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It is now widely acknowledged that no polity is a homeostatic system with equilibrium (Brumfiel 1992) but instead consists of individuals and collectivities with varying interests and practical capacities. There are multiple sources of power (Mann 1986) forming distinct but overlapping social fields (Bourdieu 1990) in which different sets of rules and resources embody multifaceted social relations (e.g., McGuire 1983; Paynter and McGuire 1991; Sewell 1992). Contradiction, defined as opposition of structural principles (Giddens 1979:141–45), therefore, exists in any societal formation and is actively negotiated by varying social segments. In a critical assessment of the dual-processual model (Blanton et al. 1996), David B. Small (2009) demonstrates the varying social contexts in which exclusionary and corporate strategies were employed in an ancient Greek polity (see also Beekman, this volume). Small breaks down the dual-processual model into several analytical domains, including ideology, institutions (contexts), and behavior. As critiqued by several scholars (e.g., Campbell 2009; Smith 2011; Yoffee 2005: 177–79; see also Inomata, this volume; Joyce et al., this volume), political dynamics cannot be subsumed in a single dimension of leadership strategies. Rather, there can be ideological multiplicity, various discourses, varying practices or behaviors, and social and physical contexts associated with certain ideologies where specific sets of practices are socially expected, promoted, or constrained. Thus, we need to pay attention to the fact
that multiple and contradictory principles become contextually defined and situationally operative (Flanagan 1989:261). Ultimately, “it is the practice of social life” that sets up and perpetuates equalities and inequalities (Josephides 1985:140; see also Inomata, this volume).

As reiterated by Sarah Kurnick in the introduction of this volume, similarities and differences (or equalities and inequalities) between the rulers and the ruled need to be simultaneously achieved for the successful operation of politics (Ferguson and Mansbach 1996; for the logical coexistence of both hierarchy and equality, see Dumont [1977]). These differences and similarities can be conceptualized broadly as some dimensions of political authority and a shared identity (or imagined community), respectively (Campbell 2009). A network of ideology/discourse, practice, and human and material resources constitute political authority and a shared identity. This indicates that both political authority and a shared identity have material dimensions or are mediated by material culture, including portable objects and built environment (Smith 2011), which can be gleaned in the urban architecture of Teotihuacan, the capital of a regional state in Central Mexico (ca. 150–650 CE).

The city of Teotihuacan consists of grand-scale monumental structures and other buildings along the Street of the Dead (hereafter the central precinct) and the surrounding residential area (figure 6.1). Similarities can be observed in the canonical orientation of buildings and standardized construction materials as well as several components of architectural complexes such as rooms, temples, and courtyards (Murakami 2013, 2014). Differences are noted in varying scales and the degree of embellishment of these buildings. This general observation on the architectural similarities and differences provides a useful starting point from which we can delve into historically contingent processes of the creation of an imagined community and social distinctions (Murakami 2014). This chapter examines how these architectural similarities and differences were shaped by strategic actions of and the negotiation among different social segments, resulting in the creation of social integration and distinctions. Specifically, I focus on the changing nature of the relationship between rulers, bureaucracy, and intermediate elites and demonstrate that the similarities and differences observed in urban architecture were produced and reproduced through complexly entangled political strategies employed by different social actors.

