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Abstract

This thesis traces the ways of explaining the generative process by the eastern Peruvian descendants of the Capanahua. These predominately Spanish-speaking people tend to emphasize the discontinuity with their ancestors, a little known Panoan-speaking indigenous population of the Western Amazon. Based on ethnographic fieldwork and transcriptions of recorded conversations, this presentation follows and reconstructs a salient frustrative-generative dynamic in a wide range of representations, wherein alterations of self-containment or perceptibility incept the processes of differentiation and discontinuity. These processes guide a local conception of “descent” as infliction.

Implications of this dynamic are examined for the formulations of kinship. The familial relations, explicitly based on notions of consanguinity and filiation – are cast in an ambiguous, if not predominately negative light. Procreation is formulated in predatory, parasitic terms, and shares dynamics with pathogenic causality and aetiology. As such, it does not naturally contribute to reproduction and continuity, but rather frustrates it by introducing difference into the vertical axis. Such results also produce horizontal differences and hierarchies, encoded as the person’s divergent, hidden “descent” in the always “mixed” social life.

This image of the generative process is instrumental to understanding the villagers’ explanations of the acculturative processes. Because representations of acculturation focuses on the idiom of procreation and its frustrative results, it appears as the very function of procreative dynamics. This produces a series of associations between the progeny and sociality, focusing on their inherently “third” or external position and perpetual dividuality of belonging/containing. Such ambiguity might be tamed and everted, to produce cleansing or encompassment that counteracts the divisive continuity of time (qua descent, history, or kinship). In a contemporary context, these formulations are seen reflected in the villagers’ construal of the Peruvian state as the urban environment that is hierarchically closer to the ideal originality and beautiful imperishability than the smaller, isolated unities of rural ancestors.
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Introduction

Before, there used to be Capanahua living here – Beder told me when I asked – they... I mean... We, today, live on the land of those Capanahua, but have little to do with them. We have inherited their land. There used to be those who knew the language, but they are gone. As long as the gringos used to come, people here would talk to them, and practiced the language [practicaban idioma]. But since they stopped coming – people forget. There is no one to teach them how to speak, and there is no one to speak to. (fB0704)

This is a quote from my field notes taken during an initial, short visit to the “Capanahua” villages in April 2007. On the Buncuya River, these are located 2-3 days by boat from the nearest villages and the town of Tamanco at the confluence of the Guanache and the lower Ucayali rivers. At that time, villagers told me that all “the real Capanahua” had moved out or died. The living people who talked with me were not, in any simple sense obvious to themselves, “Capanahua.” Their daily life, language, clothes, occupations, celebrations, and even facial features and skin colour, were not significantly different from other rural inhabitants of eastern Peru.¹ They confirmed that these were the Capanahua comunidades nativas [native communities], but maintained that there were no more “Capanahua people” there. For me, those few days on the Buncuya were the culmination of previous, foiled quests for “the Capanahua,” based on the much older tradition of defining, making sense of, and thus “creation” of “the Capanahua” and other people sharing similar spatial (eastern Peru, Amazonia or elsewhere) and historical positions (socio-cultural transformations leading to joining larger societies as “indigenous”). However, this visit was also the beginning of a new quest for an understanding of what it actually meant to “be Capanahua” or to be “someone else already” for the villagers. Here, the vehicle has become the local take on the generative process that we may refer to as “descent” (Rivièrè 1993). It is such engagement that resulted in this thesis.

¹ When speaking of the “mestizo” in this work, I refer to eastern Peruvians of other than (known) Capanahua descent. Many may have parents or ancestors who spoke other indigenous eastern Peruvian languages.
1. Traces of “the Capanahua”

An overview of the previous unsuccessful quests introduces some basic problems I found with the conventional categories such as “the Capanahua” in the region. Two years previously, in 2005, I participated in an AIDESEP² project aimed at gathering and verifying the reported indications of “uncontacted” people’s presence to the east of the Middle and Lower Ucayali. Visiting the area between the Tacshitea River and Contamana, I found that the local Shipibo-Conibo and mestizo people referred to such isolated people as “the Capanahua” (among other names). The closest that most of those people (or me) got to these “Capanahua” have been their footprints or fleeting encounters.

Over the next few years, I took this quest to the written historical material. The more I looked, the more elusive the historical “Capanahua” became. In the historical sources, the name Capanahua, as well as the ethnonyms that usually accompany it – such as “Remos,” “Mayorunas,” “Amahuacas” or “Sensis” – seemed to refer with random consistency to basically unknown people, emerging for momentary encounters with other riverine populations, and therefore sometimes entering into the written history. Mentions of “the Capanahua” go back to the 17th century, refer to the general area of the Ucayali, and spread to the upper Jurúá and Purus rivers or the upper Javari in the 20th century (Fig. 1). Based on this analysis, it appears that even though they were presented as indexing “nations,” “tribes,” or “ethnic groups” in regional histories, these names overall referred to people speaking different languages and inhabiting mutually remote areas over numerous generations. In many cases, they referred to people connected by little more than their distance from the riverine societies or missions and vague, synchronically and diachronically transforming categories with which those societies and historians defined them. They looked no different from those generic labels and fleeting traces used currently on the Ucayali. Between 2005 and 2009, much of my time was devoted to making sense of such complications.³

² Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana, indigenous-led Peruvian NGO.
³ The report from this research is Krokoszyński, Stońska-Kairska, and Martyniak (2007). The historical work was initiated in connection with the AIDESEP project (Krokoszyński 2006-07) and used in my MA thesis (Krokoszyński 2008) and some other work (Krokoszyński 2007; Krokoszyński and Fleck n.d.; Fleck and Krokoszyński n.d.).
Between the late 19th and early 20th centuries, these “interfluvial” or “marginal” peoples known under such remote categories were becoming increasingly “visible” to the riverine societies — and thus to national states and literate observers. This coincided with extensive penetrations of the area by rubber workers (themselves often indigenous), who were the ones who “contacted,” “tamed,” or “civilized” these forest people, employing them as labourers, guides, mercenaries and so on. The latter’s perspectives revealed in networks of names, identities, languages and relations have further complicated the historical image of the area. Throughout the latter half of the 20th century, ethnographers and linguists studied this image, and the people who created it. On the one hand, they agreed that many of these people could be classified as members of the larger Panoan linguistic family, whose languages are spoken across a contiguous territory stretching from eastern Peru to western Brazil and northwestern Bolivia. On the other hand, while recognising a general similarity among various Panoans, anthropologists pointed out complex layers and levels of identifications. Philippe Erikson addressed the continuities of the global similarities alongside the ongoing atomic differentiations, which responded to the relational logic formulated for the Panoans as “constitutive alterity,” describing their reliance on the encompassment or input of social otherwise in establishing identities. The historical articulation of these social attitudes was a mosaic of identities dispersed across social formations on the one hand, and on the other, “mixed” identities within any given community, with apparently porous boundaries. In such a context, described by

---

4 The Capanahua have been opposed as the “interfluvial” group to the riverine Panoans such as the Shipibo and Conibo or historical Pano and Shetebo according to classical distinctions between mainstream Ucayali and marginal (Steward, Métraux, and Métraux 1948) or interfluvial, “upper reaches” groups (Lathrap 1970; cf. e.g. DeBoer 1986; Myers 1976; 1990). In contrast to earlier classifications (e.g. Loos 1999), David Fleck has recently proposed (2013) to treat Capanahua as a co-dialect of Shipibo-Conibo.

5 For the most recent, exhaustive discussion of the linguistic family, see Fleck (2013). For ethnographic syntheses, see Santos Granero and Barclay Rey de Castro (1994; 1998). Philippe Erikson’s publications quoted below signal the Panoan-specific problems.

6 “Alterity,” encoded in the virtually universally Panoan category nahuá has been identified as the “constitutive” element of Panoan social ideologies (Erikson 1986; 1993; 1999; Keifenheim 1990; 1992).

7 The Panoan Marubo, as well as closely related Katukina-Pano on the other side of Peruvian-Brazilian border talk of their “peoples” (Port. povos) (Lima 2000; Ruedas 2001; Wellang 2001; Welper 2009; Cesarino 2008), emphasizing the mixed character of contemporary social life and relatedness. The same expressions can be found in many examples from the Panoan identifications. Matís (as well as Matés) perceived themselves as a set of named groups, as distinct from each other as from e.g., from Korubo, speaking a separate language (Erikson 1994). Graham Townsley found it extremely difficult to know who, precisely, the Yaminahua were, as they answered to a variety of other nahuá names (Townsley 1988). Other observers of Panoan social formations have been equally confused. Father Tastevin had difficulties in determining actual Katukina identity in the first quarter of the 20th century, describing them as panos de toda raça, composed of a variety of groups whose number in all of Tastevin’s publications reached twenty one (in: Lima 1994: 21). Similarly, Marinawa (one of the units called Yaminawa), were “a mixture of a number of tribes that were dying out and got together to form the group that now exists”, with the number of “tribal names” being twenty five (Scott 1963 in: Erikson 1986: 186), and Shanahua are “composed out of a multitude of subgroups that decided to live together and to aquire or construct something of a common identity” (Déleage 2005: 23–24; cf. Siskind 1973) Other Amazonians seem to perceive their relatedness and sociality in a similar manner. People are classified into -djapá groups by the Kanamari, -madíba by the Kulina, -iniri by the Piro (Calavia Sáez 2002), or -nauá, -xutabo, -xajfo, -kato by different Panoans, but is also reminiscent of the way Urubambinos speak of the ‘races’ (razas) that compose persons and communities (Gow 1991), or of the set of Cocama surnames (Gow 2003). Córdoba (2006) noticed an overlap of surnames and
Erikson as the “nebulous compact” (Erikson 1993), in the words of editors of the Guía Etnográfica de la Alta Amazonía, “it is little appropriate to use the notion of ethnic group as it has been used in other Amazonian contexts” (1994: xx). The Panoan speakers themselves did not seem to have much interest in these, instead producing locally complicated histories of fissions and fusions, interweaving periods of reformulation and conservatism. These problems concerned “the Capanahua” too, both as one of the dispersed categories (the widespread exoethnonym), as well as an agglomerate of diverse intra-social categories.

2. On the wane: “the Capanahua” of the Tapiche and Buncuya rivers

Judging by the linguistic, cultural and historical affiliations, the Panoan people of the Tapiche and Buncuya rivers have participated in a larger historical network of relations in the Ucayali-Juruá divide. Between the 19th and 20th centuries, some came to establish more permanent relations with rubber extraction workers, (Brazilian, Peruvian, or both), and came to be associated with an ethnonym traditionally employed by outsiders for the inhabitants of those areas. Since then, the population with the attached “Capanahua” name has occupied the banks of the upper Tapiche, and later the Buncuya rivers (both flowing into the Lower Ucayali). The

the old maxobo categories among Chacobo, Bolivian Panoans. In such a plural context, autoidentifications in many cases are designations referring to kinship or humanity (which could be argued to be coextensive).

This view of Panoan groups coincides with the larger critique of traditional notions of static and bounded groups. Entities, identities and linear continuity were shown to be primarily Euro-American (scholarly) concerns (Wagner 1974), embedded within specific cultural orientations (Wagner 1981). The critique of such a “billiard ball” model of societies (Wolf 1982) was one of the main trends in formative for contemporary Amazonian anthropology (Viveiros de Castro 1996). Challenges to this traditional view began over 30 years ago (Ferguson & Whitehead 1992; Hill 1996; Hornborg 2005; Whitten et al. 1976). Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (in: Monteiro 2012: 31) pointed out that “freezing and isolation of ethnic groups is a social and cognitive phenomenon of post Columbian provenience,” and the attribution of ethnonyms was a result of a “complete misunderstanding of ethnic and political dynamics of the Amerindian socius,” based on incompatibility of the “substantivist and national-territorialist” conceptions of society to the relative and relational nature of ethnic, political and social categories of indigenous people. In the Panoan context, recognition of the kaleidoscopic recombinations of identities have further contributed to such a critique, because, according to Fernando Santos Granero and Frederica Barclay, concentrating only on the fluidity of borders themselves produces distortion, because this implicates that despite reformulations, entities “are reproduced as essentially identical, and thus present an impossible continuity. Indeed, even if this can be the case for periods of short or medium duration, it most certainly is not for periods of long duration” (ibid.: xxx).

These fusions throughout Panoan territories have been taking different forms at different points in time, ranging from violent incorporations of the captives on a large scale, like among the Matses (Romanoff 1984; Matlock 2002; Matos 2009) or the Shipibo-Conibo (e.g. DeBoer 1986; Izaguirre 1922-29; cf. Santos-Granero 2010), to peaceful aggregations of people and groups at different points on the Panoan ethnic and linguistic continuum as exemplified by the Marubo and Katukina (see above), Nukini (Montagner-Melatti 1977; Montagner 2007), Yawanawa (Calavia Sáez 2001), Amahuaca (Dole 1998; Hewlett 2013), Isconahua (Whiton, Greene, and Monsen 1964), etc. Fernando Santos-Granero and Frederica Barclay (1994) proposed a model for intra-Panoan relations with the immediate social level of interactions, or the direct, mundane alliances and scissions.

In Erikson’s proposition, the Panoans were divided into eight principal cultural-linguistic categories, with the Capanahua classified within the “Central Panoans” (mediens, mediantos, Medianeros) ensemble, intermediate between the Northern Pano (Mayoruna) and the Juruá-Purus Panoans (Yaminahua, Cashinahua, Amahuaca etc.) – and a missing link in the “Panoan unity” (Erikson 1992; 1993; 1994; 1999; cf. also Lima 2000; Welper 2006). This cluster included the Remo (i.e. population known historically as Remo and more recently as Isconahua and Nukini, cf. Krokoszyński 2007, 2008), Marubo, Katukina-Pano (including the group from the Campinas and Gregorio rivers, and those from the vicinity of Feijó, also known as Shenauna), Poyanaua, and the historical Sensi (Erikson 1999). Editors of the Guía Etnográfica employed the name Southern Mayoruna in reference to this formation (Santos-Granerok Barclay 1994: xviii). Historical, cultural and social continuities with other Panoans and neighbouring families question this classification, showing it to be primarily geographical. Here, too, recent linguistic investigation conducted by Fleck (2013) proves the category problematic, at least linguistically, as languages spoken by these people belong to various subgroups of the Nawa group.
language they spoke received attention from linguists due to the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (1954-1990s) and more recently, of José Elias-Ulloa. Yet, the written record on their history or society is scarce, making the “Capanahua” one of the least described Panoan nuclei.

The detailed discussion of both the earlier sources and those referring to this particular population formed part of my M.A. dissertation (2008). Here, I want to note a remarkably consistent motif in outsiders’ ways of describing “the Capanahua” of the Tapiche over the last century, because it relates to my 2007 visit and is the very focus of this thesis. In an early reference from the 1920s, American Harvey Bassler informed German ethnographer Günter Tessmann that the Capanahua of the Tapiche were “civilized,” and living and working with a non-indigenous employer. Despite their separation from the national population, they were already “subjected to civilization to such an extent that it can be supposed that they will disappear within a short time” (Tessmann 1999: 91). Around ten years later, Latvian geologist Victor Oppenheim described the Tapiche Capanahua as living “in complete liberty and independence of the civilized people. Of all the tribes of the ‘Panos’ race (...), the Capanahuas left [us] the best impression of vitality,” maintaining their customs despite the “development” caused by contact with “civilization” (1936b: cf. 1936a: 10–11). Still, a decade later, in 1943, a physician originating from Germany, Máxime Kuczynski-Godard spoke of the “abandonment of their proper [way of] life” common to indigenous people on the Ucayali in contacts with bosses. As to the Tapiche Capanahua: “At the beginning, their proper economy was maintained; later, however, already working with different bosses, they abandoned it and degenerated as the other tribes in similar transformation” (2004: 123). In the 1950s, when the
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12 This material is composed of: several brief references or descriptions by missionaries, researchers and other visitors (López 1903-46; 1912; 1922; Izaguirre 1922-29; Kuczynski-Godard 2004; Oppenheim 1936; 1995; Tessmann 1999; Lamb 1985). Work by Eugene E. Loos from the Summer Institute of Linguistics, includes 30 pages of ethnography (Loos 1960), unpublished reports on socio-economic situations (Loos 1972; 1975; nd.a; Loos, Davis, and Wise 1981), and notes on kinship or cultural categories (Loos nd.b; nd.c; nd.d). The Capanahua myths and historical narratives gathered by the SIL personnel (Loos and Loos 1976a; 1976b; nd.a; nd.b; Schooland 1969; 1975; 1976a), as well as the linguistic publications that contain some information on the Capanahua people (Loos 1963; 1969; Loos and Loos 2003); synthetic lexical entries based on SIL personnel’s firsthand information (Ribeiro and Wise 1978; Thompson 1997; Sparing-Chávez 2005); and publications with some scattered ethnographic or historical information (Dumont and García 1991; Palaci and Pascual 2003). A recent socio-economic report for the lotes 134 and 138 prepared for Canadian oil company Talisman Energy contains information on the Buncuya inhabitants (Walsh Perú S.A. 2010).
13 It is worth mentioning that, based on information from Father López’ diary (López 1903-46), at the time canoe travel from the Ucayali to the upper Tapiche took several weeks. Today, a trip to San Antonio takes 5-7 days (see below).
14 This and other translations are my own, unless noted otherwise.
15 This might have been based on the encounter at the highest reaches of the Tapiche described in an unpublished manuscript (1995), where “the Capanahua” are naked, painted and tattooed, living in the forest, and although trading with a patrón, avoiding other strangers.
American SIL missionary Eugene Loos started working on the Buncuya River, he found that its inhabitants were “all really Capanahua. And quite vigorously Capanahua. They described their ancestors as being very strong... And brave... (...) But that didn’t last too long. Maybe 15-20 years, then they started going downhill” (EL01). He explained to me in an email:

On the Buncuya, they kept pretty much to themselves from 1954 to 1970. Then outsiders began to intermarry with Capanahuas, and their children would understand but not use the language. The next generation lost it altogether (...) Acculturation was more advanced on the Tapiche where there was a greater influx of outsiders migrating in. (Feb 20 2009, Loos 2009-14)

