andean myth, lúcuma is symbolically linked to fertility, being used to inseminate a female huaca (sacred being) who was weaving under the lúcuma tree (Salomon and Urioste, 1991: 46–47). A white cotton cloth knotted using the four corners of the textile to create a bag was also included in the larger bag.

Along with these items was a sub-bundle (Figure 7). A brown cotton bag, secured by knotting the four corners of the cloth together (Object 20), was tied using a fiber rope around the entire bundle and secured at the point of the knot. Visible through the cloth were two small pieces of a greenish colored mineral, probably malachite, placed at opposite ends of the bundle – at its base, and at the point of the knot.

Bundle Object 20 contained a white cotton skein tied on both ends with fiber, and a white and brown cotton skein that were knotted together. Both the brown and white cotton skeins were tied with brown cotton. Inside this bundle was a small cotton bag with a fiber tie that was sewn into the bag along one side, then used to seal the bag shut. This small sub-bundle contained a white mineral. Given its appearance and composition, it is a mineral used in curing ceremonies, referred to as ‘q’olpa’ or ‘millu’ (Browman and Gunderson, 1993: 416).
The second bundle (Figure 8) has a more complex structure than Bundle 1, containing three sub-bundles (Objects 4–6) that each contained more bundles and contents (refer to Figure 5).

Object 4 (Figure 9) a cotton bag, was sealed at its opening with a fiber tie. The fiber tie goes through the opening into the bag where it is tied to a smaller bundle inside – they are linked. Besides the smaller attached bundle, which has contents, there was another cotton bag with contents, a brown wool textile bag with decorated edge, and a net bag. The brown wool bag and the net bag were empty (Objects 4A and 4B). The unattached cotton bag (Object 4C) contained three items: a ball of dyed blue cotton yarn, a roll of yellow and dark brown fiber material (the latter is possibly hair), and a small, decorated wool ‘chuspa’. ‘Chuspas’ are used to carry ‘coca’ leaves, though we found none in this bag. A white cotton skein with a white cotton tie on one end was placed inside the ‘chuspa’. The smaller bundle, a wool bag, was tied to the outer bundle (Object 4D) and was sealed by tying it with fiber string. Inside this bundle were rolls of yellow and very dark brown fiber (the latter also possibly hair).

Object 5 (Figure 10), unlike Object 4, was sealed by tying the four corners of the cloth into a knot. It contained another bundle (Object 5A) which was a cotton bag sealed with fiber string tied around the opening. This smaller bundle contained six discrete items, four of which contained more items: a cotton bag tied around the middle, a net bag with miniature contents, an empty net bag, a wool bag, and two other cotton bags (Objects 5A1–5A6).

Figure 5. Schematic drawing of Bundle 2 structure. Diagram made by author.

Bundle 2 items
Object 5A1 was a small cotton bag that contained seven small bunches of ‘Huperzia crassa’. Each bunch was tied with either yellow or dark brown fiber with the exception of one that was tied with a mixture of the two fibers. Today, ‘Huperzia crassa’ grows between 3500 and 4500 m.a.s.l. (Cano et al., 2006: 271) – not locally. It is used in traditional medicine today, and its primary uses are to ensure luck or success in travel, as a fragrance, and to treat *mal aire* (bad air) (Bussmann and Sharon, 2007: 356). The qualities of this plant suggest it is not used in sorcery or doing harm. According to Bussmann and Sharon, three stems of the plant are tied in a bunch (they use the term ‘seguro’) and then placed in boiling water that is used for bathing (p. 356).