**RULERSHIP AT TEOTIHUACAN**

The consolidation of a central authority can clearly be seen in the explosive growth of monumental structures toward the end of the Tzacualli phase (ca.
The canonical orientation was likely established by this time (Sugiyama 2004). The alignment of the Moon Pyramid and Cerro Gordo (a mountain standing on the northern limit of the Teotihuacan Valley) (Tobriner 1972), the presence of an artificial cave under the Sun Pyramid (Heyden 1975, 1981), and the east-west axis of the Sun Pyramid, which is aligned to the sunset point on the initial day of the Maya Long Count calendar (R. Millon 1993; see also Cowgill 2000; Dow 1967; Šprajc 2000), all suggest that these monumental structures were closely associated with the creation of the world (Headrick 2007). While the representation of cosmic themes might have enhanced a corporate solidarity (Blanton et al. 1996:6), the construction of these major monuments probably served to legitimize and disseminate the central authority through the mobilization of a large labor
force (Murakami 2010) and the institutionalized violence as seen in sacrificial burials that accompanied these monuments (Sugiyama 2004; Sugiyama and López Luján 2007). Considering the large size of major plazas, including the Street of the Dead, a wide audience likely participated in sacrificial and other rituals, and these public spectacles provided a basis to enhance sovereign power (Foucault 1995; Murakami 2014). Although material evidence for ruling elites, such as rulers’ portraits and royal tombs, has not been uncovered to date, it seems reasonable to assume that the body of ruling elites was directly experienced in these rituals.

The association between major monuments and rulership became clearer when the Feathered Serpent Pyramid (FSP) (figure 6.3) was built at the Ciudadela in the Miccaotli-Tlamimilolpa transition (around 250 ce). Sculptures on the facades are interpreted as a scene representing the Feathered Serpent carrying on his back a headdress in the form of a primordial crocodilian monster, or the Teotihuacan equivalent of Aztec cipactli, which represents the first day of the ritual calendar (Sugiyama 1992, 2005; see also Taube 1986). Taking into account that the headdress was an emblem of rulership in other Mesoamerican societies, Saburo Sugiyama (1992, 2005) argues that the scene represents the creation of a new era and the succession of a ruler, both of which were brought by the Feathered Serpent. Along with the message embedded in the façades, over 200 sacrificed victims accompanied the construction (Sugiyama 2005). Rulership backed by military institutions was sacralized and promoted widely among city residents and beyond who would

Figure 6.2. Diachronic changes in total labor costs for the central precinct (CD: Ciudadela; SDC: Street of the Dead Complex; SP: Sun Pyramid; QPC: Quetzalpapalotl Palace Complex; C6: Complex 6:N5W1; MP: Moon Pyramid).
have participated in the ritual. René Millon (1993) and others (Cowgill 1983; Sugiyama 2004) see the construction of the Ciudadela as the culmination of the despotic rulership.
It is likely that the nature of rulership underwent a significant change by the Early Xolalpan phase (R. Millon 1988, 1993; Sugiyama 1998) or earlier (Cowgill 1998). Sacrificial burials have not been found from the rebuilt portions of major pyramids (Cabrera et al. 1991:88), and such an absence might attest to changes in the material and ritual manifestation of rulership. This change is probably associated with a termination ritual conducted at the FSP during the Late Tlamimiloapa or Early Xolalpan phase. Sugiyama (1998:158–61) demonstrates that the construction of the Adosada Platform abutted to the frontal façade of the FSP at the Ciudadela was accompanied by the demolition and burning of the old temple atop the FSP, the looting of burials, and the defacement of the façades of the FSP. He proposes that all these events were institutionally organized acts that served as the desecration of the FSP and the termination of the original ritual meanings for political ends. Sugiyama (1998) suggests that this possible termination program is indicative of political discord or replacement of rulership. René Millon (1988, 1993) postulates that the despotic rule provoked a reaction and rejection, leading to the establishment of institutional checks on the glorification of personal power and/or collective leadership.

After the Early Xolalpan phase, major pyramids were never rebuilt and construction activities were centered on administrative and residential buildings (figure 6.4), as I will discuss shortly. This may or may not signify the decline of rulership, but what we can see here is the changing network of ideology, practice, and resources. Construction as a practice, the use of a large labor force, and architectural conspicuous consumption were disconnected from the production of a central authority with or without ideological changes. Evidence suggests some continuities in the representation of militaristic rulership. For example, during the Late Xolalpan phase (450–550 CE), a pottery workshop was constructed at the north side of the Ciudadela, where theater-type censers (figure 6.5, top left) were produced (Múnera 1985; Rattray 2001). The central figure or mask in the center is interpreted as warrior (Sugiyama 2002), with some figures wearing nose pendants and ear spools, which are possible symbols of the central authority. The censers were widely distributed in the surrounding apartment compounds and were used in funerary rituals or for other purposes. This might indicate changes in practices and technologies of authorization, not necessarily the discursive meaning of rulership.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF BUREAUCRACY**