This latter observation decided how the Capanahua continued to be described in SIL material:

[The Capanahua] is one of the tribes that assimilate most with national life, so that apart from their language and a few customs, they differ little from the local mestizos. They wear Western clothes, speak Spanish – although sometimes only roughly – build houses in the common [regional] styleiii (Loos nd.a)

In 1969, Loos described them as “among the more acculturated. Most of the younger adults are bilinguals (Spanish-Capanahua) with an increasing tendency to prefer Spanish.” (Loos 1969: 3-4). This opinion influenced other connected SIL publications:

Today they [the Capanahua] are integrated [into the national society] (...) – distinguished from the Spanish-speaking peasants mostly by the language (...). The fourth part of the group is proud of their maternal language; the rest wants to abandon it or is indifferent as to its use.iv (Ribeiro and Wise 1978: 97–98)

Until only two or three generations ago, Capanahuas were still living in very primitive conditions. They wore little or no clothing and depended on hard-to-acquire stone implements (...). Today the Capanahuas have almost completely integrated into mestizo culture. They wear western type clothing, use iron tools, metal pots and other utensils obtained by working as labourers. (Sparing-Chávez 2005: 96–97)

The second time I returned to the Ucayali (2007), while still trying to understand the meaning of the stories and traces of the “uncontacted” people, whose ethnonyms changed as I travelled in the region, I was anxious to finally meet the people known as “the Capanahua,” as if there was a group. Yet, as Beder’s opening words show, this seemingly straightforward aim became just as problematic as the previous “quests.” In “the Capanahua” villages I found... that “there were no more Capanahua,” that is, as if there was no “group.” The people living there told me they were merely descendants. Wegmer (in his 20s) said that he did not understand the
Capanahua language, not even a little bit. He was not a Capanahua: if anything, there was a Capanahuillo stream [lit. little Capanahua] nearby, he smirked. The grandfathers used to be Capanahua, but his own father does not speak nor understand the language: “We are from another time already.” Others told me their parents or grandparents came from other parts of Peru, such as Jeberos16 or Requena, and merely “stayed to die” in this place, some learning to speak Capanahua. Beder (in his late 20s), said that even in the old days, while strangers thought that here, far away, was where the “wild Indians” lived, this was not true. He speculated that his own grandparents were a cruce [mixed-blood], as they had “almost blue eyes,” celebrated birthdays, and knew how to read. They would invite mestizos to live with them, and it was such a gathering that it also composed of “the Capanahua.” Later, when the gringos (SIL missionaries) came, they made a large longhouse, and shared the languages. The old Capanahua spoke English, and the gringos spoke Capanahua. However, since Thelma Schoolland (the last SIL missionary) stopped coming (in 1990s), no one had been able to teach the language to the people and there was no one they could practice it with. Beder also told me that the alcalde [mayor] did not help them, and there was no one to organise the people or to assist them, thus disunion reigns. Then, one night, a man in his late 30s came to ask me for medicine. He addressed me as “wetsan” (brother in Capanahua). He told me he did not speak Capanahua to anyone, because his companions did not want to converse in the language. Smiling, he said, “the majority can speak it, but they are ashamed, they don’t want to.” Later, I discovered from genealogies that the villagers who talked to me were predominantly descendants of people whom others have identified as “Capanahua.”

Given the description of the 2007 visit, we might wonder what the significance is of this recurring historical motif. How much of it can be attributed to the European and American visitors’ expectations of what “the Capanahua” – living on the isolated Buncuya or at the end of the Tapiche (the longest of the Ucayali’s tributaries) – should be like? How much of it is due to representations of “the Capanahua” persons’ past and present that they offered to these visitors and to themselves, also within certain understanding what “the Capanahua” meant (for example, the “strong

16 Jeberos is a town and district on the Aipena River, in the Alto Amazonas province, in the Loreto region of Peru. Requena is a town, district and province of Loreto, situated on the Lower Ucayali River, at the mouth of the Tapiche River.
ancestors” or “the real Capanahua” being gone motifs)? Noticeable in those conjunctions is a repeatedly transitive character of consecutive historical moments. The process of “transformation” or loss is not quite finished in any such instantiation of a historical present. It is predicted to be accomplished “within a short time,” only to recur in every generation for another century. In the process, the idea of a more authentic “Capanahua” is projected back in time and deeper underneath the visible surfaces until, for example, only the (half-remembered) language remains in the present. Therefore, descriptions of the continuously elusive Capanahua, consistently hovering on the brink of extinction – pertain to these very ancestors, whom I was told by the villagers themselves during this visit in 2007, were the “real” Capanahua, as opposed to the their “diluted” descendants. While, over the last century, (that is, the history we know from written sources) the process of intersubjective cultural or social change seems to be real enough, the question remains; how did its participants or witnesses make sense of these historical situations? Why would they repeatedly make them transitional, and yet not quite finished? Is this series of encounters indicative of a long history of gradual disappearance of an “ethnic category”? Or is it “too easy an interpretation,” and we might reflect on it following the words of Claude Lévi-Strauss, who, observing the repeatedly reported indifference towards “holy” effigies abandoned among the Caduveo, wrote that “[a] situation which remains stationary for fifty years can only be called, in one sense, normal” (1961: 156)?

On the one hand, it is possible to guess what “being Capanahua” and “not being Capanahua” might have meant to European and American visitors. In descriptions of these encounters, the consecutive generations of “the Capanahua” are said to become less and less like “themselves.” The visitors through reference to the interfluvial habitat, longhouses, painting or possibly tattooing, funeral anthropophagy, signal drums, large feasts, wooden sword-clubs, and language define this process. Instead, the Capanahua become more like “someone else.” They regretfully lose their distinctiveness and become “the same” as anyone else in eastern Peru. My own initial observation about the villagers’ indistinctiveness in 2007 revealed a similar approach. Eugene Loos explicitly identifies the story and its terms in the above quotes: such a particular present bears the traces of the process of “acculturation.” Such history relies on the Europeans’ or Americans’ own perceptions of the categories assumed and consequences imagined for this process: the elusive, disappearing “Capanahua” cease to be “indigenous” or “traditional.”
On the other hand, how the historical “Capanahua” understood such moments themselves will remain unknown. Yet, in the particular instance of such a transformative moment that I observed, I could inquire what sense the people living on the Tapiche and the Buncuya rivers were making of it. While they also used “the Capanahua” category and told the story of disappearing, their approach seemed more radical in its take on the notions of descent or identity, which decide how we understand processes of socio-cultural change. What, then, was the meaning for the villagers of what looks like “acculturation” to Euro-Americans? What did “being someone else already,” “being Capanahua,” and most of all, being “a descendant,” mean for the “acculturated” people themselves?

3. Acculturation and the generative process

Between the 1980s and 1990s, ethnographers started paying attention to the hitherto “invisible” indigenous people of the Amazon, and their subjectivity within their socio-historical positions.17 Peter Gow’s work with the eastern Peruvian Urubamba River villagers has been particularly instrumental in contributing to a shift in perspectives on “acculturated” people. It directly addressed the very idea of “history,” “transformation” or “acculturation”18 through ethnographic research with apparently “non-traditional” Amazonian people. The gradual reorientation to which this work contributed allowed for presenting the contemporary, acculturated populations in the Lowlands as continuing their own socio-cultural concerns in contemporary settings. Further, it allows for local explanations regarding historical processes and for understanding how these influence contemporary situations.19 Indigenous understandings and uses of the state institutions such as native community organisation, schools, or foreign cultural elements in general, were presented as complex expressions of continuity and discontinuity, rather than unambiguous indicators of passive cultural loss, as represented in previous approaches.

19 This shift coincided with the general trend (Viveiros de Castro 1996) in Amazonian studies to connect ethnographic and historical approaches, which produced several important volumes and ethnographies (see: Oervering-Kaplan 1977; Hill 1988; Whitehead 2003; Gow 2001; Fausto & Heckenberger 2007; Vilaça 2010). Importantly, these investigations not only considered the readings of histories by Amerindian people, but also the ways in which Amazonians themselves created their histories. Social or cultural historical transformations in this part of South America were no longer attributed exclusively to the subjectivity and agency of the colonizers, but analyzed from all the perspectives and contributions involved.
In embarking on this project with “acculturated” people such as the Capanahua descendants, I have taken these developments in anthropological perspectives as the starting point. In an endeavour to make sense of what the villagers told me and other people about their historical and social position might therefore amount to their own “theory of acculturation.” In this effort, I join other anthropologists who address the problem of the socio-cultural transformations, acculturation, or interethnic contact in the South American Lowlands from the perspectives of those directly involved. Because of the effort to emphasize a creative resilience rather than a passive loss, such attempts usually emphasize the continuities across the thresholds of “change” in these processes. In this case, I take the continuities and agency as given, and indeed illustrate some of the striking continuities implied by the similarities of the villagers’ explanations with those of other, more “traditional” Amazonians. However, I also ask about the Capanahua descendants’ agency in formulating and producing the discontinuities that they conceive in time: either as diagnoses of the inherently devolutionary character of the world, always on the wane, and/or as recognition of their own choices and actions, refusing continuity of what they see as undesirable, and in their own ways. That is, the “subjective” character of their “passivity” in allowing themselves to “be seen” historically.

The obvious problem here is that the Capanahua descendants do not use a category of “acculturation,” which indexes the anthropologist’s or Euro-American’s problem with the flow of history. Instead, Beder, Wegmer and Clomber answered my questions as if I was asking about their relations with parents or grandparents (whom other people called “the Capanahua”), and about their own position as descendants, living in particular places that their ancestors have abandoned. Therefore, their take on “acculturation” revolved around specific formulations of an intergenerational aspect of kinship. Yet, the negative way they spoke about it alluded to something other than “descent” as the unifying principle. While affirming a connection to the
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20 Recently interethnic contacts or acculturations have been understood in the ethnographic terms of corporeal-perspectival transformations. This was done either through focus on perspectival changes and the process of “becoming other” (McCallum 1990; Lepri 2003; Calavia Sáez 2004, 2006; Kelly 2005; Costa 2007; Naveira 2007; Oakdale 2008; Santos-Granero 2009; Tola 2009; Vilaça 1999; Vilaça & Wright 2009; Feather 2010; Sarmiento Barletti 2011; Gil & Naveira 2013; Hewlett 2013); or on the processes of establishing new kinship relations or on the knowledge which would make the transformation possible (Gow 1991, 2001); or alternatively as establishing relations in terms of mastery and taming (Rival 1996; Bonilla 2005, 2007; Walker 2013).

21 On the complications of speaking about the subjectivity in the “perspectival” context of South American explanations, see (Course 2010).
ancestors, they did not associate it with an unambiguous transmission of identity. Rather, they affirmed they had no identity, were “normal,” and “mixed” – that is, no one and everyone - generic “Peruvians.” Similarly perhaps to the undefined, unmarked normality of acculturated or potentially acculturated *nangami shuar*, a “just-so person” residing in the cultures’ middle ground of “zero states” (Taylor 1996).

Therefore, to imagine what my question about “acculturation” might mean to them, I assumed it would be useful to consider the kinds of relations conceived between the villagers and their ancestors, and to inquire into the assumptions regarding procreation, time and identities that allowed them to make sense of the world in their specific ways. My questions were aimed at addressing how Beder and his fellow villagers represented “the general area of the relationship between generations and the ‘generative process’ (...) that we call ‘descent’” (Rivière 1993: 511, 513). I did not mean to return to the notion of “descent” as a recruitment principle that could define groups or the transmission of goods (based on the ways of imagining African social systems within the anthropological traditions of “descent theory”). My interest lay in “uncovering indigenous representations of the relational forms that underlie lived kin relationships” (Taylor 2001: 45). As such, it resulted from the trajectory initiated with the recognition of limitations of such conceptual models in Lowland South America (as earlier in Melanesia). Such critical re-evaluation of the anthropological notions of descent and alliance in the mid-1970s for understanding lowland South American societies has been a fundamental step towards the individuation of Amazonian studies in anthropology. It has led to attempts at understanding descent and affinity in terms of indigenous Lowland South Americans themselves (Rivière 1993; Viveiros de Castro 1996). In a wider perspective, these investigations might be seen as paralleling anthropological concerns more broadly, by taking interest in the local constructions of “kinship” (Schneider 1980, 1984).

Peter Rivière noted that the development of Amazonian anthropology, guided by the effort to “rid ourselves of the unwanted connotations that cling to descent” (1993: 510) has rendered it speechless in the face of Amazonian relations that involve
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transmissions between generations. Over two decades after Rivière’s observation, talking of specific notions of descent in Amazonia, already difficult because of its critiqued genealogical connotations, became even more difficult. For one, unifying principles transmitted between generations did not appear common in Amazonia, and in either case, not directly associated with procreation. The anthropologists who did see Amerindian “descent” as potentially organizing, pointed to the “non-substantial” character of transmissions of “symbolic” values, such as names, souls, and so on which were “acquired” rather than given, transmitted “externally” rather than “internally” unifying, and thus, at least partially transcending procreation.

Secondly, “consanguinity” came to be associated with produced rather than given or genealogically transmitted similarity. Anthropologists have come to understand commonalities, continuities, or unities of indigenous Amazonians’ socialities as produced or “put on” rather than inherited or given. Based on corporeal idioms that defined the Amazonian studies, consubstantialities were presented as the result of conscious human activities aimed at reworking or masking the original otherness through care, co-residence, commensality, and conviviality. If the idiom of blood as used by Amazonians was considered, it was often analysed within the larger paradigm of relatedness, as constructed by human activities rather than transmitted as “kinship” along with the acts of procreation itself. Production of similarity was thus seen as mediated by relations of the original alterities. Therefore, the idea of “kinship” could be extracted from the procreative process, which appeared not to be connected with the transmission of identities, or constitutive of relatedness. I return to this in the Conclusion.

Largely, Amazonian studies have developed by moving away from notions of descent, based on a given similarity or uniting principle, and instead have built theoretically on the paradigm of alliance and marital exchange in constructivist, Amerindianized views of Lowland ethnographies. Following the foundational move away from “descent” to “alliance” or “affinity,” Amazonian studies inherited the


26 Similarly, in Melanesian kinship, the corporeal focus of processual “relatedness” or “new kinship studies” (e.g. Carsten 1995b, 2001, 2004) has recently been critiqued by demonstrating the lack of “bodily” or “biological” substrate in the area (Bamford 2007; cf. Latour 2004). This reflects on Euro-American biological, genealogical imagery in general (Bamford & Leach 2009), as well as on the idiom of “blood” itself (Carsten 2013) in defining “kinship” (cf. Schneider 1984).


structural language of marital exchanges. In an important essay, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2001) pointed to the somewhat unbounded character of social constructivism in theorizing Amazonian socialities. He proposed some limits by taking the logical consequences of binary structural relations to their conclusion, and identifying affinity and difference as the Wagnerian (1981) given of indigenous Amazonians’ relations, which precedes and hierarchically encompasses produced consanguinity and sameness.²⁹ The paradigmatic relation is identified as alterity and associated with horizontal relations of “affinity” in this context. In turn, the vertical, generative relations of filiation, especially between fathers and sons, or mothers and daughters, are placed closer to the pole marked by sameness, which results from processes conceived as cloning, and thus, lean towards identifying “consanguinity” as a non-relation (cf. Taylor 2000, 2001). My argument here is that such understanding may associate the relations created by procreation with an automatic continuity and similarity, as a possible corollary of the conventional anthropological wisdom of “kinship” (Schneider 1984).

Returning to the Buncuya encounter: if difference is a relation, and sameness is the lack of it, what would the implication of Wegmer and others explicitly defining themselves as not identical to their ancestors, but rather – diachronically – “someone else already” be? Would we tell them whom they are, based on our expectations and interest in continuity (or descent), thus perceiving them as “acclimatized,” yet actually the same: simply as clones or transformations of preceding societies and cultures? “Invisible,” but still exotic “Indians”? We could assume that this difference is the result of the process of “becoming other” that has been helpful in explaining similar situations in other places.³⁰ However, considering that from their own points of view and in a local context, it makes more sense to speak about their “ceasing to be others,” is it possible to consider their explanations of the generative process itself as responsible for a radical discontinuity? In any case, it is not enough to say that Wegmer and others were concentrated on the horizontal, affinal relations, and that descent or filiation did not matter to them. They actually used the demonstrably

²⁹ The argument itself is based on extensive formal analyses determining the logics or diachronic transformations of kinship systems (e.g. Hornborg 1988; Viveiros de Castro 1995; 1996a; Henley 1996; cf. Godelier et al. 1998). This focused on alliance-based variants of Dravidian or Australian systems, as well as on the logical consequences of alterity as the totalizing idiom of kinship, dialectics of affinity and consanguinity and predation in indigenous ontologies (Fausto 1999; Overing 1983; Viveiros de Castro 1986).

broken connection with the ancestors as a difference through which to speak about themselves. I argue in this thesis that filiation among the villagers proves more problematic than reproduction or cloning of identity. If procreation produces a “dividual” child, villagers focus on its discontinuitive rather than the reproduced or cloned aspect. The problem thus proved quite literally, much “deeper,” and in fact related to the distribution and transposing of dimensions of the “visible” or perceptible, and “invisible,” or concealed and contained, which effect reproduction and other relations. Following such ways of making sense of that “(non-) relation” has literally everted my view of the categories and terms involved, in a manner that shows filiation or descent – based on separation and marked with ambiguously fertile cosmological “difference” (which in this context means discontinuity) – as a kind of relation. Moreover, a relation resulting from the dynamics echoing those of encompassment or incorporations that came to be labelled as “predation” (Viveiros de Castro 1992) or “familiarizing predation” (Fausto 1999), generally reserved by Amazoniansts for relations of affinity (or adoption), but not procreative relations.