Object 5A2 and 5A3 are net bags similar to object 4A in Bundle 1. While the Object 5A3 net bag was empty, the other net bag contained a ‘jiquima’ seed necklace of the same kind found in Bundle 1, two miniature loom holders made of the same material as those found in the other bundle, and pieces of the white mineral also found in Bundle 1. This bag was attached to the knot of the outer bag (Object 5A). The net bags are similar to ‘medicinal pouches’ reported from a mummy bundle from Pachacamac on the central coast of Perú (Fleming, 1986: 43). The necklace is small enough that it might also be considered a miniature. Miniature items have been reported in the context of pilgrimage, ritual, and offerings in the Andes, and have been argued to be a kind of synecdoche (Allen, 1997: 75, 81). They are used to facilitate communication between people and gods via material icons that represent larger hopes.

**Figure 6.** Bundle 1, tier 1 items. Bundle before and after opening (left); *lúcuma* fruits, loom holder (unraveled), *jiquima* seed necklaces (middle column, starting from top); maguey fiber and cotton skeins (right column, starting from top). Photos courtesy of author. (See colour version of this figure online).
Object 5A4 is an empty wool bag. Object 5A5 is a cotton cloth sealed by knotting the four corners of the cloth together. There was a fiber rope tied to the knot which was attached to a seed necklace inside the bag. Botanical analyses and thin sections of the seeds show their anatomy to be consistent with a cotyledon, and most likely from the genus ‘Fabacea’. However, their species identification has yet to be determined. The last item in the bundle, Object 5A6, was a deteriorated cotton bag containing the same white mineral found in Bundle 1, and in the net bag with miniatures.

Object 6 (Figure 11) was an open cotton bag sewn on three sides, and not knotted or tied shut. It contained a smaller cotton bundle, a fiber loom holder, a ball of unknown bast fiber, and a ‘Nectandra sp.’ seed necklace (Objects 6A–6D). ‘Nectandra’, or ‘ishpingo’, is reported from other prehispanic contexts (Eeckhout, 2006; Montoya Vera, 1996, 1998, 1999). Chronicler’s mention ‘ishpingo’ was used in prehispanic rituals (Arriaga, 1968[1621]:41, 4–5). The fiber loom holder is the same as the two found in Bundle 1. The cotton bag (Object 6A) was tied with a cotton tie, and contained the same white mineral already mentioned.

**Bundle structure and patterns**

By drawing on the spatial relationships of bundle contents we can look for patterns. One pattern is the location of the white mineral in the innermost part of both bundles. In Bundle 1 it is located in the sole third tier sub-bundle. In Bundle 2 it is located in the third and fourth tier sub-bundles. In terms of Zedeño’s (2008) classification, this mineral
might be considered as ‘intrinsic fixed’, and may be a central, animate agent within the
bundle. It is associated with both seed necklaces and loom holders in miniature form in
Object 5A2, but isolated in separate bundles in other spaces of the larger bundle.

Regarding the textiles used in the bundles, there were three materials represented
among the cloth bundles: seed fiber (cotton), bast fiber (maguey), and wool. Of these
materials, cotton is the most common in the two bundles. All textiles in Bundle 1, in fact,
are cotton. Maguey and wool items are only found in Bundle 2, and only in the third and
fourth tiers of the bundle. Cotton is grown on the coastal strip, and there are some salt-
tolerant species that can be grown quite close to the littoral (Vreeland, 1986). Cotton is the
third most abundant macrobotanical remain we find at Acaray, found as either raw cotton
or seeds that indicates cotton processing at the site. Wool is acquired from camelids, typi-
cally llama or alpaca, which are domesticated highland animals. Camelids range into the
coastal area periodically, however, and may have thrived on parts of the coast in the past
(Shimada and Shimada, 1985). At Acaray we found camelid coprolites, but very little
camelid bone. The bones suggest the animals were not being processed there for food, but
that some choice cuts were consumed at the site (as evidenced by the presence of cervical
vertebrae and rib bones). The coprolites suggest camelids were housed at the site, possibly

Figure 8. Bundle 2 (top row) showing detail of knot, and opened; tier 2 sub-bundles (bottom
row, from left): Object 5, Object 6, Object 4. Photos courtesy of author. (See colour version of
this figure online).
for use as pack animals. Maguey grows in coastal as well as highland areas. The net bags produced with that fiber are very similar to fish nets known for the time period.