Possible changes in the nature of rulership during the Early Xolalpan phase were likely accompanied by the development of bureaucracy at Teotihuacan.
Although identifying bureaucracy in the archaeological record is not straightforward (Murakami n.d.), architectural evidence from the central precinct indicates changes in the central administrative organization.

**Identifying Administrative Facilities**

It is not an easy task to identify specialized administrative facilities at Teotihuacan and other sites in Mesoamerica mainly because the same buildings often have multiple functions (e.g., Inomata and Houston 2001). At Teotihuacan, architectural form is highly standardized across the city, and this complicates the identification of administrative facilities. Each architectural complex, a discrete group of buildings usually surrounded by walls, has both residential quarters and courtyards or plazas associated with temples (figures 6.6, 6.7), which may have served as ceremonial and/or social gathering areas. This means that there were no recognizable (at least for us) specialized facilities for administration. Administrative activities could have been carried out in both courtyard units associated with temples and rooms. Therefore, morphological traits alone do not provide reliable criteria for isolating the administrative function of buildings; rather, the location, size, internal layout, and associated artifacts and features have been used to infer the function of each complex and courtyard unit (Cabrera and Gómez 2008; Cowgill 1983, 1997, 2008; Gómez 2000; Gómez and Hernández 1999; Manzanilla 1996, 2009).

Further complicating the issue of identifying administrative facilities is that there is little evidence to suggest the extent to which political spheres were differentiated from religious and other spheres, unlike the Maya region and
Postclassic polities (see Baron, this volume; Pollard, this volume). In other words, we do not know for sure whether there were specialized administrators separate from priestly and other institutions, such as the military. Iconographic
studies show that priestly and military figures are prominent in murals, and there is little doubt that they participated in the state administration; although it is possible that priestly and military institutions were not conceived as separate and distinct from each other (Cowgill 1992:212–13). However, as Linda Manzanilla (1992) points out, it is likely that political hierarchies were largely conceived in religious terms. This does not mean that state administrators were all priests but that political decision-making processes occurred in

**Figure 6.6.** Layout of some apartment compounds, arrows indicate entrances: (a) modified after Cabrera and Gómez 2008:figure 7; (b) modified after Manzanilla 2004:figure 5.6, courtesy of John Wiley and Sons; (c) modified after Manzanilla 2004:figure 5.3, courtesy of John Wiley and Sons; (d) modified after Cabrera and Gómez 2008:figure 3.
religious settings, both physically and organizationally. Thus, the overwhelming number of ritual facilities within the central precinct does not imply that this zone was used mainly for religious purposes; governmental functions and political activities were likely carried out in these facilities (Cowgill 1983:332).

Based on the location, size, quality, and complexity of architectural complexes, George L. Cowgill (1983) proposes that the North and South Palaces of the Ciudadela, the Street of the Dead Complex (SDC) (figure 6.7), and other complexes were the major administrative foci, with possible shifts in importance through time (see also R. Millon 1973). Among these complexes, I argue that the SDC is the most plausible candidate for the central administrative facilities. The SDC is a mega-complex located between the Sun Pyramid and the Ciudadela, consisting of five three-temple complexes, room structures around the temple structures, and the street segmented by four transverse platforms forming three sunken courtyards (Wallrath 1967; figure 6.7). Only some portions of the complex have been excavated, including the Viking Group, the East Plaza Complex, the area of the “Excavations of 1917,” the West Plaza Complex, and the Complex of the Superimposed Structures (see Morelos 1982, 1993).