Crucial for the present argument is that both poles of the above model of approaching Amazonian relations are impossible or potential. That is, actual, lived filiation never reaches a complete state of de-affinization, and never produces the “consanguineal replica” (Viveiros de Castro 2001) of their parents. It is the “horizon” of consanguinity (Taylor 2001). This is true also of the opposite pole, the pure “hyper-relation” or predation. In other words, the process of reaching either pole always seems to be “almost finished” yet never actually is in real life, which makes it reminiscent of the historical moments of “the Capanahua” being “on the wane.” Such liminal quality is, as this thesis attempts to show, at the heart of the living people’s problem, as I came to understand their representations. This can actually be explained as the curse of unachievability of both poles. It is therefore in this “asymptotic” state of incompleteness, with its tangent in infinity, that I situate my analysis of “descent” as an infliction of the past, which produces ambiguity of the present.31

Further, an important consequence for the present case is that, as I will attempt to show, when seen from a local perspective, both perfect “consanguinity,” as

31 Cf. Fausto 1999 on the impossibility of neutralizing the pet’s subjectivity.
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well as “potential affinity” eludes the actual present life. In the non-ideal, post-mythic conditions, procreation, the generative process, that is, “descent,” is, for the Capanahua descendants most of all, disjunctive: dissimilating rather than uniting because it transmits the partiality of identities or differences. The genitors and descendants are mutually differentiated, discontinuous “others,” and the differences they leave behind complicate the unity of the community. Just as procreation would be conducive to differentiation and hierarchy, overcoming the discontinuity produced by procreation or origins would be the function of marriage, alliance, relations of assimilation, and “equality.” I will argue that for Clomber and his neighbours, the village space, everted, is the external space where affinity and neighbourhood strive for unity and purity. In other words, for clarity from the remains of internal, consanguineal hierarchies and differences that is, the potentially disjunctive “descent” concealed behind people’s appearances. In short, the villagers are trying to establish sameness or continuity that they assume is ultimately unachievable, from the differences or discontinuities that they see as ultimately indelible. Here, ideal consanguinity and ideal affinity would turn out to be very close to each other as ideal pre-differentiation and post-differentiation (both non-discontinuity), both opposed to the dividual realities of procreation and the mixed, “third” status of living people. What this means is that Amerindianization of not only affinity, but also of descent results in the distance between them to appear less obvious. We use a “controlled equivocation” (Viveiros de Castro 2004) when speaking of “affinity,” in a way which actually extends beyond the position suggested by its embeddedness in the language of marital alliances. Thus, we might, perhaps, attempt to understand these specific relations of “descent” or “filiation,” as a vehicle that allows a glimpse into the difficult, obscure side of Amazonian kinship or sociality.

Here, “descent,” and “kinship” created in procreation as defined by the villagers, differs from the anthropologists’ expectations of what it should be, by referring to the discontinuitive and disjunctive, and obviated side of the social. That is what I hope the title of this thesis suggests, by connecting “infliction” definitions of the Oxford English Dictionary, to the villagers’ topology and character of “descent” or “kinship”:

inflict: a) To lay on as a stroke, blow, or wound; to impose as something that must be suffered or endured; to cause to be borne; b) To impose something unwelcome; c)
With inverted construction: To afflict, assail, trouble (a person) with something painful or disagreeable.

infliction: a) The action of inflicting (pain, punishment, annoyance, etc.; b) An instance of this; something inflicted, as pain, punishment, etc., or in weaker sense, an annoyance, a nuisance, a ‘visitation’.

4.1. Capanahua descendants as the eastern Peruvian villagers

According to Eugene Loos, “the Capanahua” who he worked with between 1954 and the 1980s, were reluctant to be identified with this exonym, because they felt it connoted stranger or “wild Indian” (nawa) status. Instead, they preferred to call themselves merely *nuken kaibu*, “our breeds/kin” (Loos 2009-14). Currently, on the Tapiche and Buncuya Rivers, people are sometimes taken aback when they are called Capanahua, especially the extremely rude variant “Capacho,” an unequivocally pejorative designation. “The Capanahua” name is used today to refer to “the ancestors” (antiguos), and in ordinary situations people would identify as merely their offspring or descendants. Why this should be so actually composes the subject of this thesis. Note that the designation “Capanahua descendants” reflects an important idea about themselves. The word *paisanos* [“of a kind” – lit. countrymen] can be used by themselves (and sometimes, mestizos) for identifying people of similar, Capanahua descent. Those, apart from “the villagers” of Limón Cocha and Berea, are the designations I use in this thesis.

The villagers refer to their vernacular language as *castellano*. It is a variant of Spanish spoken in the Peruvian Amazon (Ramírez 2012), which I refer to as Loreto-Ucayali Spanish (SIL 2015), or “LUS,” throughout this thesis. LUS words appear in *cursive*. In the villages the additional local specific is that it includes a number of Capanahua words or expressions (referring to animals or fish, work, food, or drinking), and some of its grammatical features seem to reflect those in the Capanahua language. My referral to Capanahua words in this work largely reflects the words many of the villagers know and sometimes use. The Capanahua utterances appear with the *underlined cursive* (see Appendix 4 for details of orthographic convention). There are no monolingual speakers of Capanahua in the villages.32 The older generations (over 60s) are usually the most fluent bilingual speakers. Middle-aged villagers have a largely passive knowledge. Most people under 40 have little

32 It has indeed been included in UNESCO’s “Interactive Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger” (Moseley 2010) with the vitality status “severely endangered.”
knowledge of it, and no children speak or understand Capanahua as far as I am aware. On the other hand, apart from talking with people, during our stay in Limón, I attempted to learn some Capanahua by reading texts and translations recorded by SIL. Although I have not become a fluent reader (without the dictionary) or speaker, this nevertheless provided me with enough competence in occasional Capanahua expressions used in daily life, and additional insight on the connections between ideas which may not be evident based on the LUS words alone.

Although the villagers’ temporal and social position could be argued to be the point in which the process of “acculturation” converges with the Amazonian ethos of opening up to alterity, or the Panoan “constitutive alterity” (Erikson 1986), I speak of the Capanahua descendants as Loretanos, or eastern Peruvians, rather than as the Capanahua, or the Panoans, resisting an attempt to compartmentalize various elements of their lived world. I try to avoid unsubstantiated historical claims as to the provenience of any representations. I focus instead on the way these representations were invested with meaning by the people who used them in the villages during my stay. Further, my hope is that this work will be an opportunity to glimpse what being “indigenous” or “non-indigenous,” “traditional” or “non-traditional” means in the specific context where false friends of Euro-American categories function in the much broader eastern Peruvian social imagery. In eastern Peru, the presence of the state may be understood as the composite of agencies and imaginaries of people such as the Capanahua descendants. That is to say, the original inhabitants of the area, engaged in, and reformulating the idea of Peru as a “middle ground” (White 1991), in dialogue with socio-cultural systems or dynamics possibly pre-dating the existence of the modern Peruvian state.

4. Fieldwork

The thesis is the result of fieldwork conducted in eastern Peru over 19 months, between August 2011 and March 2013. I use “we” throughout the thesis when referring to my girlfriend Kinga Kokot and me, as we were there together for the duration of fieldwork. The stay was initiated on the Buncuya River, in Berea, also known as Nuevo Aipena, in the native community (comunidad nativa) Aipena, with a population oscillating at around 70 inhabitants. We spent a total of three months (two stays), between October 2011 and January 2012 in Aipena. Later, we moved to comunidad nativa Limón Cocha on the Tapiche River, with some 150 or more
permanent inhabitants.\textsuperscript{33} We spent a total of 11 months there (two longer stays), between December 2011 and March 2013.

Limón (as the village is normally abbreviated) is situated around 190km from Requena as the bird flies.\textsuperscript{34} However, the only access is the Tapiche River itself, which is in no hurry to reach the Ucayali River and Requena. The fantastic bends it creates lengthen the distance to around 450km. Hence, in reality, the seemingly moderate distance on the map spells 40-60 hours, or around three to four days of travel downriver. The reverse journey is 50-70 hours upriver from Requena to Limón, which usually takes four-seven days.\textsuperscript{35} Berea is two-three days (27-29 hours) from the Ucayali River and the town of Tamanco (which connects to Requena and Iquitos by large commercial boats called \textit{lanchas}), first up the Guanache and then the Buncuya Rivers. The reverse route requires around one-two days (19 hours) of travel downriver. The 85km as the bird flies stretches here to over 200km when following the meandering river.\textsuperscript{36} During long journeys and unplanned delays, we also came to know many mestizo villages, towns and cities. Additionally, I went to the uppermost villages on the Tapiche for a few days in September 2012. In April 2013, I paid a visit to the SIL missionaries Eugene and Betty Loos in Dallas, Texas.

\textsuperscript{33} Aipena was inscribed as a “Capanahua native community” by the Ministry of Agriculture in 1980, and received entitlement to the land in 1984. For Limón, this was in 1982 and 1984. The third and so far last native community registered as Capanahua with the land title also originating in that period is Yarina Frontera, inhabited by the descendants of speakers of the Lower Capanahua dialect, known from the SIL publications as Pahenbaquebo. Four additional Tapiche villages (Palmera, Monte Alegre, Fátima (Nuestra Señora De Fatima), and Nueva Esperanza) were registered by the Peruvian government as Capanahua in 2001, but have not yet received land titles. Finally, in 2010, Victor Raúl on the Buncuya was also registered as a Capanahua native community, and has no land title. Wicungo has recently participated as a “Capanahua native community” in consultation over oil exploration on Lote 164 (Perupetro S.A. 2014). The Map in Fig. 3 situates all of these communities.

\textsuperscript{34} Requena (population 18,000 in 2007) is situated at the confluence of the Tapiche and Ucayali Rivers, and is the capital of Requena Province (74,041). The latter includes, among others, the Alto Tapiche District (2,106), to which Limón Cocha belongs, and where Santa Elena (1,000) is the capital. The Emilio San Martín District (7,488 has Tamanco (1,000) as the capital and is where Berea belongs (INEI 2015; INCTEL-UNI 2014; Wikipedia 2015).

\textsuperscript{35} Times depend on the engine, boat, cargo, and the driver. The standard medium of transportation in the Selva [lit. tropical forest, here: eastern part of Peru] is a wooden boat equipped with the long shaft \textit{pequepeque} engine. Their capacity usually ranges between 5.5 to 13 HP, producing an average speed of 6-9 km/h upriver and 13-16 km/h downriver. Only the wealthier logging bosses or the oil company uses speedboats, which make the travel much faster, because the cost of gasoline increases proportionately to the shortening of the journey. Near Limón Cocha upriver about 2.5 hours lies Nuevo Esperanza (a few remaining houses from the village). From there, about 2.5 hours upriver lies San Antonio (de Fortaleza), and a further 4 hours takes one to Bellavista, which is the uppermost permanently inhabited village on the Tapiche River currently. On the way from Limón Cocha to San Antonio, there are also five \textit{puestos} or \textit{fundos} inhabited by single families. Travelling downriver the closest village to Limón is Fátima, about 1 hour away. Further down the Tapiche are Monte Alegre and Pacasmayo (around 2 hours), then Frontera Yarina (another 4.5 h, with a few houses left from the former village), Wicungo (2 h). From there, it is another 4.5 hours to reach Santa Elena (see Fig. 3).

\textsuperscript{36} Berea is the farthest extent settlement, and its only neighbour on the whole of Buncuya River is Victor Raúl, located around 2 two hours downriver. From there, a long stretch of the Guanache River flows through uninhabited lowlands to the villages near Tamanco (see Fig. 3).
4.1. Participant observation

During our stay in Berea and Limón, we often joined in communal or individual work, attended feasts and celebrations, public meetings, and visited (*pasear*) and received visitors. In Berea, we lived in a house kindly provided by Clomber. When in Limón, after initially being located in the teachers’ house, the villagers built a small house for us on the *Puínawu*, or “Shit Street.” Occasionally, I accompanied the men on hunting, fishing or foraging expeditions, while Kinga joined women at work, or playing football and volleyball. We spent quite a bit of time worrying about food, and participated in the local economy with commodities we brought from town. At the insistence of the villagers, we started accepting money instead of food for the commodities (fishhooks, fishing lines, shotgun shells, candies, oil) we brought, which – I imagine – allowed them to avoid being indebted to us and the expectation of sharing what they caught or hunted with these materials. Once we had achieved a rudimentary level of production (fish from our nets or plants from our little garden), we were occasionally able to feebly join in the food exchange network. With our neighbours, we shared hunger and food, fun, boredom and hard work with machete, mosquito and black fly bites, heat and humidity, small talk, jokes and stories, gossip and frustrations. We talked, watched and were watched; laughed with and were laughed at; got irritated and were the source of irritations. Every night, in a little netbook charged with a solar panel during the day, I took notes based on memos taken throughout the day of conversations, events, expressions, genealogical connections, techniques, practices, and so on.

4.2. Being affected

An important aspect of this experience was composed by facing the very processes and forces that dictate the specific, tense rhythm of village life over long periods. Such problems came to influence the conception of this ethnography. Initially, some of the challenges may have been related to our status as strangers; welcomed with a mixture of attraction and distrust. People made sense of us either as “owners”; the source of goods and money, or as “predators”; extractors of people’s faces or fat, of knowledge or language to “sell” in our land. Yet we shared other problems with the villagers. Thus, we were affected by or frustrated with the same

---

It is a playful use of a geographical name from the Lower Ucayali River, Canal de Puinahua. Since Puinahua comes from a Panoan language and signifies literally “faeces-strangers,” it was given by the villagers to a street where people would go to relieve themselves before the houses were built.
things that many of our friends were when they said “it’s impossible to live well here”
(thefts, accusations, prejudice, avarice, envy, rumours, lies, misunderstandings,
helplessness, inability to cooperate, and distrust). Achieving a perpetual, harmonious
social domain was commented on explicitly as notoriously thwarted. It took a long
time to approach slightly their lightness in face of such problems (“What can you
do?!”) (cf. Pollard 2009).

One might say these problems composed the repetitive moments of “being
affected” in the very positions that are posited and made sense of by Capanahua
descendants, which this thesis strives to approximate. As with the experience that led
to the original formulation of this notion by Jeanne Favret-Saada (2012: 104–08),
here, too, we have been affected by the dynamics which ultimately connect with
sorcery. Experiencing and navigating these tangible predicaments took much of our
energy in the villages, and taught me more about the way people make sense than
mere conversations could. In the end, these conditions played a tremendous role in
shaping my understanding of local terms, dynamics and relations, on which they are
based and which they reproduce. For this reason attention is paid to opacities and
clearings; internalizations and externalizations; surfaces and contents; “owning” or
“containing”; the frustrating and life-producing “thirdness” of things, words, or
substances received or extracted.

4.3. Conversaciones (recordings)

Another repetitive activity that structured our experience in the villages and
defined my work for the people was for me to conversar [talk]. I visited people in
their homes, while others preferred to visit us and talk while I recorded the
conversations. I paid for such conversations with modest amounts of money and/or
commodities. These were mostly unstructured or semi-structured interviews. While
my questions were not completely irrelevant, they were not very decisive. Most often,
you served to begin conversation or to try my turn at using the local ways of making
sense. Although I made sure to come back to certain subjects, I did not aim for
consistent theories, and instead inquired into personal understandings or
interpretations and sometimes confronted them with explanations from other such
conversations or daily life. Appendix 1 presents short portraits of those people that
most often had enough patience to talk with me during those recorded conversations,
and therefore have ended up having a decisive voice in this thesis. They were mostly
middle-aged people (40-60), and less often elders or younger people, whose perspectives in turn largely come from daily interactions rather than recorded interviews.

I thought the only way it was partially possible to understand how people make meaning was to listen to them, although I might have followed the ethnographic advice too extremely to listen carefully and to take what they say seriously. By the end of our stay in Limón, the recordings included 164 conversations. After leaving Peru and before starting to write the thesis, contrary to the advice of my supervisor (and apparently the common practice among my colleagues), I have transcribed and coded (using Nvivo software) 152 conversations (approximately 225 hours), resulting in over 850K words.\textsuperscript{38} The 10 months spent at this laborious task turned out to be a new and extremely fruitful phase of fieldwork and understanding, which made me even more aware of how little my questions actually mattered, how they were misunderstood, or how they were naïve and intrusive, especially in the beginning. This history of mistakes and misunderstandings was tremendously instructive. Despite my questions, the conversations created an invaluable data set, which evaded simplified generalizations by revealing discussions, individual interpretations or doubts on a variety of subjects. As much as my field notes allow for a different perspective and additional contexts for these conversations, in a few cases (e.g. summary notes that I made immediately after a recorded conversation) I found them less reliable in conveying the nuances of people’s expressions than with recordings. Therefore, I had no choice, but to use that material extensively in preparing the thesis. I have used a separate referencing system, directing the reader to Appendix 2, the list of recordings and field notes, and to Appendix 7 with the original quotes (marked throughout the text with Roman numerals). Using the Capanahua descendants’ words in a way that other academics reference their colleagues, I hoped to emphasize their importance in shaping the arguments.

5. Ethnographic theory

Importantly, I came to realise that their opinions comment on anthropological opinions. In many ways, the condition for doing this fieldwork has been suspending my academic preparation, rather than using it to understand how my interlocutors

\textsuperscript{38} Additionally, 34 other recordings documenting public meetings, sermons, etc. Eugene Loos has kindly allowed me to digitalize 41 audio tapes with recordings in Capanahua recorded between 1970s and 1980s. These have not been transcribed.
and neighbours explained the world to themselves and to me with preconceived notions about what “the Amazonians” should be like. I sometimes tried to share what I learned about Amazonians from anthropological writings with them, but their comments on basic premises were often surprising. How could it be, that kinship is produced?, they asked. It was not true that their bodies were highly transformational, or that animals were actually humans – these times belonged to the ancient ones and ended a long time ago. Sometimes they told me these were either “lies” or “just stories.” Similar comments also contributed to the direction of this thesis. My ways of making sense have been “affected” by the villagers’ ways of making sense. I have become more interested in what they had to say about themselves and the subjects discussed by anthropologists. They were perfectly capable of explaining themselves to themselves and to others like me. As I understand it, this is the way that Marcio Goldman (2013) draws from Bronislaw Malinowski’s “ethnographic theory” (Malinowski 1935) to present the views on “politics” by members of the Afro-cultural movement in Ilhéus’ (cf. also Da Col and Graeber 2011). Such theory is a mediatory form between the reflecting anthropologist and the people he writes about. Equally, the villagers had something to say about what “acculturation process,” “being Peruvian” or “descendant” is.