Eight of the 22 textile pieces analyzed from the bundles showed signs of mending or patching. These were not new pieces of cloth, but used, and reused, items that had been patched throughout their life-histories. Mended pieces are found throughout all tiers of the bundles. The outermost textile wrappings of both bundles are mended. The repair of items may signal them as socially valuable, and the repairs serve to further enhance that social value (Spielmann, 2002).

Counterspun yarn in the Andes may be magical (Kula, 1991; Tschopik, 1951). In the Chancay cultural area s-spun yarn appears to be the typical tradition (Kula, 1991: 265). Z-spun yarn is unusual, and may signal a form of magic embedded into the textile. Other scholars have suggested that counterspun elements in Chancay embroidery and gauzes from burial contexts may relate to religious beliefs and a need for protection (Conklin, 1999: 118–119; Kula, 1991: 276–279). Seven of the cloth specimens from the bundles had s-spun components. Bundle 1 has one textile with s-spun components, and one with z-spun components. Bundle 2 also has s-spun and z-spun textiles, and two textiles that have combined s- and z-spun elements. These are only found in the third and fourth tier of the bundle.

Figure 9. Bundle 2, Object 4 sub-bundle and contents; chuspa bag in lower right image. Photos courtesy of author. (See colour version of this figure online).
Figure 10. Bundle 2, Object 5 sub-bundle and contents: *Fabacea* necklace (upper middle), net bag with miniatures and mineral (center), and *Huperzia crassa* amulets (lower right). Photos courtesy of author. (See colour version of this figure online).

The schematics clearly show the connections between the sub-bundles. There are three instances where sub-bundles were tied to their outer covering, all from Bundle 2. Object 4D was tied to the outer container, Object 4, which was tied to its outer container (Object 3). Objects 5A2 and 5A4 were both tied to their outer container, Object 5A (see Figure 5). In one instance, two sub-bundles were linked to each other (Objects 5A5 and 5A6).

Patterning in terms of types of closures was also assessed. Containers were closed in two ways – either by tying the corners of the textile container into a knot, or by tying off the opening with string or yarn. Some containers were not closed, but left open. In total there are 20 discrete bundles or containers (3 from Bundle 1, 17 from Bundle 2). Bundle 1 has two containers sealed by tying, and one that is a combination of tying and knotting. The outer textile container (tier one) was closed by tying.

In Bundle 2, there were seven bundles in tier four. Three were sealed by tying knots with the corners of the cloth container, and four were left unsealed. In the third tier there were six bundles, three of which were sealed by tying them shut with another string or yarn, and three that were unsealed. The three bundles in the second tier were each treated differently, with one sealed by tying, one sealed by knotting the container cloth, and one left unsealed. The tier one bundle, which contains the entirety of Bundle 2, was sealed by knotting the corners of the cloth together. The knotted cloth
containers are sealed in a manner similar to ethnographically documented ‘q’epi’ bundles (Zorn, 1987).

**Discussion: distinguishing bundles**

The items inside the bundles and their configurations show similarities to ethnographically documented bundles and ‘mesas’, and relate to the general concepts discussed at the beginning of this article. Though the ethnographic examples are much later than the bundles from Acaray, given the syncretism and continuities that have been discussed for Andean religion despite conversion to Christianity (Abercrombie, 1998; Brosseder, 2014; MacCormack, 1991), it is appropriate to use those examples to examine the meaning of archaeological bundles and reconstruct their attendant rituals. Variability in how bundle bags were constructed and sealed, materials suggestive of larger exchange spheres, substances and materials infused with powerful qualities, and their entanglement, may now be better understood once reassembled and considered together. First, a consideration of how the Acaray bundles fit within frameworks used for bundles in other world areas is useful for pulling out broader concepts that extend beyond the Andes.
Using common North American typologies, can we characterize the bundles from Acaray as personal/individual, group, or tribal bundles? Because of their complex and composite nature, the hypothetical sociopolitical context in which these rituals were carried out, and the possibility that only a subset of a larger group directly participated in the deployment and interment of the bundle, Bundles 1 and 2 of Acaray would be consistent with tribal bundles.