The SDC and other excavated architectural complexes within the central precinct are characterized by the near absence of burials underneath floors in their residential quarters. This contrasts with apartment compounds outside the central precinct and may suggest that the SDC housed institutionally affiliated groups, such as government officials, their retainers, and servants. The majority of excavated apartment compounds seem to have been organized into houses and that members of each compound, or house, shared ritual practices (specifically mortuary rituals) that can be distinguished from those of other compounds, thereby perpetuating a specific identity through time (Clayton 2009). Thus, the absence of burials at the SDC (and other complexes) suggests that hereditary groups did not inhabit the complex (see Cabrera and Gómez 2008:49; Gómez 2000:596–602). It is possible that personnel of the SDC were recruited from outside the central precinct and that they stayed within the complex for the duration of their appointments.

These observations do not preclude the possibility that residents of the SDC and other complexes received some special mortuary treatment and were buried somewhere else. However, the North and South Palaces at the Ciudadela contain burials, suggesting that these complexes housed hereditary groups such as royal families or priests (see Cowgill 1983, 1997; R. Millon 1973). Due to these differences regarding the presence of burials, it is likely that there is a clear difference in the nature of social groups among different architectural complexes within the central precinct.
Additionally, there are other possible administrative buildings within the central precinct, such as the Quetzalpapalotl Palace Complex at the west side of the Moon Plaza, Complex 6:N5W1 at the west side of the Moon Pyramid, and possibly other unexcavated complexes. The nature of social groups in these complexes is poorly understood, but it is likely that some administrative activities were carried out there. The presence of multiple administrative facilities might attest to a relatively high degree of internal differentiation of administrative organization into multiple institutions,
although it is not clear to what extent these institutions were specialized or independent and how they were related to each other (e.g., Cowgill 1992). It is possible that there were multiple orders, such as civil, judicial, military, and religious, as seen in the Aztec empire (see also Pollard, this volume). Annabeth Headrick (2007) proposes that the institution of the ruler, lineages, and the military order shaped the dynamic of power in the city. If so, royal families and lineage and military leaders may have formed the upper echelons of the bureaucracy.

High-level administrative decision making would have taken place in royal palaces (e.g., Christie and Sarro 2006; Inomata and Houston 2001), but the location of royal palaces remains controversial at Teotihuacan. René Millon (1973) and Cowgill (1983) think that the North and South Palaces at the Ciudadela were the seat of the rulers, but Cowgill (1983) also suggests the possibility that the royal residence was moved to the SDC afterward (see also Sanders and Evans 2006). Manzanilla (2006; Manzanilla and López Luján 2001) argues that the Xalla Complex, to the east of the Moon Plaza, was the royal palace. In any case, due to this unsolved issue, the spatial and organizational relationship between the rulers and possible administrative organization is not clearly understood.

The Evolution of Administrative Buildings

There are diachronic changes in the size and labor expenditure for administrative buildings, which suggest the expansion of administrative organization and possibly an increased degree of bureaucratization. All the complexes mentioned above were built during the Early Tlamimilolpa phase (ca. 250–300 CE), with rebuilding episodes in the subsequent phases. There is little evidence of administrative buildings before the Early Tlamimilolpa (i.e., the Tzacualli and Miccaotli phases; ca. 1–250 CE) largely because, except for major pyramids, most structures were razed to build new architectural complexes during the Early Tlamimilolpa phase. There is a possible elite residential quarter in an area where the Ciudadela was to be constructed, but its layout is not well understood (Cabrera 1991:35; 1998; Cabrera et al. 1991b:83–84; Gazzola 2009). Therefore, I focus on changes from the Tlamimilolpa to later phases.