Therefore, in this thesis, I attempt to use these affects, or my diminished copies (cf. Ch. 4) of the terms used by the Capanahua descendants to speak about themselves. In other words, it is another experiment with the anthropologist imagining how the terms of the villagers’ social, cultural or historical theories might look like. One implication of this is that these ways of understanding spill out of the original context. In the process, some of my previous understandings of categories used in (Amazonian) anthropology - such as inside and outside, alterity or consanguinity and affinity, continuity and discontinuity or traditional and acculturated (which here are reflections of each other) – are watched as in a prism, folded back, transfigured or inseminated.

Still, as much as that third product between us might be a “theory,” I would hesitate to call their explanations a “theory” not because they are not making and remaking sense, using sets of standard formulations. I hesitate because I imagine that they participate in the processes of constituting meanings, or explaining them to themselves and others (Toren 1990; 1993; Gow 2001) that correlate with the
“elemental affective stances,” “schemes of relating” or “modes of ‘relating to’” (Taylor 2001). Therefore, the result of such conversations and my ways of making sense of theirs, as well as of our experiences, is a dense landscape of connections and disjunctions, hidden similarities and false friends, working misunderstandings and mistaken understandings. I hope that this thesis will partially relay some of the “density” that reflects our experience of these conversations and the layers of our life in the villages.

Unknowing, for the Capanahua descendants, was an important, ambivalent, and therefore potent, element of life: causing trouble, as well as expressing the marvel of the world.39 The ritual of rhetorical co-questioning „Porqué quizás!??” [Why on earth!?], „Aishta!” [Well that is the question!], “Quién sabe!” [Who knows!?] or the epistemological „Nooo se puede saber!” or “Niíi se sabe!” “[One could not know this!] – were the staple of conversations and the fieldwork experience. Villagers’ everyday statements were often situated in constructions contained between “¿!Como quizás!??” (corresponding to the Capanahua suffix –ra), and/or “digo yo” [I’d say], or “así me dicho” [that’s what I was told – a LUS equivalent of the Capanahua reportative kí]. It is as if the narrators realized that when they repeat what was told to them by others, or report what they have seen, listeners can take it as potential engaño [trickery] or mentira [lies]. They tended to be explicitly sceptical about the human ability to know or about finding ultimate explanations. For me, this is an expression of a darkly realistic humbleness and suspension of belief in any “theories” or “stories,” and is therefore instructive. Nor do I have any guarantee that they lied less to me than anyone else, but if they did, I assume this was done in their own particular way, and possibly protecting what they deemed must be protected. The important thing is that their “lies” about themselves counterbalance anthropologists’ “lies” about them. For the same reason, I try to avoid speaking about the Capanahua descendants’ “thinking” or “understanding,” because – as they themselves would soberly say – it is ultimately impossible to know what the other person is thinking. Rather, I tend to refer to their “representations” or “ways of speaking/explaining/making sense.” Therefore, without further ado, in Don Jorge’s words: “let us now lie a while” [ahora vamos a engañarnos un rato] about how the Capanahua descendants “lied” to each other and to me.

6. Thesis overview

This ethnography explores the connections in the villagers’ ways of making sense, between spatial positions of containment created by limitations to perceptibility and knowability on the one hand, and the temporal processes and causality, expressed in spatial terms, on the other. I trace the dynamics whereby the production of opacity conditioning these positions of containment is simultaneously the inception of a temporal process of differentiation and the beginning of discontinuity – that is, new life at the cost of the previous one. I propose that in this context it is possible to approach the problem of conjunction of continuities and discontinuities in relations produced by procreation, and thus understand the specific takes on descent and acculturation.

The thesis is organized in five chapters and initiated with a Prologue. The purpose of the Prologue is to provide the most explicit presentation of the villagers by themselves, through drunken speeches or presentations. They reveal the formulations of identities in specifically conceived sociality. Here, one can appreciate the various layers and problems that are discussed later in this thesis.

Chapter 1 presents one field or perspective, locating it against the opacities of the forest and human bodies. It concentrates on the surface of the communities (villages and their socialities) as knowable entities, exploring the actions and explanations of clearing the spaces/socialities, knowing these, and participating in them, according to some aesthetical and ethical ideals. In this chapter, I characterize the movements that create these spaces and make them knowable as clearing, coming out, or emerging (in a strictly ethnographic sense).

Chapter 2 complements and complicates the perspective on the social space by exploring the internal contents beyond the limiting opacities: other imaginable worlds and people’s hearts and minds. Human bodies are also shown as existing within the larger common space of the “outside” and encompassed by it. I show that the additional complications or contents are expected to be found within those additional entities. The chapter therefore investigates the second side, against which the field from the previous chapter is produced. Here, I signal some dynamics of articulation between the two sides or entities containing each other, and the ambiguous character of that constellation. Together, the first two chapters focus on
the “topological” categories of inside and outside. The following chapters focus mainly on their conjunctions with the temporal, generative and frustrative processes initiated by distorting those spatial categories.

Chapter 3 explores causality as explained by the Capanahua descendants, tracing it from myths to aetiology and omens. This relies on the introduction of differentiating quality, which contributes to the split between the topological fields discussed thus far. The movements of emerging from Ch. 1 and containing in Ch. 2 are shown in a different perspective, within the more general, frustrative-generative dynamics of introducing or implanting. These dynamics suggest the direction of time and some basic conditions of human existence expected by the villagers.

Chapter 4 examines such causative dynamics in human ontogeny, analysing the imagery of procreation and the resulting categories of kinship, relatedness and descent. The imagery is shown to parallel the generative-frustrative dynamic and the devolutionary character of time. Some social strategies are explained through the problems caused by the differentiating sickness of procreation. The presentation shows previous movements of emerging or introducing and containing to be a result of interpenetrations between two entities or spatio-temporal originalities, for which the extracted, introduced and contained element is a third, and can be understood as the relation between them.

Chapter 5 presents the villagers’ explanations of social history on the Tapiche and Buncuya rivers as employing the initial topologies, the processes that create them and the terms that they articulate. These historical narratives are portrayed as operating on the rescaled image of untamed, natural progression of time and descent as outlined earlier, and considering some imaginable solutions and obstacles. These histories portray the processes of “acculturation” and encompassment by the Peruvian state, as much as illustrate the more universal “descent” of the human condition as seen by the villagers.

40 Such “topological” orientation of this thesis is the side effect of the search for making the explanations of the generative processes meaningful. I note that a similar language of containing articulating the surfaces has been explored explicitly in Melanesia, in the context of exchanges, most notably in (Strathern 1988; 2013; Mosko 1985; Wagner 2012), in the formulations of gender in Africa (Boddy 1989; Wood 1999), or more generally, in aesthetics by Alfred Gell (Gell 1998). It has to be said at this point, and I hope it will be illustrated in the presentation of those explanations, that the positions which I explore in the separate chapters as “inside” and “outside” are the result of dynamics producing the very opacities and situating of the gaze on either side, rather than set fields. For that reason, they are, characteristically for Amazonia, rather perspectival (e.g. Lima 1996; Viveiros de Castro 2012; Kohn 2007), and fractal (cf. e.g. Kelly 2001; Viveiros de Castro 2001; Costa 2007; Cesarino 2008) in character and rely on the levels of instantiation of surfaces (e.g. Gow 1999; Taylor and Viveiros de Castro 2006).
In the Conclusion, I bring more focus to the “third” quality that is responsible for generating the topologies and processes in the representations of the villagers. I also note its intersections with other ethnographic theories. The Conclusion briefly returns to some implications for the issues that I have pointed out in this introduction.

Figure 1. Map of the historical usage of the Capanahua exo-ethnonym (from Krokoszyński 2008).
Figure 2. General location of the Buncuya and Tapiche Rivers on the Lower Ucayali.

Figure 3. Settlements on the Buncuya and Tapiche Rivers, along with travel times. "CN" marks the administrative "Capanahua native communities" inscribed, and the * marks those that do not have titles to the community land.
Prologue

The drunken speech

On an October afternoon in 2012, N. (53) came to buy trago [popular sugarcane liquor] – on a merchant boat docked on the river bank of Limnón Cocha. Kinga and I had agreed to guard the boat temporarily during the owner’s absence, and so N. stayed to visit and drink liquor. He was already relatively drunk on masato [fermented manioc beverage] copiously served at the minga [neighbours’ work party] from which he had just arrived. He addressed me in idioma [the language], proudly stating: “Haskari nukan kaibu teeti: siripi. Numiˀi, kuin kuini, sina sinayamaˀi. Numiˀi, nashiˀi, uxaˀi” [This is how “our relatives” work: just fine. They drink happy, peaceful, and unanimously, nobody gets mad. They drink, bathe and go to sleep].

His greeting evolved into an extensive, almost uninterrupted monologue in Spanish, enriched with Capanahua words or sentences. N. started by saying with a twinkle in his eye: “Áyubu pa’en sta hai! ‘Ea ta’ Áyubu kî!” [The Áyubu is ostensibly drunk! I am the Áyubu!], and then added a Capanahua phrase associated with the Áyubu, which he explained to A. (44), who in the meantime had joined us: “You know how when you try to pick peach palm (pijuayo) fruit with a long pole, and you can’t, because it slips away and twists? This is what I am! That is how agile the Áyubu are! You can’t catch me!” He then listed the few men in Limnón Cocha who were also Áyubu. “But those here,” continued N., motioning towards the village, “they are Pechabobakebu, Neabu, my mother, my uncles... Yet, it is my father who engendered me (engendrar)! My mother, who cast me out into the world (botar al

---

41 I insert the English translations or short explications in square brackets, and original expressions in round brackets.
42 This speech was recorded in my field notes. I have changed the identities in this Prologue, because these speeches might be potentially conflictual, and were spoken while inebriated. Still, the surnames conserve the original differentiation between the local Panoan-sounding surnames and the “noble” surnames, because this is important for understanding the context for some utterances. The Capanahua-sounding fictitious surnames come from names found in old Capanahua historical narratives (e.g. Schoolland 1975).
43 Eponymy of Áyubu is uncertain, sometimes associated with aya, maracana or shamiro (possibly white-eyed parakeet), but sometimes with pijuayo palm.
44 Pechabo is a fictitious version of one of the village surnames.
45 From nea, pale-winged trumpeter. Some people on the Tapiche suggested that there are two kinds of trompetero – one smaller and more gregarious (nea), and the other bigger, living in smaller groups (chinchí).
mundo) was Neabu, but I am ‘Áyubu!’ A. then asked N.: “So what am I?” N. thought a while: “You are Na‘inbu!46” A. laughed: “That’s what my father used to say, but I never knew what to make of it.” “The ‘Áyubu is like this: chah! chah!” explained N. demonstrating the fighting gestures with the imaginary winu.47 “And the Na‘inbu is like this, lying down,” N. mimicked a scene where the defeated Na‘inbu, lying on his back, pushing his leg out to protect himself from the ‘Áyubu, “I am the trunk of the ‘Áyubu, really-real! (itronco de ‘Áyubu! ilegítimo, legítimo!)” N. triumphed. “I know how things were, how the breed (generación) began, who we are and where we are from! I know all of it! Nuken hui ‘unana? [I know our language] — better than anyone else here, including my older brother! All the others are ‘ibumabu! [lit. “are not owners” or “are without owners”?] I use the word for those who have no knowledge (conocimiento), or who do not know anything, do not have a family, and do not have any experience. When I get angry I say: Tsuan mia ta’ kin?! ‘Thuma! ¿Quien eres tu?! ¡No sabes nada!” [Who do you think you are? You know nothing - in Cap. lit. “you are/have no owner”].

In the narrative reiterations of his legitimacy, N. made a perplexing claim: “My father was well viracuchazo, like a gringo! He had good knowledge, he was mestizo!48 Not my mother, she was a cholita, indita49, but she just threw me out into the world. The others begrudged (odiaban) my father, saying that his surname was given to him as a gift (regalado) as an ‘inábu [slave, adopted child] when his umbilical cord was cut. But no! Not him! He was truly real (bien legítimo) Rojas. And he would say: ‘Why should I change my surname?’ Yet others, yes, they are ‘inábu – like F. [the protoplast of the García line on the Tapiche], who was kidnapped by the mestizos when he was little. They claim they are García, but that’s not who they are! They are neither García nor Rojas [paternal and maternal surnames50 of the oldest living generation], they are Parayube Huasinahua! [Panoan-sounding (sur)names]. Their mother was also ‘inábu, raised by others. Did you hear how they speak Spanish? They have an accent, right? And me, I speak well, don’t I? That’s because

46 From na‘in, three-toed sloth.
47 Macana in Spanish: a long, sword-like weapon made from peach palm wood (Tessmann, 1999: 91). The last known examples were lost some 40 years ago.
48 In local Spanish, gringo refers to an exotic Caucasian foreigner; viracucha is a Caucasian or a person of “elevated” or foreign origin and culture (note the AUG-zo); mestizo can mean a person of mixed origin and/or brought up in a Spanish-speaking environment.
49 Cholo, Indio (note DIM -ito) – pejoratively charged designations connoting “hillbillies” or “heathens,” used to mean persons raised and living in a primarily indigenous language and setting.
50 In Peru, a person has two surnames, first from the father and second from the mother. Every parent passes on only his or her first (paternal) surname to the child.
they are more cholo than me! Only I am real Rojas, I am ahead (adelante) of them! Also, of J., G. [N.’s mother’s brother’s sons] – they are Pechabo Rojas, but me... I am Rojas Pechabo! They are behind me!”

A. asked, “And your father?” “X. Rojas Mocanahua.” “Mother?” “Y. Pechabo Rojas.” To this A. responded spontaneously: “I, too, am – as you say, ibien legítimo! My folks united among Herreras! My father was Huasinahua Herrera, and my mother Tello Herrera [sic, actually Herrera Tello].” “Is Tello Cocama51?” asked N. “¡Cocamazo!” answered A. strongly, intensifying the name with the augmentative suffix.

N. said he knew who his grandfather was, while earlier even his older siblings were not able to tell me. Recalling a name [of a man that others said was not his father’s father, as he claimed], N. told us the story of the older man’s death: He fell from an elevated pona palm floor breaking his neck, resulting in accusations and the subsequent temporary arrest of his uncle. When speaking of the “the old ones,” N. said that they, the antiguos, were real, while “us – we are nothing but their branches (sus ramas).” This led him to talk of his oldest son: “I have engendered him, he is mine! His mother only cast him out into the world – I made him (yo le hecho)!” He told us about how he teaches his son to deal with paturumu – patrón [mestizo employer]. How he urges his son to study at school, learn to read and write, and get ahead (adelante), to be ashuan huni [more/better man]. To not to feel shame (tener vergüenza) like his father who did not know how to read and write. His stepdaughters set an example – out there, in other parts of Peru, writing letters, studying.

With R., N.’s wife, who joined us later on, all three maintained that I spoke “their language” and insisted on speaking to me in Capanahua, which I could only partly follow. Whenever N. and R. switched to Spanish, A. opposed strongly, urging them to go back to speaking idioma, even though he too understands it only partially and kept asking for the meaning of particular words or utterances.

All the while they drank trago that N. asked me for, and he acknowledged this by telling me “the story of this trago” (cuento dese trago) in Capanahua. He mentioned how I served him a drink, and how nobody needed to know about this (he

51 Tupian, an indigenous group from the Ucayali, Marañón and Huallaga Rivers, on the Tapiche often assumed to be “more advanced” and sometimes synonymous with mestizo.
assumed I served him trago belonging to the patrón taken during his absence without paying for it, which was not the case). He told how I served him tobacco (“siri humi!” [a good man]); and how good it was to be there, kuin kuini, peacefully, unanimously. A. and N. went on to convince me of their great friendship towards me and how they were going to miss me (pensar, shina shinakin) when I left to “miin hema hanin” [your land/city], even though at this point we still had 4-5 months stay ahead of us. They finally left to look for the boom-box to play música.

1. The drunken speech

This speech will reverberate throughout the thesis, either directly or indirectly. Based on some standardized narrative elements or motifs, this and other similar presentations, or drunken speeches, offer an overview of the various dimensions of sociality and identities held by the villagers. One of the most important features demonstrated in these speeches is that they are spoken under the influence of alcohol, and are generally conceived as revealing what is expected to be hidden in daily life. As this thesis unfolds, exploring the world and other people construed as opaque containers of intents, hungers and affiliations, we can appreciate the importance of these demonstrations for the people. They offer valuable, rare glimpses into the multiple levels or layers of truth that are normally contained, concealed, or ignored in sociality, yet always taken into consideration in people’s explanations of human sociality. Here, they are important for this narrative for the same reasons, as they introduce the villagers’ ways of being complex social persons and the sociality in which they participate. With this in mind, I review some of these standardized expressions and motifs, organizing them for explanatory reasons into “modalities.”

The Capanahua descendants tend to associate the drunken speeches with “customs of the ancestors,” specifically with the pa’en hui (Sect. 1.4), and occasionally, wini’i wailing (Sect. 1.2). My use of the expression is more inclusive. During my fieldwork, what I call drunken speeches would take place on any occasion where alcohol was consumed. Usually middle-aged, (rarely younger) men and women in the situations I witnessed presented these. Any explicit commentary on drunken speech presented it as occurring spontaneously or “naturally” when people drink and the content as the things that drunk people say, and which do not require special skills. To an outsider, however, they show significant consistency. The ordering of presentation from the convivial to conflictive modalities may reflect the chronological
progression in actual speeches, but this is not always the case. The introductory example demonstrates how a drunken speech can actually be laid out – drawing on all or any of the modes and combining them.