Would the bundles from Acaray be personal, medicinal, or ceremonial? While Bundles 1 and 2 seem to be ceremonial because of their association with a larger group, some of the sub-bundles may be medicinal because some of their contents relate to healing. Although the Acaray bundles and sub-bundles appear to be ceremonial, they are buried in architectural fill, inhibiting their use after deposition.

The bundles excavated from Acaray were not meant to be reopened. They were sealed and deposited within newly-built architecture. While the bundle items and textile wrappings showed signs of wear and patching, there was no destruction or burning of the bundles or their items. The bundles were not a ‘despacho’. They were not meant to be periodically fed and maintained by a group or sponsor. The bundles were buried and, one might argue, ‘abandoned’. Catherine Bell (1997: 112) states that ‘abandonment of an offering in a ravine or on a hilltop is usually sufficient to convey it to gods thought to be abroad in the natural environment.’ Because the bundles were offered by way of burying them, it is reasonable to say that the offering was not made to humans, but to supernatural beings that could access the offering. Humans would have had to dig up the bundles to employ them in some way, and there is no archaeological evidence to support that they did. This is a major distinction between ritual deposits such as this one, and caches that can be returned to and accessed again.

For Central Andean prehispanic coastal communities we lack detailed information on epistemologies and ontologies. Without knowing whether these communities viewed certain objects to have latent animacy, or intrinsic potency instilled by the supernatural world, it is difficult to characterize the bundle contents in terms of their origin and position (see Zedeño, 2008: 374–376). It is nevertheless productive to consider the possibility for certain objects to be ‘awakened’ by association with other objects, or through songs, prayers, or ritual practices. This awakening would have happened prior to the bundles’ burial in the architecture, indicating they were in a state of bundled power, embedded in a defensive and ritual space.

The Acaray bundles do not fit characterization as a venerated ancestor, and with some confidence it can be asserted that the associated bundle ritual was not related to an individual’s death. The bundle was not associated with a funerary bundle or burial. The nature of Chancay religious practice is not clear, but the use of bundles suggests animistic beliefs, and hints at the presence of ritual specialists. This has been suggested by others with relation to ‘witching cloths’ made and used by Chancay people (Fung Pineda, 1999). The interment of the bundle at Acaray was a suprahousehold ritual, and thus linked to something larger than the family unit.

From objects to ritual orders

At the time that Chancay people rebuilt Acaray they carried out certain rituals. To rebuild the summit structure, millennium-old plastered architecture was modified but not
completely destroyed. Pits were dug down into ancient floors to bedrock and subsequently filled with food remains. Abundant remains of fruits such as ‘pacae’ and ‘lúcuma’ were recovered from pits as well as from construction fill used during reconstruction. These ritual food remains might be the remains of a shared, special meal, conceived of broadly as a feast (Hayden, 2001: 28). This consumption activity was accompanied by food and other offerings. These rituals formed the fabric of a larger social and communal context.

There are indications that the bundles were partially assembled in the summit structure at Acaray. Fragments of ‘Huperzia crassa’, the same plant stems found in the innermost tier of Bundle 2, were recovered during excavations, as were seeds, leaves, and rhizomes of the ‘jíquima’ plant. Additionally, spinning and weaving artifacts were recovered from associated deposits within the room. Spindle whorl fragments, bone and wood needles, and wooden spindles were found in the summit structure. In short, activities related to textile production took place inside this structure. Furthermore, these remains are found in intrusions along with food remains, on floors, and in construction fill.