There are two major construction stages at the SDC and they are dated to the Early Tlamimilolpa and Early Xolalpan phases (Morelos 1993; Sánchez 1991), although there are limited ceramic data to confirm this (see Cabrera and Andrade 2004:284; R. Millon 1973:55). Matthew Wallrath (1967:115, 119)
originally suggested that the original complex may have been smaller, and excavation data seem to confirm it (Morelos 1993:106). If so, the east-west dimension of the complex likely measured around 250 meters in the first stage and was extended to around 350 meters in the second stage. There was probably no change in the north-south dimension (ca. 380 meters). Thus, the total area of the SDC was likely expanded from ca. 9.5 hectares to ca. 13 hectares. Moreover, excavations at the West Plaza Complex revealed that a number of room structures were constructed in the second stage in an area where there were open spaces during the first construction stage (Morelos 1993:84, 90). All this suggests that there were fewer room structures at the first construction stage, although this needs to be examined through further excavations.

The second construction stage, dated to the Early Xolalpan phase, corresponds to most structures now exposed at the SDC. The floor level was raised on average ca. 2.10 meters from the floor of the first construction stage (Morelos 1993:19, 82). A number of room structures were built on this raised floor. The SDC is surrounded by walls (1.8–2.2 meters thick) and embankments likely built during the second construction stage (Wallrath 1967:117–18). Cowgill (1983:339) estimates that the SDC housed around 800 to 1,600 persons, or probably more. This increased number of administrators may correspond to the increased number of official positions, which is an indication of an intensified internal differentiation or bureaucratization.

A substantial change in the layout is also reported from the Quetzalpapalotl Palace Complex (QPC) and the Complex 6:N5W1. There are two major construction stages at the QPC, which are dated to the Early Tlamimilolpa and Early Xolalpan phases (Acosta 1964; Koga 2005; R. Millon 1973:57; Müller 1978:30). At the second stage, the floor level was raised about 4 meters, burying previous temple and room structures (Acosta 1964:plano 6). A similar trend can be seen at the Complex 6:N5W1, where the floor level was raised 2 meters from the previous level, with several temple and room structures being built atop the new floor during the Early Xolalpan phase (Carballo 2005:89). The North and South Palaces at the Ciudadela also show some rebuilding episodes after their original construction in the Early Tlamimilolpa phase, and the floor level was raised from ca. 70 centimeters to 150 centimeters, probably during the Early Xolalpan phase (Cabrera 1991:planos 2–4; Cabrera et al. 1991:87–88). While the same layout was likely kept throughout the rebuilding episodes at the North and South Palaces, a new residential compound was added at the west side of the North Palace, suggesting an increase in the number of residents within the Ciudadela (Cabrera 1991: 39–40, 1998:158).
Resource Allocation for Administrative Buildings

The expansion of administrative organization can be seen more clearly in the changing resource allocation for construction within the central precinct. Energetic analysis (for specifics of the method, see Murakami 2010) has revealed decentralization processes in the use of labor and material resources, which suggests changes in internal power relations among ruling elites (figures 6.2 and 6.4). During the Tzacualli and Miccaotli phases, power was highly centralized and labor investment was concentrated in a single structure: the Sun Pyramid (ca. 90 percent of the total labor costs within the central precinct). In the Early Tlamimilolpa phase, power became less centralized, as seen in more proportionate labor allocation among different architectural complexes. However, construction activities still focused on ceremonial structures, as exemplified by the erection of the FSP and the Ciudadela (ca. 65 percent of the total labor). As mentioned above, excavations at the FSP revealed burials of around 200 sacrificed victims, and Sugiyama (2005) convincingly demonstrates that the erection of the FSP represents the creation of a new era and the accession of the ruler.

By the Early Xolalpan phase, the process of decentralization within the governmental institutions was likely intensified. The SDC stands as the most important architectural complex in terms of labor investment (ca. 43 percent of the total labor). Furthermore, as figure 6.4 shows, investment in administrative and residential structures increased during the Early Xolalpan phase; about 24 percent of the total labor costs were invested for administrative/residential structures in the Early Tlamimilolpa phase, whereas the proportion of this cost increased to 51 percent in the Early Xolalpan phase. An emphasis on structures of primarily administrative (and residential) function during the Early Xolalpan phase departs from an earlier emphasis on ceremonial structures (the Sun Pyramid and the FSP in the Ciudadela) and probably speaks to the increased power of the inhabitants of those structures (government officials, institutions, and/or the factions of those institutions) and/or the increased importance of administrative activities. In summary, all these observations suggest an increase in size, complexity, and possibly power of the administrative organization during the Early Xolalpan phase.