1.1. Conviviality

N.’s speech began with the description of the circumstances that led to his inebriation. This mode focuses on the present temporal setting and on the communal dimension. Central themes concern being joyous, peaceful, and creating bonds of friendship. Ch. 1 will take up these dimensions of sociality. The expression *kuin kuini* used by N. refers to the feeling of joy and contentment (*alegrarse, contentarse*) (Loos & Loos 2003), as in contemporary practice, *estar alegre*. The peaceful, harmonious element is also defined through adjectives such as *siripi* [good, right, clear] or *tranquilo* [peacefully], *lindo* [neat], *normal* [in order], and indicates a peaceful interaction based on unanimity. A. told me about his birthday party as exemplary of the right way of drinking and rejoicing: “All the others got drunk and slept, some with vomit all over their faces and clothes... but all perfectly neat (*puro lindo*), no fighting, none whatsoever. No arguments. Nothing, not one little bit! *Puro lindo tranquilo!*” Similarly, P. spoke about another villager: “at least he does not harm anyone, he just walks about talking to himself and singing until his drunkenness passes or he goes to sleep”, and E. said she prefers it when “everyone on a *minga* is merry and content, when no one gets mad (*no se rabia*)”. V. told me “some look to pick a fight (*son liosos*) for no reason. Others bother (*molestan*) you by talking or singing” – he stays away from these, and he drinks tranquilly himself – “there is no harm in somebody getting drunk and going to sleep, this does not bother anyone.”

This ideal is evoked in drunken speech. On another occasion in a drunken speech, N. told us “people are enjoying themselves in a good way, *alegre*, among *kaibu* [relatives]: *sinayama* [without getting mad], just like the ancestors – they would come together to *chirini* [dance] all night, drink *masato* and go to sleep the next day”. P. assured me in his drunken speeches that he is *tranquilo*, “not arguing (*discutiendo*) with anyone” – and Z. made sure that he had not offended me (*¿he faltado algo a tu persona?*). A related meaning of *alegría* refers to the joyous uproar of laughter and music, perceptible proof of being together. A boom-box or a stereo is a device for overcoming the *tristeza*, or sadness/silence, and a proper meeting should be enhanced and affirmed by loud music.
Special effort is made to verbally create or confirm the surroundings (ambiente) of family and friendship links, joining the participants of the gathering. The zeal in defining the situation is, as will be seen here and in this thesis, indicative of a lurking shadow. Silence can be interpreted as the refusal of interaction caused by anger (rabiär, sinati) (cf. Ch. 2). People articulate and acknowledge the situation in a way that is characteristic to the villagers and their Capanahua ancestors. For example, the usual greeting questions the perceptible state of the addressee in the negative, and the response affirms it. The most common example, translated for outsiders as “hello” is “mu'yama’ín?” [lit. are you not awake?], with the response “mu’ta’hai” [lit. I am awake]. However, there are many others in Capanahua narratives, including “hiweyama’ín?”[are you not living (in your house?)] (Loos & Loos 1980b; Schoolland 1975). In LUS, the habitual greeting questions the activity of the addressee, for example, ‘tas sentado? [are you sitting?], and the response is an affirmation, aquí estoy, sentado [I am here, sitting]. In a similar manner, during drunken presentations, speakers verbally affirm what is perceivable. People make merry and simultaneously describe how they drink while working, talking or dancing, elaborating how good it is to be together in peace.

The drunken demonstrations most often refer to:

- working – for example, on a minga, working hand in hand. Laughing V. called to me, “Uuh! Suffering (i.e. working) together!” In other situations, which explain current inebriation: “We have been working lindo, co-ordinately, with all of our friends!”; N. told me, speaking in Capanahua and gesticulating, that they had been drinking strong masato while felling trees – and “[they] all got drunk!”;

- passing time together: “We are sitting here, joined by the bonds (vínculos) of friendship!” Drinking masato (sharing one bowl and sitting next to each other): “we are here, drinking like humans!”; “We are sitting here, drinking our masato, tranquilo – you know how it is!” having a conversation (“Here we are, entirely peaceful, having a conversation, recounting – everything in order (normal)!”), preferably regarding work; E. was pouring scorn on her

52 Peter Rivière noted for the Trio encounters, “hospitality (...) is in fact a prophylactic against witchcraft” (1969: 239).
companions for verbal accusations. “Don’t talk about stealing, cheating – talk like Capanahua, about how to clear a field, how to harvest manioc!”; “When my father was tipsy, he would talk about work, and tell stories from other parts”; or dancing, etc.: “Here we are, in these surroundings (ambiente), drinking, smoking and dancing, peacefully, tranquilo, lindo!”

Evoking conviviality is also achieved by affirming the relation using proper terms by which people address each other (tratarse) (in LUS or Capanahua). When inebriated, I. would call on his “beautiful idea for everyone to live in tranquillity and neatness. One large family! That’s what I go for!” – For this reason, he said, we were also part of the family, and that is why he called me compadre [child’s god-father, see Ch. 4]. S. would complain laughingly that Y. (distantly related) always called her mami when drunk, but when sober – she does not even bring her one fish. Speakers also praise the valued characteristics of a person they address: bien bueno conmigo [so good to me!], linda gente or siri huni [lit. beautiful folks, connoting generosity and unanimous participation]. They convince the listener of their good intentions and feelings (estimar [respect], amar, querer [love]).

Expressing sadness at the prospect of future separation is another way of emphasizing the bonds evoked in the present, both in terms of time and of space. For example, long before the time of our departure, during their drunken speeches people would say, “When will we see you again? Never? We are going to be very sad when you leave!” This can also be heard on other occasions, which focus on the passing of time, such as the New Year’s Eve or birthdays. There, amidst the wild cumbia music and dancing, drunken speeches accentuate joint participation to explicitly produce and fortify memories in the face of the unpredictability and inevitability of death or separation: “Tomorrow I die, and you will cry when you remember me – how we used to dance and drink together! And at the same time if you die – we will be very, very sad! We don’t know if we’ll make it to next year!”; “We may die tomorrow; we have to be alegre now!”; “Don’t you ever forget me!” Z. even ascertained that he would never forget my friend who visited us for a few days – “What’s his name again?”

1.2. “Remembering, they cry”

Eugene Loos mentioned the existence of traditional “tribal chants and [funeral] wails” which by the 1950s was known only by older women (1960: 12–13). In Capanahua this is referred to as wini’i [to cry, lament]. When I played a
Sharanahua *fidi*, discussed by Déléage (2007b), to several middle-aged people, they said it was the same as *wini*i of their parents or grandparents. Today, their wailing is referred to as *hablando-hablando lloran, llorando-hablando, llorar en su idioma* [they cry while talking-talking, crying-talking, crying in their language]. While it refers mostly to funeral wailing, it is also said to have been employed when recalling absent or deceased loved ones. It is easy to recognize in *wini*i a variant of the “ritual wailing” genre of native South America (e.g. Urban 1988). It seems that here, one occasion for lamenting would be the gatherings where people drank alcohol:

[My aunt’s] father (...) was also ... saying... singing... like this. But I didn’t understand what he was saying. (...) Like I said, drunk! Drinking, closing his eyes, there he would be, singing in his language, yeap... [chuckles] (...) *Pa’en yuwani*, they would call it, too. *Pa’en yuwani... wini*i (...) nukên xenibu *wini*i *pa’eni* [Speaking drunk, they lament (...) – our ancestors would lament when drunk]. My cousin (...) told me this: “How was it [done], cousin?” – “*Pa’enax... winikani*” (...) All bundled together, just them right there, (...) and they cried like this. There I heard the old C. sing like that – what could he possibly have been saying, the old-timer? I couldn’t understand him!

A *borracho* [drunken person] is commonly expected to cry and this is considered a “normal” element of inebriation. Often this emotional outburst is taken as spurious, just as when E. ridiculed the *borracho*’s “*mami*”, or when A. said people only cry at the funeral because they get drunk. Yet, the underlying idea is that *borracho* cries when recalling (*pensar*) his family, and this touches on the central point of drunkenness as outlined by Capanahua descendants. *Alegría* is opposed to *tristeza, bena* [sadness], which refers to silence, loneliness and abandonment. It is intrinsically connected with the verb *pensar, shinakin* [to think] that describes yearning for someone or something, remembering, homesickness, worrying and being in a state of detachment. While in the convivial mode, lamenting serves to reinforce existing or evoked bonds by envisioning future separation, here actual sadness reinforces estrangement. Remembering deflects from the social setting at hand, causing thoughts to leave for other places, other times, and other people.

Memories and nostalgia can take centre stage in drunken speech. Speakers bemoan their own pitiable state of loneliness, abandonment, and detachment from other members of their family, e.g. “At no time of night or day do I see my father. Any time I look, he’s not there. There I am, recollecting, thinking of my dad...” “I have neither father nor mother” is an expression often used, and even older people deplore being orphans. Others lament the dispersion of their family – siblings or children, or
their own status of being “from somewhere else.” Yet others express their sadness at temporal separation, e.g. when a wife leaves temporarily while the husband stays at home and drinks, deploping his loneliness and hunger as well as the fear that she will never come back. Overall, the evoked image is that of an individual’s abandonment and estrangement in the present social space, and of belonging somewhere else (“I have no family here!”). Those affiliations with remote or past places are often supported by revealing names or actual descriptions of people and places to which the borrachos claim to belong: “and so, when they [the old ones] were drunk, they recalled... their grandfathers, fathers of grandfathers...” Often the personal knowledge of genealogical ties or origins is actually traced to this modality. The recollections concern the departed loved one’s virtues, harmonious joint activities (hunting, working and conversations) or shared places. Apart from memories connected to family, one of those remote places revisited is the SIL social space on the Buncuya River between the 1950-1980s.

Also disclosed are emotionally charged, painful recollections of sickness and death. The night before día del tunchi (All Saints’ Day) N. came to us inebriated, and stating her full name and the names of her father and siblings (although we had known each other for 10 months – cf. section “Claiming ‘all that they are’”), she began a crying soliloquy, replete with gesticulation and dialogues. She told us of her loneliness in this village and recounted her father’s sickness, collapse and death, detailing the caretaking, suffering, and arguments after his death. “I am alone; I have no mother, no father. Just my children and grandchildren, but there is no one to comfort me (dar consuelo)...” P., crying, when inebriated, recounted separate stories of the deaths of his aunt, his grandfather, and his baby sister, one after another. Similar stories detailing dying and death are also comparable with the separations (e.g. farewells with the SIL missionaries), or the collapse of community (e.g. the story of the vampire bat plague that destroyed the whole stock of cattle on the Buncuya).

Speakers also reminisce about the transmission of knowledge (language, mythic stories) from close departed people (“T. Paranahua! (...) mi abuelo! (...) ¡El me contaba muuchas... pasadas! ¡Cantidades!” [T. Paranahua! (...) my grandfather! (...) He used to tell me so many stories from the past! A lot!]), and sometimes proceed to the content of the stories themselves (it. Ch. 3). These carry away to even more
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remote places and times, especially the curious and terrifying tales of the sad past (triste pasado), where the ancestors suffer violence, persecutions and ignorance.

Finally, a speaker may lament his own life mistakes or misfortunes (such as premature deaths in the family) which determined his life path, failed chances at education or work in cities, traumatic memories, or a near-death experience.

Therefore, in this mode, borrachos recall their lost connections to other places, other times and persons. Most of all, they remember the departed family members and the social spaces they have passed through during their lives – it could be said that they recall the spaces of conviviality of the past. Inevitably, such reminiscences bring up a very common and important theme of the Capanahua descendants’ social representations: passing away and temporal degradation or diffusion (Ch. 3, 4): “He was really-really real Capanahua! When he died, the Mocanahuas ended. We are... nothing but the roots (raíces)” – Z. told me disdainfully whose own surname is Mocanahua.

1.3. The language

The language of everyday, “sober” communication in the Capanahua descendants’ villages is LUS. Yet, it is commonly maintained that everyone in the village actually knows idioma (“the language”) of the antiguos, but refuses to speak it or admit to understanding it. These commentaries feature a very characteristic mixture of resentment and derision: “They know the language, brother, they can speak it. How else would I hear them speak when they get drunk? And when sober, they don’t want to!”; “They don’t speak it every day – only once in a while, when they are a bit tipsy – there they remember too!”; “Just listen how this borrachito talks! That’s how they are: when he’s sober, he doesn’t want to say a word. And when he’s got his booze: Damn! He knows it all too well!”; “That one, when he’s all liquored up, he speaks it. And the guy speaks it really well, too!”; “Oh boy, how they would speak it when they had their liquor!”; “They don’t want to speak it. Only when you catch them with their masato – only then!”

While the actual commonality of language competence seems questionable to me, drunken speeches do favour usage of Capanahua. Inebriation, then, is strongly associated with speaking idioma. “[I am drunk, so] I feel like speaking my language! (¡Tengo ganas de hablar mi idioma!)” – is a popular expression, and the “urge” is
more often simply enacted, regardless of the actual competence of the speaker and the listeners. This is best illustrated by speeches of those persons who most strongly deny their knowledge and claim to have forgotten it completely while sober. Once such a man struggled to utter: “buna ka’iř” While I tried to figure out what happened with the bullet ant (buna, isula), his daughter asked her mother: “buna what?!?” Laughing, the latter responded that she had no idea. Only when the man started gesturing with tears in his eyes, did I understand that he meant bena [pena, sadness] – that he was going to feel sorry when we left the village.

Drunken speeches seem to privilege languages of other social spaces, and since they are to a large extent monologues – as in the extreme case of P., who “walks around talking to himself” – they can be opaque to listeners. Loos noted that “a grandfather chanted for the group in a dialect not clearly understood by the others, who claimed it was ‘too fast’ for them” (1960: 13), and P. (who is among the most competent speakers) recalled not understanding his uncle’s speeches. Further, he remembered that when his father was inebriated, he sang and spoke in Quechua, which no one else understood: “My father spoke Inca [i.e. Quechua], me – never, I just listened. When he was drunk, he would sit there, all alone, speaking.” Contemporary examples are P.’s use of incomprehensible languages, including an invented dialect of Capanahua, improvised legal-official Spanish and the pretend-Polish which he spoke in his drunkenness, and even L.’s exclusive use of his native Yanesha language while drunk conforms to this pattern.

These other languages may be considered as traces of remote social spaces included in one’s formation and experience. Similarly, for the villagers, Capanahua language is closely associated with the social space of the parents. Hui [language] also stands for words and stories, which are always traced to specific persons and the “exact” way that they told them (Ch. 3). “The old ones no longer exist” – is often repeated, thus, there is no one to speak the language to. Therefore, language of the stories and of communication with relatives who are gone is also a matter of memory, a trace of other places, times and conviviality – especially if it is not used in everyday parlance.

1.4. Speaking “all that they are”

The following modality of drunken speech is similar to the previous one in that it relates to places and people outside of the current spatial-temporal setting. In fact,
it may evolve from nostalgic remembrance itself. Yet, while a drunken lament expresses separation, longing and the temporal diffusion of authenticity, this mode actively brings particularity within the confines of the present social space. This aspect involves a boasting affirmation of difference in persons. Instead of projecting authenticity (legítimo, connoting seniority and purity) onto the past, the speaker claims it for himself. Speakers announce “all that they are” (todo lo que [son] ellos), which is interpreted as their claim of superior authenticity against other participants of the social space, substantiated by origin, affiliation, formation, physical strength, prowess and knowledge. Such an overt demonstration radically opposes the uniformity ideal of conviviality and everyday sociality, where self-restraint and humility are expected. While daily communication postulates relative kinship address terms, drunken speech exposes “absolute,” singular identities (cf. Ch. 4).

This modality corresponds to the Capanahua descendants’ representations of what they explicitly refer to as pa’en hui, and in LUS, it is also simply described as están conversando entre borrachos [they talk among drunk people]. According to historical sources, their ancestors recognized a speech genre called pa’en hui or pa’en yuwani [pa’en – inebriated; hui – language, story, speech, word; yuwani – conversation], describing monologic turns that were translated by the Looses as “drunken discourses” (Loos & Loos 1980a: 64). It seems that the privileged setting for the pa’en hui described for the ancestors had been drinking gatherings of men described as “all-night drinking fest[s]” (Loos 1960: 7). The speech was interpreted by Loos to be “dedicated to ‘counselling’ the younger generation” (Loos 1960: 7; cf. Loos & Loos 1980a: 64), although the Capanahua descendants tend to present the pa’en yuwani of the ancestors by focusing on the partly unintelligible self-assertions or presentations. One might identify these discourses with the “ceremonial dialogues,” “ceremonial greetings” or the “strong talk” described for other South American Lowlanders,54 with whom they share themes and standards, despite the fact that none of these seem to be explicitly connected to inebriation. While Loos and the villagers link drunken speech to encounters or gatherings, there is no information as to the relations between people participating in such encounters.

The most basic formula, reported for both historical, as well as the contemporary presentations, is “Pa’en sta/ta hai” [I am drunk], followed by one’s “breed” name (tribu, raza or kaibu – cf. Ch. 4, 5). For example, “When they got drunk, they used to say: “pa’en sta hai, Neabakebu!”; “uuu – pa’en ta hai!” – He would say – ‘Áyu! Æyubu! “My uncle used to say ‘I am Neabu’ when he was drunk” “my father-in-law used to say: ‘Pa’en ta hai! Áyu – Æyubu! Nea’in bake” [Æyubu, son of the Neabu woman]. It is a violent, expressive shout, occasionally accompanied by a pounding of the chest with the hand or fist. In the case of Neabu, speakers can imitate trumpeter’s calls (chuuh! chauuh! čhiish! shshff! tushshsh!), and one man recalled seeing his grandfather imitate the bird’s walk. Today, apart from (or instead of) the above, a full name and surname may be given, sometimes along with the names of parents or grandparents, including situations where people know each other and their relations, so that a man can yell his full name and surname even to his brother.

However, normally such affiliations are considered boisterous or sometimes rebel identity claims outside drunken speech. First, the speaker can be interpreted to arrogate an originality by taking on a “strong” name, the potential beginning of a new “breed.” Such names are said to be either made up by the speaker for himself, or sometimes improvised on the spot, to support his skills, strength, or authenticity claims. Both the past and present claims are slightly ridiculed by the villagers, e.g. “He [my uncle] used to say that he was Binun’i’бу, Manan’i’бу55, Neabu. How? Which one in the end!? [laugh]”; “They used to say those [names] [laughs]. They say it in jest (De broma hablan ese), (…) – like that drunkard J.: don’t you know when he’s drunk he says: ‘I am Mashin Kunibu56?... I mean, they invent those names themselves, to speak them there.”