During any, and probably all, of these component activities it is reasonable to assert that prayers were recited and specific body movements and prescriptions were followed (see Bolton and Bolton, 1976: 106). Those movements or sounds cannot now be deciphered. However, by considering the rituals that took place in the summit structure as a process (Walker, 1995: 71), we can outline some component activities that culminated in the interment of the bundles.

Preparation of the sub-bundles likely took place in different locales. Some may have arrived to Acaray already assembled, while others were assembled inside the structure. In either case raw materials were acquired to include in sub-bundles, and some of these materials are non-local. ‘Huperzia crassa’ was attained through long-distance exchange or trade. It was tied into amulets at Acaray before being placed inside a textile bag, reminiscent of contemporary curing rituals. The composite bundles were likely created only after items contained in them were used in an extended ritual. This ritual entailed the use of a variety of items to call animate forces and appease supernatural forces. This was accompanied by the burning of small offerings, the chewing of ‘coca’ leaves, the consumption and offering of ritually charged foods, and the structured deposition of all of these items as part of the reconstruction of the summit structure. Spinning and textile production, and the consumption of ‘chicha’ (fermented maize beer) from fineware bowls accompanied these activities.

Liturgical sequences, or orders (as used by Zedeño, 2008), may not be the appropriate term to use in the context of the Acaray bundles or of other archaeological bundles for which there is little to no knowledge of ‘canonical’ religious worldviews (see discussion in Bell, 1997: 176). According to Rappaport (1999: 169), ‘inasmuch as liturgical orders are more or less invariant sequences encoded by persons other than the performers their performance entails conformity.’ Currently there is insufficient information about typical Chancay ritual performances. There are indications that the ritual interment of the Acaray bundles was a ritual innovation (albeit with historical roots) in the context of the formation of a new community in the lower Huaura Valley (see Brown Vega, 2008). While the bundle ritual helped establish a new social, and perhaps political, order, the rituals also reflect the immediate circumstances of the participants (Bell, 1997: 176).

Drawing on the ethnographic literature, we can suggest that supernatural forces, sponsors, and ritual specialists were involved in the rituals at Acaray (see Bolton and Bolton,
To this list we must add the bundles, and the power objects they contained, as actors in the ritual. Through the actions of animate and non-animate actors in the ritual and ceremonies at Acaray, Acaray as a place and a community was created.

Regarding sponsors and ritual specialists (the human agents), some practical parameters provide some clues to their identity. The space in which this offering was made, measuring 4.8 m x 4.7 m, could have a conservative capacity of 20 people, based on a meter square space for each person. Is it appropriate to consider that a segment of a larger group was directly involved with the rituals surrounding the deployment and interment of the bundle? The lineage bundles of Coroma come to mind. The subset of individuals in the ritual space would presumably be the sponsors, who could have been acting on behalf of families or larger extended kin groups. I suggest they might have been heads of households, or ‘ayllu’ leaders. This interpretation is compelling if we consider that groups may have been converging at Acaray to defend themselves, forming a larger group or community to do so.

Ethnographically, ‘unkhuña’ cloths, similar to the square cloths that were tied by knots in the bundle, are linked to women, while the ‘chuspa’ is typically associated with men (Zorn, 1986: 291). Weiner’s (1992) work is compelling in how it relates the exchange of objects to kin and gender identities, and specifically the use of cloth.

Cloth may be the most apt metaphor to visualize the paradox of keeping-while-giving as societies in all parts of the world associate weaving with acts of tying and unraveling, sacred threads and dangerous dyes, woven warps and unworked woofs, expressions of longed for unity juxtaposed against the realities of death, destruction, and change. (pp. 153–154)

Cloth, and its use as an outerwrapping to contain collections of items, should be considered as a binding force (Guernsey and Reilly III, 2006). In prehispanic times weaving is typically associated with women (Dean, 2001: 154–161), although there were some Inca male weavers (Costin, 1998). Stone-Miller (1995: 176–177) suggests that textile-making in Chancay society was passed from mother to daughter. Given the presence of weaving loom holders, raw materials for weaving, ‘lúcuma’ and ‘jíquima’ (which may reference fertility or fertility regulation) in the bundles, Chancay women were probably involved in assembling contents of the bundles. They may have made the textile containers, and curated and patched them. The spindles and whorls found in the summit structure room support this interpretation. A segment of a larger group performed the rite within the room, and I suggest some of them were women, possibly ritual specialists. Women associated with the moon cult on the north coast of Peru were ritual specialists (Vogel, 2003).