Bureaucrats and Intermediate Elites

As discussed above, it is likely that bureaucrats at Teotihuacan were recruited from outside the central precinct, and this implies that there was a close connection between administrative officials and some lineages, or houses,
at apartment compounds, walled enclosures with several residential units inside (figure 6.6). The most likely candidates for bureaucrats are members of intermediate elite apartment compounds or higher ranked intermediate elite compounds, which are generally thought to have been neighborhood centers (Manzanilla 2006; R. Millon 1976, 1981). These intermediate elite compounds have a larger central courtyard and temple structures than those of other apartment compounds, and their internal rooms are profusely decorated with murals. Studies of these murals at some apartment compounds (e.g., C. Millon 1973; Headrick 2007) show that the decorative themes include those related to state ideology. Furthermore, a set of greenstone earpools, a nose pendant, and beads, possible symbols of state officials (Cabrera 2002), were also uncovered from a burial at La Ventilla B (LVB 21) in the Early Tlamimilolpa context (Rattray 1997:lamina III).

Somewhat paralleled to the expansion of bureaucracy in the Xolalpan phase, mural depictions of priestly and/or armed personnel (figure 6.5, bottom) increased at intermediate elite apartment compounds (e.g., Miller 1973; C. Millon 1973; R. Millon 1992). Accordingly, the production of stuccoed tripod vessels depicting these personnel (figure 6.5, top right) increased during the Xolalpan phase (Rattray 2001). This might attest to the close association between state bureaucracy and some intermediate elites as well as the proliferation of bureaucrats/intermediate elites. Although residents in administrative buildings possibly included servants in addition to administrators, a relatively large portion of social groups in the city was involved in administrative duties (see Cowgill 1983:339). It is possible that bureaucrats were also recruited from lower status apartment compounds to form lower echelons of the bureaucracy, as seen in the Late Postclassic Basin of Mexico (Fargher et al. 2011; Hicks 1999). Manzanilla (2001:177) points out that each apartment compound has at least one burial with very rich offerings, including slate discs, theater-type censers, and tripod vessels, among other items. This suggests the possibility that these persons with rich offerings were formerly state bureaucrats.

**URBAN CONSTRUCTION AND ENTANGLED POLITICAL STRATEGIES**

The changing relationship among governmental institutions, along with the development of bureaucracy during the Early Xolalpan phase or earlier, was probably a consequence of social transformations during the Tlamimilolpa phase, which substantially altered the urban landscape surrounding the central precinct. The adoption of apartment compounds marks the start of this urban
transformation, and over 2,000 apartment compounds were constructed over the course of one hundred years or so (R. Millon 1981). Considering the conformity of the orientation of the apartment compounds, R. Millon (1993; see also Cowgill 2000) states that the decision to build such compounds derived from a strong and effective centralized authority. The creation of an orderly laid-out city was perhaps an extension of the construction of the central precinct, which embodied an ideology associated with cosmic themes (Cowgill 2003). Furthermore, the reduction of basal units of urban populace by aggregating several residential units in a single compound would have reduced the burden of the internal administration of the city (R. Millon 1981:212). Thus, the urban renewal project was likely predicated on the ideological and practical interests of ruling elites.

René Millon (1993:29) postulates that the state must have sponsored the building of apartment compounds by organizing the supply of building materials. My study of construction materials (Murakami 2010) generally supports this view, which suggests that the state regulated labor forces and that lime and cut stone blocks were procured centrally by the state and distributed to the urban populace. This indicates a strong infrastructural power of the state, which is defined as its ability to penetrate into civil life (Mann 1984). The exercise of strong infrastructural power is generally associated with developed bureaucracy since a complex administrative system is required to administer the wide distribution of public goods (Blanton and Fargher 2008). Archaeological evidence at Teotihuacan is consistent with such a general trend, and the urban renewal project probably resulted in the expansion of bureaucratic organization mentioned above.