Such rampant, wilful self-naming of the ancestors, inventing “strong” fighting names (invoking the eponymic animal’s strength or agility), is often used to explain the emergence of the different tribus [breeds]:

55 From binu [aguaje or moriche palm (Mauritia flexuosa)] and òbu [owner of], and manan [hill, highland] and òbu. These names are said to have been used only by one man, but no one today could explain their status. Note that both have the suffix òbu, thus denoting claim for ownership and originality (cf. Ch. 4, 5). While the precise aguaje palm reference is opaque to me, the highlands as habitat seem to have had significance for the antiguos’ identity.
56 From mashin [beach] and kuni [knifefish] (order Gymnotiformes) and -bu [generic].
My father said that sometimes, they would take on names of animals (…) for example, Sloth-Indians (Pelejo-aucas): [sloth] is really strong. Has a lot of strength. Because of this they say they are Na’mhbakebu – nobody can beat him! [laughs] (…) They took on names, nicknames. These are the meanings [significaciones] of Na’mhbakebu, Neabakebu – that is where their meaning comes from.

In one unique explanation, the origin of the tribu name is traced to a mischievous boy, “naughty, playful, running around like a monkey!” Such replacement of the usual image of the drunken contest with a mischievous boy shows the mocking attitude towards the names of tribus and the wilful drunken boasting. In the story, the urchin would shout: “I am The Squirrel (Kapabu)!!!” The sardonic response from the adults was: “Oh, very well, then, Kapabu it is, the Squirrel!” Thus, Kapabu was his name and eventually, according to this one interpretation, this came to designate all the ancient Capanahua [from kapa – squirrel, and nawa – strangers, foreign group, (in contemporary use: the mestizos)].

For the Capanahua descendants, this aspect of pa’en hui is often the source of information on ascending generations’ affiliations to what Eugene Loos referred as “patrilineal clans” (1960; Loos & Loos 2003). These affiliations are generally traced through the father, although both lines are sometimes affirmed (as in N.’s speech) – and on occasion the focus can shift to the mother’s side. They are composed of an animal or plant eponym and suffix -bu [denoting a generic class or 3rd person plural] or -bakebu [offspring of]. The Spanish equivalents are composed of the eponym and the -auca suffix, e.g. pelejo-aucas, trompetero-aucas. They are referred to variously as tribus or tribadas [lit. tribes], as well as razas, generaciones and descendencia [lit. races, breeds, descent]. They are presented today as original separate groups said to have made up the Capanahua social formation in the past, and/or as origin categories of the ancestors. Sometimes they are said to be the surnames (apellidos) of the antiguos, and they in fact parallel contemporary forms, so that one or more local surnames are associated with a given -bakebu category.

Between the different publications of SIL, transcribed narratives and my own fieldwork, the number of such patrilineal names ranges from 7-17 for upper Capanahua and 2-5 for Lower Capanahua. For the Upper Tapiche/Buncuya dialect, I counted seven most commonly mentioned: Neabu (with possibly several separate patrilines, some occasionally alternatively called Chinichebu), Na’mbu, Āyubu, Kapabu, Xawanbu, Binabu, Muebu. Four possibly extinct, mentioned in SIL narratives or stories told to me: Kumabu, Iskubu, Xanebu, Kanabu; and two uncertain (possibly alternative names): Waninbu (possibly alternative to Āyubu) and Xes ‘isabu (possibly Muebu). Tentatively, there are four historical surnames with possibly similar status (like Binabu surname): Yuchiyuba, Yukabu, Kaman, Bakiyuba. For the Lower Tapiche dialect, on which I have little information two are mentioned most often: Neabu and Pa’ebu; of unknown status (possibly alternative names or segments): ‘Inabu (sometimes for Pa’ebu). ‘Tsanneabu, Bi’l huni (the latter two were also associated with Neabu).

Auca in Loreto Spanish comes from Quechua language, where it refers to “barbarians, heathens.” Here, it is rarely used other than in this suffix form, which is locally meant as “an isolated group of savages (indios).”
Eugene Loos said (2009-14) that in the 30 years of his experience with the Capanahua, the “[bakebu] distinctions [did not] play much [of a] role in daily life as far as [he] could discern.” Daily sociality focuses on the present and obviates the past, as the conviviality section suggests. Drunken speech does the reverse, by drawing such outside identities from the past and revealing them in the present. Some 30 years since the departure of the SIL missionary, they are still are not very important in daily sociality, but people (generally middle-aged) do maintain a memory of them as things from the past – very often referring precisely to what the “old people” were saying in their pa’en yuwani. It is this very association with the past that seems important. These affiliations seem to actually be transmitted as already partial identities of the past. Rather than categories of living people or “descent groups,” they are seen as the traces of ancestors hidden in people, as ramas (“branches”) in Capanahua descendants’ expression. Therefore, claiming to be the “real” representative of one’s rightful raza is questionable. This is because the drunken speaker positions himself at the very core, as the tronco (“tree trunk,” connoting centeredness) by assuming the identity of his father or grandfathers.59 Such claims to being authentic can therefore be ridiculed – for example, a man who is reported to have soberly called himself in a public situation a “real, proper Capanahua,” is now mockingly nicknamed Capanahua, and his son – Capanahuillo [lesser/smaller Capanahua]. I take on the issue of raza in general, as well as the tree and trunk imagery and patrilinearity in Ch. 4.

Another type of claim usurps foreign identities. It parallels the previous examples in that it capitalizes links to remote places or times as sources of authenticity or strength. N.’s father’s association with the mestizo is emphasized through his language and surname. The villagers say that it was common practice in previous generations to adopt the names and surnames of the non-Capanahua godparents, or to consciously, wilfully take up the viracucha surnames. Others claim that their ancestors were actually gringo-like Brazilians or Peruvians, or not “from here” like everybody else. This is spoken of as an act of “ignoring” (negas, ignorar) one’s own raza by assuming a new identity in order to appear as “someone more” (gente más). In either case, the actual lines of descent are assumed to be ultimately unknown in the present, being connections which are beyond the experiential

59 It might be reflected by switching from variation Áybakebu [Áyu’s offspring] to Áyubu [the very Áyu].
knowledge of people. Therefore, all identity affirmations are received more or less sceptically and may be contested. Indeed, the backstage of Capanahua descendants’ social lives, the majority of the existing surnames are suspected of being inauthentic: cambiado, robado, regalado [changed, stolen, or received as a gift], etc. I return to such claims and their negotiations in Ch. 5.

Apart from the very names or descent, saying “all that they are” also includes self-assertive boasting of knowledge, capacities or qualities (ultimately, as I will show, these are connected with the name and “descent”). Strength or agility in fighting, endurance, competence in work (measured in field size or possessions), hunting prowess, superior sorcery skills, as well as honesty, generosity, knowledge of raza origins and the ancestors’ language. He may also emphasize privileged connections to remote places as a sign of “getting ahead” (adelantar). These may include his relatives living or working in cities, fluency in Spanish, mestizo habits or diet, education (with a viracucha teacher), overall worldliness achieved through travels to other rivers or countries (cf. Ch. 1 on knowing places), meetings with strangers such as ornithologists, oil workers, traders, municipal officials, etc. In the process, other members of the community are downplayed as less authentic, more backwards (atrasado, cholo), or less knowledgeable (either as Capanahua or mestizo). Sober people denigrate, mock and contest such self-assertions.

It is worth noticing here that the claims to Capanahua and mestizo domains do not seem to cancel each other out as demonstrated in N.’s presentation, where claiming to be the truest core of Ayubu goes along with being a real viracucha. Similarly, in the same example, knowledge of the past original domains does seem to contradict the knowledge of the mestizo cities. I return to this in Ch. 4 and 5. Here, I will point out that both of these assertions link to strong purities, and claim hierarchic primacy.

1.5. Confrontation

Another common motif of drunken demonstrations reveals the conflictive potential of people’s composition is captured by the sentence: “We are looking at each other like enemies!” which I heard in the initial stages of making acquaintances. This contrasts dramatically with “sitting joined by the bonds of friendship” of the convivial modality. In the villages, silence and withdrawal from social participation is read as a possible indication of “thinking other things” (pensar otra cosa), which describes
misunderstanding, jealousy, upset, or having a disparate agenda that disturbs social harmony and unanimity (Ch 2 discusses the internal contents of persons). This can be addressed openly as: “Are you mad?” (¿Tas rabiando?), or “Why are you mad?” (¿Porqué estás rabiando?), “Are you thinking of harm?” (Masa shinakin?), or “Do you know sorcery?” (Min kushunti unanain?), “Perhaps you are trying me?” (¿de repente me estás probando?). A popular greeting aims to prevent discord: Sinayamawe! [Don’t be mad!].

However, a borracho makes open requests and pesters others; he can be described as an exilón “an impertinent, notorious demander” [from exigir, demand]. While his nagging can lead to the collapse of personal business (such as selling cigarettes or trago), the refusal of alcohol or tobacco to a drunken sorcerer is extremely dangerous, because it constitutes sufficient grounds for a sorcery attack.

The revealing nature of drunkenness can lead to the unveiling of daily conflicts, either directly to the person concerned, or to a third party. In daily life, disputes tend to be neutralized, whereas in those moments of drunken revelations I would learn about the discords that exist between the villagers themselves. People recalled past wrongdoings (thefts, rumours, debts) or conflicts, and produced new accusations. An observation by Loos (1960: 4) indicates a case of incest denied by the offender in daily life that was brought up in the drunken feasts seems to be related. Similarly, I often learned of people’s qualms towards Kinga and myself – ranging from serious charges to bemoaning us for not visiting their house.

1.6. Violence

Violence is the extreme illustration of the ruinous potential recognized in people and sometimes revealed by drunken demonstrations. Claiming “all that they are” supremacy borders on confrontation, and, as seen above, is expressed in terms of superior fighting skills, evoking the old days of the macana sword-club fighting, as in N.’s demonstration.

The speaker builds up his case to a point where he demonstrates the ultimate proof of the vaunted strength, skill or endurance. An example may be found in the behaviour of a drunken uncle who reportedly used to scratch the palm floor with his bare fingernails: “I am Tarzán!” he would say as his fingers split and bled. Another antiguo is remembered for bringing out his macana whenever he was inebriated. He would insist on demonstrating with his impressive weapon: “That’s how you fight!” –
jumping up, dodging and ducking, he would swing his two meter sword-club (*macana*) very close to the observer’s head, saying: “Don’t worry, with Cha’i [his nickname] everything is measured!” Yet another uncle used to wield his *macana*, hitting house-poles as a demonstration (*muestra*) of “how [he] used to fight.”

These solo displays by the remembered, remaining old ones seem to have roots in the actual fighting that the ancestral Capanahua practiced during inter-community drinking feasts, where invitations were communicated with signal drums. These fights are a constant motif in stories about the ancestors. For the villagers, they epitomize the untamed, “sad past” of the savage *antiguos*. It is often explained that the reason for such fights is a “winner-takes-all” gamble for women, or as validating the claims for individual superiority. Heads were split open, yet the injured would stand up again, resisting the pain. In another mode of violent encounter reported for the ancestors, a man was said to bring out the wrongs suffered from another man. The wrongdoer was expected to wait to receive either a blow with a *macana* or a cut with a *wušati* [huaca – small curved knife] (cf. Loos 1960: 18–19).

I did not hear of cases of persons being killed within the past couple of generations, and the older sources suggest these were contests rather than deadly violence. Eugene Loos (1960: 18) recorded a description by a man who may have witnessed such duels in his childhood. They are presented as “displays of strength” and “valor in the face of pain” during meetings between “clans” – thus, they would only turn into actual skirmishes if someone became seriously hurt. Manuel Cordova’s recollection of the Capanahua feasts from the 1920s (Lamb 1985: 58–59) tells of a sham or mock battle” where “it always seemed that someone surely would be killed, but no one received as much as a scratch,” and “shouting, groaning, weeping melee of drunkenness (...) sounded fierce but (...) no on [sic] really got hurt.” Rather, they were “a display of defensive skill and personal agility accompanied by the loud clatter of the striking clubs and wild shouts of the men” (ibid.).

Still, in contemporary representations, people were regularly killed in these fights. They are presented as dreadful acts of violence by the untamed, messed-up old

---

60 Robert Carneiro (1980), among others, have questioned the veracity of information in Bruce Lamb’s earlier book. As Lamb demonstrated in his response to Carneiro (1981), he was very well read in the written sources from the area. Yet, the data he provides on the Capanahua of the Tapiche are accurate in historical facts that cannot be found in the sources I know. I have no reason to disbelieve that they come from someone who had known the upper Tapiche at the described time.
ones (los viejos fregados). In one story illustrating the fierceness of the “old Capanahua,” while working in a field, a man’s ear was cut off with a machete during an erupting fight. The inebriated companions brought herbs to dress the wound, reattached the ear and continued to drink masato, only to find out the next day that the ear had been placed backwards. Drunken men threatened the lives of outsiders married to or working with the Capanahua who recounted situations where they felt their lives were threatened. Currently, any acts of violence I was told about or witnessed were much more about spontaneous confrontational eruptions rather than such formal displays of strength.

2. The releasing capacity of drunkenness

It would not be possible to understand the full meaning of pa’en hui without accounting for how drunkenness in general is construed by the Capanahua and their descendants. A borracho is an object of ridicule, scorn, derision as well as critique, worry and fear. At best, they are hilarious, annoying (e.g. smelly) or mischievous. At worst these are – unpredictable, violent and dangerous to themselves and others. That a drunken man is capable of hurting his own family is a common admission: wife, brothers or even parents (two cases of death are connected, though indirectly, with the inebriated fight between a father and his sons). E. once handed me a glass of trago saying: “Careful with that, it makes us fight our family. You could end up beating your woman. Dangerous!” Drunken people are expected to cry, sing, and to talk loudly and for the most part, incoherently.

The habitual discourse on drunkenness demonstrates an attribute that shines a particular light on the drunken speech. A borracho is expected to let go easily: of his money (in a drinking binge, for example, he can spend everything he has earned while working for months), of his belongings (often this is an opportunity to acquire a good quality object at a rock-bottom price) – and most importantly – his secrets.

Drunkenness is habitually represented as leading to the display of hidden information that would otherwise remain obscured as secretive or shameful in daily life. In stories of the ancient people, antiguos, drunken talk is blamed for the loss of special powers. In one example, a man is said to arrive in the sky world accidentally. There, from a man who presents himself as his brother-in-law (called Wishmabu, Star man, see Ch. 2. 3), he receives the tools that clear a field without the owner’s effort. He is warned never to disclose where the tools come from. Yet, during a
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manioc beer feast back on earth, envious companions try to find out the secret of his success. Finally, with increasing inebriation, he boasts: “I have this and this because of my brother-in-law (...) I am the quickest at making fields! I have what no one has!” (VPB03). Consequently, the tools lose their special power. If it were not for the drunken man’s talking, people would not need to work nowadays. In another story, a forest demon grants luck for hunting, under the condition that the latter is never spoken of. However, the jealous companions intentionally get the hunter drunk to draw out his secret. Ch. 3 overviews some common characteristics of myths and the ruinous potential of such disobedient actions.

Further, in contemporary life, inebriety is an opportunity to gain information that a person may be reluctant to “let out” (soltar) otherwise, like language, ejemplos [here: myths], stories of the old days, descendencia (origins) and his biography, for example of his experience with learning sorcery, or finding the village of isolated Remo Indians in the forest, etc. This can be used as a strategy – in an attempt to entice the visiting, restrained Marubo Indians to talk, the man accused of embezzling community funds admitting, or a sorcerer acknowledging his skills. Often it was seriously suggested that I got people inebriated for an interview, so they would tell me all they know.61

Conclusion

Drunken speeches reflect the unsolvable tensions and contradictions that I think define the tone of social life in the villages of the Capanahua descendants. Specifically, the main object of convivial sociality is creating overtly harmonious social spaces by overcoming differences (cf. Overing and Passes 2000). Yet, the difference – epitomized by descent – is inescapable. More than that – although in day-to-day village life, attempts are made to contain or obscure dissonances, they effectively paralyze any attempts at achieving unanimity and the ideal of a harmonious life, ultimately producing the feeling of unsolvable conflicts, which is often overtly expressed as “we don’t know how to live well” (no sabemos vivir bien) (cf. Santos-Granero 2000).

61 I have never used the method with premeditation, although several people insisted on being interviewed while slightly inebriated. This sometimes resulted in the drunken speech, where my questions mattered even less than usual. In any case, it may be interesting to note that my questions and interest in histories of the antiguos often evoked the very themes of various modalities of the drunken speech.
In drunken speech the conjuring of the ancestors as “strangers” from the perspective of modern, daily sociality, could be seen as an “act of alterity” (Course 2009: 306), making this kind of speech comparable to other Lowland South American genres of speech which invite the voice of the “other” (Oakdale 2002, 2005; cf. Déléage 2007). *Pa’en hui* proper, in which the subjects revolve around such ideas of descent as alterity – is almost the exact opposite of conviviality, made up by the ideals of everyday social life. In the shift between these two modes of drunken speech, merrymaking turns into sadness; unanimity into confrontation; unity into particularity; extraversion into introversion; conversation into shouting monologues; dancing into fighting; family or friends into enemies. The fact that inebriety is assumed to be leading to the revelations of secret information is crucial. It shows that descent here is categorized along with other powerful secrets or shameful differences as an obscured aspect of communal life. Thus, the disparity between the content of convivial drunken speech (communal life) and *pa’en hui* proper (descent, particularity) could be read as one between the perceptible and the concealed. This positioning of descent, alongside difference and particularity, reflected in drunken speech also allows a preliminary glimpse of the Capanahua descendants’ specific Amerindian notion of descent. These dynamics of presenting themselves to themselves, through the struggling of perspectives of community and descent, unity and divergence, gives a specific tone to the Capanahua descendants’ sociality.
Chapter 1.