The Chimú goddess, a likely continuation of an older female deity, often appearing in figure form atop pottery vessels, was linked to the moon, sea, and activities such as child-rearing and weaving (Moore and Mackey, 2008: 800). Numerous examples of female figurines (‘cuchimilco’) that may reference a special role for women are known for Chancay society (Morgan, 1996). Chancay women likely performed ritual roles that remain understudied. There are abundant indications from the summit of Acaray that women were involved in these rituals, though I can only speculate as to their specific role.

Was the creation of the bundles from Acaray related to a ‘vision quest’ or dream, as are some Native North American bundles (Irwin, 1994; McAllister, 1965)? Vision quests
can be spurred by the use of hallucinogens or other narcotics. At Acaray, such use is suggested by the presence of ‘coca’ seeds, the production of ‘cal’ for chewing with ‘coca’ leaves, ‘aji’ (chili) peppers, and ‘chicha’ remains. ‘Ishpingo’ seeds are suggestive as they have psychotropic properties (Bussmann and Sharon, 2007; Wassén, 1979). Given the well-documented Andean tradition, in colonial and modern times, of using medicinal plants and substances to call winds and spirits, we would expect that ritual specialists used such tools to conjure aid.

**Conclusion: The context of group bundles and collective rituals**

The Acaray bundles can be understood by not only disassembling them, but reassembling knowledge of their components toward an understanding of something greater. Literature for North American bundles is useful for considering how such assemblages may be used. However, by considering the qualities of the items along with historic and ethnographic examples of how Andean people view the world and their place in it, we gain a more specific approximation of the meaning of these bundles by emphasizing the larger social matrix in which they were deployed. This kind of analysis is critical to interpreting the broader meanings of objects, bundles, and assemblages in the past where those meanings must be inferred from materials.

A final consideration of the political implications of these interpretations is warranted. Scholars have pointed out that during periods of congregation, and specifically aggregation of smaller groups into larger ones, new ritual practices emerge to solidify group cohesion (Johnson, 1982; Walker and Lucero, 2000). In such contexts, leaders emerge. If the sub-bundles within the larger bundles from Acaray were linked to different groups or lineages, then it is reasonable to suggest that the composite group bundle is the materiality of alliance-building. Such cooperation would not be unheard of in the context of conflict, where smaller groups of people might converge to enhance group defense. At the same time, the bundles relate to healing, group security, strengthening structures (i.e. architecture), and solidifying social bonds among people and powerful spirits. As Andean ethnography illustrates, bundle rituals can manifest multiple demands to spirits and/or ancestors simultaneously (Girault, 1988: 162).

But it is important to emphasize that the bundles do not ‘represent’ social bonds, or group health. Rather, they ‘are’ agents of sociality and healing linked to other animate forces in the world, including humans. Without attention to these links, the practices that would help reveal the true impact of war on society remain hidden. A more sophisticated view of the social experience of war, such as presented here, is made possible through the detailed study of something that does not appear to be overtly related to war. The bundles contain no weapons, nor any items that display violent imagery. And yet, it is precisely the analytical de-emphasis of the conventional stuff of war that permits a view of social life and war more generally (Pauketat, 2009). It was through the bundling of people, cosmic forces, historical threads, and place (Acaray), the building of physical defenses, and the calling of other animated selves for spiritual defense that new identities were made, and the dangers of war could be unmade, by communities in the lower Huaura Valley.
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