However, it is unlikely that urban renewal was the sole result of the decisions of ruling elites. To achieve the ideological and practical goals of ruling elites, it would not be necessary to widely distribute costly construction materials such as lime. I suggest that there was a demand for such construction materials by urban residents. From functionalist perspectives, bureaucracy is usually formed to implement political goals of rulers, but it also needs to meet the demands of major social groups, from which the rulers want to mobilize resources. Thus, to the extent that the state relies on internal revenues (Blanton and Fargher 2008), bureaucracy is required to provide and regulate public services. Based on the comparative study of bureaucracies, Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt (1963:281–87) characterizes “service-oriented” bureaucracies by their dependence on the rulers along with their partial incorporation into various social groups. Archaeological evidence at Teotihuacan seems consistent with this view, as discussed above. This suggests the possibility that decisions in
the central authority reflect the interests of certain social groups, from which bureaucrats were recruited. In this kind of political organization, the distinction between top-down and bottom-up decision-making processes becomes somewhat blurred yet is certainly distinct from democratic regimes. Nonetheless, we can envision something like an amalgam of strategic actions by rulers, bureaucrats, and possibly intermediate elites, and the negotiation among these social groups would have resulted in the urban renewal project. It is intriguing to reconstruct the initial process of urban renewal in order to understand the nature of this negotiation. Although data are elusive in this respect, I summarize below currently available data and illustrate that the urban renewal project was likely initiated through the negotiation between the state (the rulers and bureaucracy) and social groups closely related to state institutions.

**Initial Process of the Urban Renewal Project**

While most excavated apartment compounds were founded during the Late Tlamimilolpa phase (ca. 300–350 CE) (see R. Millon 1981:206), there are some compounds that were founded in the Early Tlamimilolpa (ca. 250–300 CE), which include several in the La Ventilla district (La Ventilla I, II, A, and B) (see Gómez 2000; Rattray 1997), Tlajinga 33 (Widmer 1987), and possibly some compounds in the Oaxaca barrio (Croissier 2007; Spence 1992). It is possible that there was a time lapse between the construction of the first apartment compounds and that of later ones. Deep excavations at a portion of La Ventilla II (Delgado n.d.) revealed that a residential unit built in the Early Tlamimilolpa phase was rebuilt once during the same phase. This suggests that the first compound was built early in the Early Tlamimilolpa phase and that there were one or two generations of time lapse between the first La Ventilla II and other compounds built in the Late Tlamimilolpa phase. At Tlajinga 33, a lower status compound in a periphery of the city, some small-scale modifications of buildings, as well as a superimposition of a floor, were observed during the Early Tlamimilolpa phase (Widmer 1987:330–36), and this also suggests that the compound was built early in the Early Tlamimilolpa phase.

The possible time lapse between the construction of first and later apartment compounds suggests that the urban renewal consisted of at least two steps: introduction of the compounds by a limited number of people and the subsequent (probably rapid) spread of the compounds to the great majority of urban residents. Considering their relatively high labor costs (Murakami 2010), I suggest the possibility that only privileged people were allowed to construct typical apartment compounds early in the Early Tlamimilolpa phase. The La
Ventilla district is located just west of the Great Compound, and it is possible that residents in the district were closely affiliated with governmental institutions (see Gómez 2000). In fact, a burial with greenstone ornaments has been uncovered from one of these early compounds, as mentioned above.

It is doubtful, however, that the residents at Tlajinga 33 were also privileged. It is possible that they emulated the new style of living and constructed the compound by themselves (Murakami 2013). Randolph J. Widmer (1987; Widmer and Storey 1993:102) suggests that only a compound-level organization was required for major construction activities at Tlajinga 33, based on its disconformity of orientation and the poor execution of structures. Construction materials and techniques are different from those of compounds in the urban core. For example, the majority of raw materials used were available in nearby areas, such as river cobbles and earth, and lime plaster was probably not used for these early buildings.