**This side, the outside: The social spaces**

In this chapter, I explore the Capanahua descendants’ ways of speaking about the social spaces and participation within social spaces. Examining the aesthetic and ethical qualities ideally expected by villagers to be associated with such spaces, I point to the reiteration of idioms invoking harmonious clarity. Analyzing representations of these spaces, I show them to be conceived and explained as the result of labour associated with clearing, removing obstacles and differences, conducive to creating an open and egalitarian milieu of conviviality. This chapter examines the salience of ways of making meaning out of shared space for the Capanahua descendants’ conceptualizations of social phenomena. It starts with an abstracted image of sociality in the instruction for successful manioc cultivation, which could be seen as the description of the ideal human social space, and of a way of handling the generative process and mixture. Throughout the chapter, I trace composite elements of that image, refracted at various scales of social representations. First, I explore the physical conditions for existence of social spaces such as villages in the area, and the desirable aesthetic qualities of openness in such conditions (Sect. 1). In the following section (2) I move on to show how similarly formed concerns shape the idioms describing social interactions and the creation of equality – as the absence of obstacles to perceptibility and communication. I also address the way in which communities are conceived, based on such conditions and ideals of coexistence, as functions of knowledge and perceptibility. Finally, (Sect. 3), I look into how explanations and representations of participation in such social spaces, along with the other qualities discussed earlier in this chapter, contribute to understanding these as explicitly “external.”

I should note that the greatest difficulty in presenting this chapter lies in the fact that its subject is constituted by, and constitutive of, the themes or representations contained in the following chapter. Rather than understanding these as entirely separate and static categories, I propose that their relational topologies could be seen as resulting from a dynamic in the Capanahua descendants’ contextual,
positioned ways of producing meaning (not incidentally, from the generative or causative processes they postulate – the details of this germinating and differentiating dynamic will be discussed in Ch. 4). Because these two chapters address mutually constituting perspectives, which provide meaning to each other, it is unavoidable that they should partially overlap. It should, however, be taken into consideration that in this chapter, I consistently focus on one “side” of products of a larger dynamic. More specifically, I adopt the perspectives conceived as an “outside,” or “clarity” in relation to other dimensions, while the following chapter presents the points of view “internal” in relation to these (or other) perspectives.

The city of manioc

Our friend, Daniel Huainche from Limón Cocha, once gave me an elaborate description of how manioc should be planted and grown (DHR07). He was evidently fascinated with the process of reproduction that he recognized for this domesticated, staple crop. He found it extraordinary because this is the only plant known to him to be propagated in two parallel ways. One is by stem cuttings, with the help of people, and the other, by seed, and therefore, on its own. In the beginning, “you make the [field on a] purma, a clear-cut.” After the field is cleared, manioc planted from seed “emerges [salir] first, because the seeds are already there, in the ground. These are those seeds that fell [before].” This happens, since “they say manioc waits to grow until a field is ready to plant.” Daniel spoke of manioc (as of many other plants and animals) as a person, using the pronoun él [he]. “He” is eager to grow, but is holding back. What “he” wants is company. This is as Daniel’s father told him: “he is waiting for his companions before he starts growing.” The human owner of the field needs to plant his own manioc cuttings right away, just after the long and laborious process of clear-cutting (rozar) is completed with the burning (quemar) of the slashed and sun-dried vegetation. As soon as possible, “on the second day, you plant your own stem cuttings as well.”

What’s the rush? “You have to plant them evenly, son!” – so that it “will now grow equally with [those from] the seeds.” It is only “when all [the field] is planted: 

---

62 Laura Rival’s (2001) overview of Makushi manioc cultivation points to a similar distinction of cloned, domesticated plants from seed. She mentions the fascinating resiliency of the manioc seeds “waiting to grow,” possibly for up to fifty years. This endurance of the reproductive potential of the seed might prove interesting to think through the inherent, indelible ambiguity of the “inabu position,” central to the generative process, and responsible for the “asymptotic” character of taming or handling difference, to which I will return in the chapters to come (3 and 4).

63 Purma (LUS): secondary forest, a former field/clearing that has overgrown and replenished when fallow.
¡bruto! [swear], they all rise, they rise alegre [lit. “happy,” but see below)! [ŁK: At the same time?] Same time! Gives well!” The assumption is that it is beneficial for the growth of the plants to be together, at even height and evenly distributed, “so that it looks like their city. [Then] it is a city (ciudad). Growing nicely (lindo) – and they are alegre!” It is a cleared and harmoniously organized space, with enough room for each plant: “All their ‘eyes’ [ojos] are well cleaned down below (…) you need to give them air. Don’t ya know he’s hot because of the weeds!?” The ones that grow imperfect are taken out and discarded, “so that [the good ones] grow better.” Then, at the right time, their own seeds start to appear, “And the seeds start to emerge (salir) and grow. Up high. His seeds like this, some small, some big.” Finally, when the stems are cut, they need to be handled well (bonito), or the mistreated stem will be offended and will not want (querer) to grow, saying: “Why is he [the owner] dropping me – he doesn’t want (querer) me!” This is because, while the roots end up on dishes as inguiri, in bowls as masato, or in the large sacks as fariña, the final destination of manioc stems is to be cut to smaller pieces and planted in another, new field.

It will become clearer as this thesis progresses that this description and Daniel’s father’s instructions on cultivating manioc compose a powerful example of social imagery. Although Daniel was speaking about the manioc growth, the following sections will show that we might see this image as the Capanahua descendants’ general recipe for a perfect sociality, applicable to different scales of coexistence in communal spaces. Equally, it may serve as an instruction for “growing” people, which in itself is significant, because management of the generative and differentiating processes or production of children appears to be one of the principal problems of social life for the villagers. Before discussing the temporal dimensions in later chapters, here I will initiate the exploration of social topologies. In the sections that follow, I take up some of the “spatial” themes composing the “city of manioc” image, comparing this with salient, common representations associated with the existence of social spaces (section 1) and sociality contained within them (section 2). This exploration will allow introducing the first perspective on topology, evoked by such ways of making meanings through the conceptions of movements between the

---

64 Sweet manioc, yuca is used by Capanahua descendants as part of the daily diet, as su inguiri (LUS for staple accompanying a meal of fish or meat). It is sometimes replaced by green cooking plantains; in work and social gatherings – such as masato, or manioc beer in various stages of fermentation; and to produce fariña, or coarse manioc flour, the selling of which provided the villagers of Limón Cocha (to lesser extent Berea) with monetary or commodity income at the time of our stay.
distinguished spheres (section 3), and will prove responsible for the title of this chapter.

1. Construction and composition of social spaces as clearings

As Daniel said, first one needs to make a field. This seemingly trite fact, only mentioned in passing, is crucial. I therefore propose to look first into some of the ways in which the tropical forest is represented by the villagers, and then at the manner in which it is used as a negative background against which inhabited spatiotemporal spaces are created. I will then present some desired, ideal qualities expected of physical social spaces that build on this context. Finally, I will explore the “personal” aspect of such spaces, which seems to be intrinsic to the villagers’ ways of knowing and making sense of social formations. This discussion aims to provide a practical and topological context for understanding the Capanahua descendants’ ways of making sense of sociality that I will analyse in the subsequent section.

1.1. Sadness of the tropics

Aipena is the name associated with one of the biggest or at least most famous social groupings of “the Capanahua” in the 20th century, known beyond the Buncuya and Tapiche rivers. This is where the SIL established its base of operations in the 1950s, where the bilingual school was started, the airstrip opened, cattle owned by the Capanahua, etc. It leant the name to the Buncuya River’s comunidad nativa in the 1980s, and is even used today when people refer to Berea – its humble successor and home to the contemporary comuneros of Aipena Native Community – as Nuevo Aipena [New Aipena]. In reminiscences of those who have passed through, the times of Aipena loom as the golden years of cohesion and prosperity, a bustling centre of sociality. Yet paradoxically, the story associated with the provenance of its name reveals another extreme that lays the basis for the presentation to follow. According to Don Guillermo:

For example, this name of Aipena – it wasn’t invented by the one who lived there, its founder. Instead, there was a shiringa [rubber tree] worker – there used to be lots of shiringueros roaming about here before. And each camp [on the river] had some

---

65 The story ignores the older and larger namesake town and a river in San Martin region in northern Peru (cf. Introduction). The orthography of Aipena in documents differs. So, while the early documents prepared for inscription of the community at the Ministry of Agriculture (Romaina Guelle and Huaninche Romaina 1972) give the name as “Hay Pena,” in evident reference to this story – in the actual inscription and the title of property, the name already figures as Aipena (Ministerio de Agricultura 1984).

66 The word ejemplo carries, among others, the meaning of „a story“ (see Ch. 3).
5 or 6 workers. From there: another camp, and another, and another. In the last one, there was one man who worked all by himself (...). And another one downriver. Only one person worked shiringa in this camp. One day, he descended from his camp. “I’ll go and visit my fellow worker.” (...) He reached the other’s camp. There, the other shiringuero was sitting. So the man who descended said: “Hey, brother, what’s going on?” – “Puucha [swear], here I am – sitting down with sadness.” “Why are you sad?” “Oh, well... I am lonesome.” “Well then, this camp of yours will now be named “Hay Pena” [there is sadness]! [laughs].

The story by Don Guillermo’s nephew, Profesor Humberto, published by SIL is very similar, but here, it is the lonesome man who takes up the initiative: “Being sad over not having anyone to talk to, I come”vii (SIL 1995: 59). In either case, the story tells of desolation in the forest. This feeling of being cut off in the dense forest is shared by the loggers who sometimes spend months living in shacks (tambos) in the remote, provisionally cleared forest camps, far away from their families, living in Peco’s words, a “triste [sad] life: wet, lonesome, hungry” (fT1205 VRH). Getting lost in the dark forest is also a traumatic experience for the lonely hunters, especially when night falls:

I didn’t know what direction I’d come from anymore. Everything was well ugly! (...) Thorny thickets! (...) I cut my way through and came out to a better part, but I didn’t know... It got dark and it rained. I was fucked. And I wasn’t able to come back. It was night already. The one who goes astray is sad indeed. I sat at the foot of a tree. The concentration of mosquitoes there!!! (...) and while they were eating me alive, I thought to myself: “¡Puucha carajo! [swear] I will never get out!” When the rain fell, I cried. It got cold. When dawn broke [I thought]: “How on earth am I going to get out? Which way am I going to go?”

Without the trails made by humans, monte [forest] can be treacherous. Because it is common knowledge, people are said only ever to stray from the paths accidentally, most often deceived by the shapindo – the dueño [owner] or rey [king] of the forest. Therefore, from the nuisance of the mosquito stings through the pain of insect bites, thorn scratches and nettle burns, the discomfort of the cold and wet, to the serious dangers posed by demons, venomous snakes or predatory animals (the jaguars) – the deep forest is said to be harsh on people, if not hostile. Peco, summing up his own experience and that of others lost in the forest, said, „El monte es bien jodido, cho” [The forest is really messed up, man] (fT1204 VRH). The usual descriptions of the forest are therefore: triste [sad, silent], silencio [silent, with no

---

67 Also called shapshico, yashingo (shapindo) demons, and in Capanahua possibly nín yashin [forest demons], which inhabit the dark regions of the forest. These are variants of names attributed to these forest beings in eastern Peru along with chullachaqui (cf. Regan 1993. For encounters with such spirits cf. also Déleage 2005 among Panoans, and Taylor 1993 for the Jivarooan people).
human voice], oscuro [dark, with no clearings and visibility], feo [ugly, here – dense vegetation], da miedo [fearful]. This is all the makings of desolation, and as I will show, the very opposite of alegre social ideal.

Although this statement may seem banal, the fact is easy to overlook because of its magnitude. It seems so obvious to people that it usually goes without saying. Yet, the tropical forest has a ubiquitous presence in the life of Capanahua descendants. Its dense, exuberant vegetation and magnitude dictate the realities of living spaces. Before I move on to the Capanahua descendants’ representations of the relation between forest and inhabited spaces, it may be helpful to picture the geographical position of the villages. When looking at the satellite photos, we realize the immensity of the tropical forest tightly enveloping the few, sparsely distributed human settlements. There are no roads in this part of the country, so travel is only possible on the rivers. Seen from a boat or the village, the riverbanks compose a wall of dense vegetation, occasionally cut through by a sequestered house or two, a hunting lodge, a lonesome chacra. To a European like me, the distances, or rather the time it takes to travel are staggering, given they are measured in days (see Introduction).

1.2. Spatial dimension (opening)

Common knowledge among the Capanahua descendants is that in such an environment, open space represents limited value, because it needs to be created by human labour. Clear-cutting the forest is needed for establishing fields, gardens or pastures, and most importantly, for creating settlements. It is therefore quite natural that the typical historical narratives also demonstrate that the act of clearing the space is synonymous with the founding of a village: “they have already been making their chacras, setting up their houses to live in. At this point Cesar Machado [a mestizo employer, patrón] arrived so that they could live, by making their caserío [village]” (RPR01). Persons who are said to be the first to work at clear-cutting a particular place are referred to as fundadores, founders. They are “the first who came to open it wide” (MV01), those who “came, and with their axes: tac! tac! (...) cleared it and planted manioc” (fT1204 EHB) – they “made the first fields there, in Limón Cocha” (RPR07). The same goes for clearing a new space in an existing settlement, as
Clever told me when Juaneco was the municipal representative (agente municipal\textsuperscript{68}), he had kept the community, even the main port, well cleared (librado). Before that, Limón was woods (bosque) and it was Juaneco who made people work to clear the land, lindo (fT1203 CPB). A path or a route is also a part of social space that needs to be opened against the forest.\textsuperscript{x}

The existence of any cleared space – slashed and burned from the thick tropical forest vegetation that jealously keeps its hold on the land – is associated with the initiative and effort of specific, named persons:

Don Elías -- (...) He founded this pueblo. And Don Leopoldo, Don Jorge – they founded it all. They say it was monte, with only three little houses. And so they made it be. More people came – making their caserío. In the middle (campo) – all the quiruma [plant stumps] cut! Aha, made their campo [central plaza]. And from there, they formed a caserío. Like that. (...) Aha – the founders, those who lived before. (DHR07)\textsuperscript{xii}

Thus, just like the orderly streets and houses, or short-term crops (principally sweet manioc and plantains, but also some corn or rice) belong to the spaces of living people, as are the abundant, large fruit trees near the houses. The specific persons who planted the trees are remembered through them, so that in Limón Cocha, the domesticated fruit trees (pijuayo, zapote, etc.) growing around the village are commonly said to have been planted by don Elías, the most senior inhabitant (or his contemporaneous antiguos).

1.3. Temporal dimension (maintaining open)

The relation between the inhabited space and the forest is also articulated temporally. The quickly reverting tropical vegetation is a factor that constantly threatens the open space. Significantly, the word monte stands not only for the forest itself, but also for unkempt space. It is not enough to open the space once; the existence of any clearing is a matter of continuous effort over time. The practice of maintaining the clear space is described by using the verb cultivar or \textit{urúkin}. This refers to the labour of clearing the already opened space of village or field from weeds and shrubs, so that unlike the standard Spanish or English equivalent, it describes the cultivation of an open space, rather than the cultivation of plants. It is the staple of daily life, and cultivar is the kind of work that Capanahua descendants do most

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{68} This is one of the main offices at the village-level authorities. Agente’s main duties include coordinating the maintenance of the village space.
\end{footnotesize}
Chapter 1. This side, the outside: The social spaces

often, both in their fields, and in the village. Just how serious a matter it is could be illustrated by the fact that every month, the authorities of Limón conduct patio controls to check if the houses have their surroundings cleared of weeds. Owners of the unkempt spaces are punished with several hours of imprisonment (calabozo).\(^{69}\) Communal village space in turn is regularly cleared in weekly communal work (obra communal), in which all men are required to participate, and the absentees are similarly punished. When the villagers say, as they customarily do, that to live is to suffer – one of its meanings refers to the fact that to keep any inhabited space open, people must put in continuous effort.\(^{70}\) To live, it is therefore necessary to continually open and maintain new spaces, so the encroaching monte makes people suffer, inducing the continuous, recurrent toil. However, the temporal dimension of clearings is related not only to their dependence on reiterated work, but also to the fact that they are ultimately finite. How is this temporal boundedness of cleared spaces expressed by paisanos in practical terms?

Firstly, because of the tropical forest soil’s finite productivity, the field clearings are recognized as ultimately temporary. It usually yields two crops before its productivity diminishes and has to lie fallow for at least 3-5 years. During this time, it is necessary to find and clear new plots. It is easiest to cut the old purma [fallow] down, but the field may also have to be opened directly in the monte alto [primary forest], which involves much more toiling labour and if possible (in bigger, older villages), it is normally avoided. Similarly, the temporal limit of the inhabited clearings is also understood, at least in historical accounts of locations or migrations, as having been related to the availability of game animals in a given area.\(^{71}\) Some people suggested the abundance of game in a new place as influencing decisions about the abandonment of the old and establishment of the new settlement. The constantly transforming meandering of the river is recognized as another temporal limit to the open spaces. An example is the village of Nuevo Esperanza, where the river has slowly taken over a large part of the land. In Limon, people showed me the

\(^{69}\)A wooden closet, sufficient to contain a person, but narrow enough to prevent anything other than a standing position.

\(^{70}\)One of the most frequent uses of the verb sufrir [lit. “to suffer”] in LUS refers to trabajar [to work] and can be translated as “to make an effort.” It can refer to arduous work, giving birth, enduring pain, or the necessity of taking action that is, propelled to do something against one’s will. The Capanahua equivalent is teet, and the opposite, teema, means “easy.”

\(^{71}\)Both the productivity of the soil and the availability of forest resources, i.e. game, had been discussed in relation to social or cultural life and histories of Amazonia’s inhabitants (cf. Meggers 1954, and in the Panoan context, Romanoff 1976; Calixto Méndez 1985; 1986).
opposite bank of the Tapiche River as the extent of the former reach of the village, 20-30 years ago.