This suggests that lime and other construction materials, widely distributed later, were demanded by relatively powerful people (or so-called intermediate elites) in the initial stage of urban renewal. Elite residences both within and outside the central precinct probably provided a model or an idea of the ideal housing, which was adopted by most urban residents in subsequent phases. As my study suggests (Murakami 2010, 2013, 2014), a grand-scale urban renewal was made possible by the active intervention of the state in the procurement and distribution of construction materials, resulting in highly standardized construction materials and techniques.

In summary, the canonical orientation, an orderly layout, and the reorganization of basal units of urban populace would reflect strategies of ruling elites, whereas the use of costly construction materials and techniques was likely derived from strategies of intermediate elites and other social groups. These varying strategies were mediated by state bureaucracy, which exercised a strong infrastructural power to implement the demands of both ruling elites and major social groups. Thus, as Cowgill (2003) suggests, urban renewal represents a mix of both top-down and bottom-up processes, but these decision-making processes were entangled in a complex way.

**CONCLUSIONS: SOCIAL INTEGRATION, SEPARATION, AND THE DIALECTIC OF CONTROL**

Urban architecture provided varying social fields that constituted both differences and similarities among various social segments at Teotihuacan. The production of the central authority was predicated on the mobilization of
ideology, which connected cosmic themes with institutionalized violence in a substantive way, and the mobilization of human and material resources, which enhanced bodily experience of sovereign power. These two different levels or kinds of mobilization intersected at the very act of monument building, thereby perpetuating the solid network of ideology, practice of authorization, and resources. Thus, monumental construction does not only reflect the power of ruling elites but was an essential component of the practice of authorization and subjection (Smith 2003, 2011). And, in this light, we can clearly see why monumental structures were often rebuilt continuously. Moreover, the meanings inscribed in these monumental structures were probably enacted continuously through ritual performance in spacious plazas within the central precinct (Murakami 2014).

The urban renewal project was probably an extension of the same practice of authorization and subjection but at a greater scale and with different consequences. Ideological and practical interests of varying social groups were actively negotiated, resulting in the use of highly standardized construction materials and techniques. I suggested that the creation of the notion of the ideal housing and collective demands for such housing is the key to understanding this process. In a sense, standardized apartment compounds can be interpreted as a material manifestation of the dialectic of control or relations of autonomy and dependence (Giddens 1979:145–49). In other words, subject populations controlled to some extent the distribution of resources, thereby reinforcing the reciprocal relations between the state and its subjects and perhaps promoting a corporate ideology. I argued that state bureaucracy played a central role in this process of negotiation. By incorporating various individuals in the administration of the city (and beyond), bureaucracy and major social groups were well integrated to form a civil society. It should be emphasized, however, that this social integration rested on the separation of the lowest status residents from the standard “culture” of housing. Archaeological evidence points to the fact that there were people who did not have access to standardized construction materials and techniques, some of them living in insubstantial structures. This indicates that the production of similarities at one level may reinforce difference at another level of social interaction (and vice versa). Therefore, we must acknowledge multiple scales or levels in the production of similarities and differences (e.g., between rulers and bureaucrats, between state elites and subject population, etc.). In fact, it is possible that the creation of similarities through the urban renewal project had a profound impact on the nature of rulership and the relationship between the rulers and bureaucracy during the Early Xolalpan and subsequent phases.
As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, multiple and contradictory principles become contextually defined and situationally operative (Flanagan 1989:261). We should pay close attention to varying contexts and situations (or social fields, in more general terms) without losing sight of the totalizing and individualizing effects of the state system (Foucault 1982). Overall, the similarities and differences between the rulers and the ruled at Teotihuacan were achieved not as a sole result of rulers’ political strategies but through entangled political strategies among varying social groups and at multiple scales of social interaction.
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