Secondly, in the historical representations, the habitation sites are said to have been changed often before the existence of larger, more permanent villages with established structures such as schools or a church and modern organization. The opportunity to be close to relatives, or powerful an organizer or employer, is given as a positive factor influencing the move. In recent personal stories and decisions – most often it is the functioning school and teachers that are identified by the villagers as holding the most attraction, and people’s motives for changing location are very often phrased as “por educación de sus hijos” [because of the education of one’s children]. In such stories, as in contemporary representations, a particular clearing is associated with the people who have created, organized, animated or lived there. This connection between the village space, its sociality, and particular people will return in the following sections. Here, it is important to note that the absence of a person who has organised or animated the village, such as knowledgeable authorities, is often quoted as the reason for the dispersion of historical villages. When these particular people pass away or leave, or when the teachers or missionaries stop coming, the social space collapses and the clearing overgrows. Similarly, people passing away are often cited as the reason for the living abandoning old clearings. The locally comprehensible emotional reaction to the death of a loved one is the abandonment of the space where the departed lived and worked, in order to “forget” the grief and rage (olvidar pena) caused by familiar sights and memories.72

In either case, all the cleared, that is, social spaces have an “expiry date,” a fact on which the villagers often reflect. There are many more names of forgone villages and settlements in people’s memories than extant ones. Indeed, on the upper Tapiche and Buncuya, most the contemporary villages could not trace their continuous existence for more than 40-50 years, and the older ones (San Antonio or Monte Alegre) are in a state of collapse and depopulated. An overgrown campo [village plaza] or an empty, overgrown, falling house is sad image of dying, abandonment or neglect.73 Deserted fields or villages are quickly reclaimed by the forest and covered by secondary vegetation in the process of remontar [lit. “reverting back to monte”].

72 Conrad Feather (2007) wrote about the Panoan Nahua’s movements conceived as instruments for forgetting the pain of loss.
They become *purmas*, but *paisanos* still invariably associate their existence with human activity, and indeed are linked to specific people, living or deceased. Within the close vicinity of the village, these spaces are recognizable to people as “the *purma* of so and so” – the traces of memory in the invasive forest. Also in a painful way: Doña Ashuca did not want to go to the field where the *pijuayos* planted by her recently deceased son-in-law grew. More broadly, they can also mark bygone villages. Geysen’s words illustrate this: “It used to be well populated, that Aipena. Everything was cleared, open space (*bien libre*). Mhmm... Now? Tremendous *purmas!*” Similarly, areas of older secondary vegetation found deeper in the forest are interpreted as the *purmas* left after socialities from the past, invariably attributed to the unknown *antiguos*.

In this context, clearing the space is serious, because here, similarly as for the Trio, it “is not merely performing an essential agricultural activity, since these acts symbolize for [them] a far greater battle (...) since they stand physically between the village and forest, and metaphorically between life and death”(Rivière 1969:vii). It is not only the fact that an overgrown clearing could easily hide deadly poisonous vipers, as is often argued in the villages. It is, on another level, the universally human, tragic banality of the process of emerging from non-existence (the dark forest) into being (bright space) only to revert again to not being (opaqueness) that is emphasized in Capanahua descendants’ social imagery and often gives it a particular, nostalgic tone. We have already glimpsed this in the drunken speeches (Prologue). As Ronal’s grandmother used to tell him, “the day I die, the earth [*tierra*] [will] press me down. In vain I weed it [*cultivar*], work it, wanting to clear it. I am of the earth, and into earth I will revert,’ – my grandmother used to say” (RPH06).

1.4. The qualities of clearings

In this section, I move on from this context of creating and maintaining cultivated, inhabited, social spaces, as diagnosed by the *paisanos*, to consider their ways of speaking about the produced, desired qualities of such spaces. This brief overview has two aims. One is to elucidate the villagers’ ways of representing “space” or “space-time,” which builds on the context of the open spaces, as described in the

---

73 This association of cultivated plants with memory and the deceased ancestors is shared with other Amerindians in the Lowlands (e.g. Erikson 1999; Rival 2002).

74 They are usually associated with the presence of *ojé* or *barabasco* trees, at the foot of which pieces of pottery or even entire pots are found.
previous section. Secondly, in the following sections, this presentation should prove helpful in understanding the imagery and qualities attributed to sociality, and further connect these seemingly disjointed qualities.

### 1.4.1. Openness

In LUS, the specific vocabulary referring to inhabited spaces include *puesto* [homestead] or *fundo* [estate, farm] in the case of one or a few houses; *pueblo*, *caserío* and occasionally, *comunidad* [community], for a village with more houses and spatial organization, such as a plaza and streets; and finally, *ciudad* [city]. The more abstract reference to inhabited place or even village in various contexts and domains might simply be “open, clear space” for example: *el libre* [free, open space], *el despejo* [clearing], *el claro, la claridad* [clarity, brightness], *limpio* [clean], or *el campo* [an open plaza/football pitch in the middle of the village, around which the houses are constructed].

Further, Capanahua descendants tend to associate any clearing or open space with social life, sometimes belonging to “the other side,” that is, another world (Ch. 3). For example:

In the *poza* [pool, a profound part of a river] of Maipuco [right tributary of Tapiche, upriver from Limón Cocha] there is also an owner, Javico saw him once (...). This kind lives there, inside. They like to travel. (...). They travel on highways (*carreteras*). People say that this Tapiche is well open (*bien libre*), well beautiful (*bien lindo*) on the inside. They travel through there to other villages (*pueblos*), other pools – there they have their villages (*caseríos*). (...). The alligator is their speedboat, their taxi. (fT1301 DHR)

The Capanahua language is more explicit about the character of spaces of human habitation such as “clearings.” Although the dictionary translates the word *hemá* exclusively as “city” (*ciudad*) (Loos & Loos 2003: 184), in what I have witnessed, as well as in the historical texts, it seems to refer to village or any residential concentration of persons, so that “*nuken hema hanin*” (fT1301) means “in our village” (cf. Schoolland 1975: 118–19, 207). Additionally, the word succeeding *hemá* in the dictionary is *heman* (or *hemanɨti*) which refers to the patio (Loos & Loos 2003: 184). This is the space surrounding the house on the outside, which according to the village aesthetics, should always be weeded and swept of any trace of vegetation so that only the bare, bright sand is left (as mentioned above, the obligation is quite literal). Since both refer to the “cleared, open space,” we could say
that the Capanahua word for “inhabited place” does indeed convey the meaning of an open, cleared space around the house or between the houses.\footnote{The editors of the dictionary of Shipibo-Conibo acknowledge this overlap as the closest linguistic relative of Capanahua. They explain that \textit{jema} [in the spelling used in this thesis: \textit{hema}] “suggests an open and cleared space, in which it is possible for community to exist” (Loriot, Lauriault, and Day 1993: 221 my translation). Their definition of the noun \textit{jema hema} [\textit{jemán} being only its grammatical case] includes: a deforested place; street in a native community, open patio; village (caserío), community or a village (pueblo) with authorities; town (pueblo) or city (ibid.).}

\subsection{Bright space-time}

While staying with Capanahua descendants, I knew about the homonymy of the word \textit{nete}, referring to “light” or “day,” “world” and “birthplace” in the language of the \textit{antiguos} (Loos & Loos 2003: 240).\footnote{Again, very illustratively, Shipibo-Conibo noun \textit{nete} refers to: a. day; b world; c country; d. life (\textit{vida}), environment (\textit{ambiente}) (Loriot, Lauriault, and Day 1993: 287).} When I brought this subject up, it made Doña Germe laugh:

(LK: What does \textit{nete} mean?) ...Day (LK: but birthplace as well?) ...Mhm! -- (LK: The same word?) -- Aha -- there you go – “day” -- you... where you live. --- These are specialized words (\textit{palabras tecnicas})! [laughing hard].\footnote{GSR05}

Yet, even though finding this connection through LUS struck her as funny (the way many of the bizarre, “ignorant” ways of the \textit{antiguos} that I had been asking about, or my weird questions have), she still confirmed the connection between the day (light) and the place. The connection, both in contemporary speech and in the older Capanahua texts is actually often made in practice. Light is the visual aspect of a clear-cut, and likely refers to the image of sunlight filling the open space, contrasted with the sombreness of the forest. Preferably, the villages are located on arenous soil, which is very light in colour. The whitish sand of the patio around the house – the bare clean \textit{heman} – reflects the strong tropical light, producing the impression of radiant light. The villagers can describe the open space as “shining” (\textit{brilloso}) or “illuminated” (\textit{iluminado}). Similarly, when the petrol presented by wealthy, powerful benefactors, such as a mayor (\textit{alcalde}) or logging \textit{patrón} runs out in Limón Cocha, the electricity generator cannot run, and the village is left without electric light in the evenings, it is said to be \textit{triste}, sad – opposing it to illuminated space as \textit{alegre} [happy, joyful]. (I return to this quality in subsequent sections).

While space and light are habitually connected when using LUS (note that \textit{claro}, “clear” or “bright” is closely related), the Panoan languages are more explicit. \textit{Xabati} or “to shine, light up” (Loos & Loos 2003: 375), is in the Capanahua texts
often associated with the “shining” of clearings. The verb itself comes from the noun *xabá* glossed as: a. light; b. dawn, daybreak (Loos & Loos 2003: 374). Furthermore, because of the obvious association with “light,” *nette* can refer to “day.” Yet it can also point to the temporal dimension of the spaces. For example, Omécho listened when I invited him to talk about the *antiguos*, as well as contemporary times. “Nea neten!” he said. “What?” I asked. “These times” (*Esos tiempos*), he explained, and wrote it down on a piece of paper: “Neha neten [Ne’a neten] [sic, Nea neten] - en ese tiempo”. *Neten* means time, *tiempo*, he said (fT1204). This may well be the equivalent of Spanish “en esos días” [in those days], but it does correspond to the other meanings.

1.4.3. Shiny and lasting: towards an ideal beauty

This short analysis of terminology confirms the association of the open, bright and shining with inhabited social space. Such qualities of an open space are also the aesthetic and ethic touchstone more generally, which have implications for conceptions of sociality to which I return later. The adjectives *lindo* [pretty or good] and Capanahua equivalent *síri* [good, pretty], or *siripi* [do something well, being good] often refer to an area or surface which is smooth, cleared, and thus, shiny or brilliant. The verb *siriakin* [lit. “making *síri*”] is “to make smooth, brilliant” (Loos & Loos 2003: 330–31). In other words, smooth (and bright or shiny) implies good, right, and pretty. The LUS equivalent of *xabati*, discussed above, is *brillar* [to shine], which can refer to the shining surface of, e.g. coffin, coffee can, bald spot on someone’s head, glossy trousers, otter fur, anaconda skin, brilliant phlegm of witchcraft (*yachai*), golden tooth, an old, polished bow, or shiny presents for the wild backwards people (*indios*). Capanahua descendants usually find smooth and bright or shiny aesthetically pleasing. Doña Ermisha admired the clay pots made by Kinga as smooth and shiny (*brilloso*). When I wove a rail around the open part of our house from thin raw rods, my field notes describe how, for some days people came to tell me it was nice, and they wanted to learn how to make something similar. However, invariably, they added that it would actually have been very pretty (*lindo*) had it been

---

77 Once again, the Shipibo-Conibo dictionary explicitly confirms these connections. It refers to the same word, *shabá* [xaba] as “open space” (*espacio libre*) (Loriot, Lauriault, and Day 1993: 392), with *héma xabá* [hema xaba] designating the village “main place (plaza)” (ibid. 222). Furthermore, the Marubo, eastern neighbours of the Capanahua, closely related linguistically, use the same word, *shaw*, to speak of “village” (Port. *morada*) (Cesarino 2008; Welper 2009: 178–79, 182) or “time-place” (Port. *tempo-lugar*) (Welper 2009: 178–79, 182). While in the Capanahua dictionary, the verb *xabaaquin* [xabaaquin] [lit. “making *xabá*”] is said to mean “to light up” (Loos and Loos 2003: 375), the Shipibo-Conibo dictionary equivalent, *shabáati* [shabatii] stands for the act of deforesting (e.g. terrain), or clearing the thickets (Loriot, Lauriault, and Day 1993: 392).
stripped so that the shiny, smooth inner wood was displayed instead of the coarse, irregular surface and the drab colour of the bark. Equally often, they advised me that “truly beautiful” would have been painted in bright colours (ff1203 , 1204). The drawings created by children who visited our house demonstrate this point clearly enough. While drawing their own houses – not always painted and less so in extravagant colours – were all emblazoned with imaginary walls in lively colours. Although teaming with a variety of vegetation, overall, the actual forest is not colourful, but rather dim and monotone. A few colourful animal or plant species, such as parrots, snakes, or jaguars, are duly noted by the Capanahua descendants. Therefore, introducing smooth shiny surfaces and brilliant, bright colours into the social space is consistent with the insistence of a vivid differentiation of social spaces from the background of monotone forest vegetation.78

On this aesthetic (and ethical, as I will argue later) trajectory of clearing as conducive to beautiful brightness, apparently shared with other eastern Peruvians, city space and the material it comes from is close to ideal. In LUS, “the noble material” (material noble) is an expression that designates concrete, bricks, shiny smooth sheet metal roofing, glass, colourful paint, and the ultimate: glazed tiles. Here, what is important in discussing these representations of spaces as they intersect with temporality is that apart from their shiny, bright clarity, there is another feature that makes it “noble.” For the paisanos, who are always preoccupied with decay and passing, this material seems never to spoil. Hence the clear, organized space of a city, when covered with material noble is unlikely to become overgrown quickly. It is opposed to the drab and perishable, poor (humilde) materials such as wood, leaves, or bark, extracted from the monte, which Capanahua descendants use to make their houses. That city space, then, is more “ahead” (adelante) on the scale determined by openness, clarity and durability (it does not require repetitive, laborious work to keep it open and bright). Its “nobility” determined by an increased level of clarity and durability corresponds to the “true” or

---

78 Another feature of the Capanahua descendants’ representations of space bears a close connection between the space as a place, the space as the air that fills it, and the smell. The idea of surrounding “air” or, precisely, “space” (espacio or aire, also ambiente), returns in many spheres in ways of making meaning, but discussing it here in any detail would be beyond the limitations of this work. Oloroso (fragrant) is an important, positive social quality brought about by plants or commercial perfumes. Agua florida or alcanfor are commercially produced, perfumed waters used in healing, while the “smell” of the spirits produces illness. Similarly, the agreeable smell of piripiri herbs is used to tame the indios by introducing them into a space of peacefulness and sociality (see below). The heavenly realm is marked by the fragrance of unearthly flowers, which feed innocent souls. Spirits in general are said to feed on smells alone and to exist in the “air.” Conrad Feather (2010) talks of “smellscape” in relation to the Nahua’s sensitivity to smells and their importance in their perceptions of the world (cf. also Oving 2006).
“real” qualities attributed to the city dwellers and their knowledge/origins. I will return to this in Ch. 2, when interpreting the expression *kuin kuini* as conveying “knowledge,” and in Ch. 4, to locate “nobility” in a much broader, temporal context of descent.

Figure 4. Limón Cocha with street names. The numbers indicate communal buildings: 1. *Colegio* [high school and elementary school]; 2. *Local communal* [communal meetinghouse]; 3. *Jardín* [kindergarten]; 4. *Iglesia “Dios te llama”* [the churched named “God loves you”]; 5. *Casa de la iglesia* [house for visiting missionaries]; 6. *Casa de profesores* [the teachers’ house]; 7. *Casa de patrón* [house of the locally invested logging patrón, which stands locked and empty]; 8. *Cuarto del teniente* [the deputy’s office] and *calabozo* [the “cell”]; 9. *Juéz de Paz* [office of the “Peace Judge” for the whole of the upper Tapiche]; 10. *Botiquín communal* [medicine store]; 11. *El bote de comerciantes* [the merchant’s boat, purchasing fariña and selling an assortment of merchandise, from hair oil to TVs]. (Image: Bing 2013, Microsoft)

Ultimately, ideal clarity is not found on this earth. The heavenly realm seen during clinical death, which many people say they have experienced – and arguably reflecting the ideal social conditions – is described as a concrete-like smooth surface\(^79\) of the shiny road, decorated with colourful flowers, which emanate other-

\(^79\) The concrete surfaces of sidewalks in Loreto’s cities are polished to be ideally smooth, making them dangerously slippery when the rain falls.
worldly perfumes (RPH05; GHR05). Indeed, descriptions of the heavens evoke an image of an ideal city, which I heard most explicitly formulated in sermons sprouted by visiting Shipibo missionaries. I will return to the subject of heavenly transparency, cities and clarity later on (see Ch. 5).

In summary, I would note that these qualities of space seem to correspond to the status of inhabited spaces as described earlier in this section, and thus to be constructed on the foundational movement of clearing. The ideal aesthetics of social space for the villagers could be interpreted as conceived against opacity, forest vegetation, perishability, dullness, and darkness. The direction in which the trajectory of such clearing aesthetics leads to are the large, cleared and organized human settlements. Cities come close to ideal, but its ultimate realization is beyond this world, where it is liberated from the inescapable perishability of space that characterizes the conditions known on this earth by the villagers and many other rural eastern Peruvians.

1.5. Su entremedio: Knowing the clearings and knowledge making the clearings

Therefore, in considering the ways in which the Capanahua descendants speak of inhabited spaces it is finally necessary to expand on the already mentioned association of such spaces with the persons who create or participate in it. They have the faces, so to speak, of individual persons who live, participate and can be known within them at a particular time. Villagers recall precisely who lived in any village at a specific time when they visited, and the places are defined most often through the people who open or live in them. Thus, the place can be identified by those peoples’ generalized names – so on the example of the surname Chumo such a place might be referred to as: “dónde los Chumos” [where the Chumos], “puesto de José [the point of José [Chumo], head of family],” and spoken of as “puro Chumos [purely Chumos],” etc.

In light of the above characterisations of physical aspects of settlements by the villagers – revolving around their openness and luminosity – one of the most important “functions” of the opened, organized spaces is that they enable perceptibility, and are conducive to knowability. Therefore, within their space, those
specific people are experientially perceptible to each other and to visitors. The verb conocer/[ˈunanaʔi] [to know, be familiar with] refers to experience and perception.\textsuperscript{80} Although visibility is an important dimension enabled by the clearings, it is not enough to create the desired clarity, knowability and flows between subjects. I will argue in the next section, that actual knowability in the villagers’ ways of speaking is a function of multi-dimensional removal of obstacles to perception, including hearing, smelling, touching, or kinaesthesia of joint activities, such as work, consumption, sharing and other social interactions as described below.\textsuperscript{81} In fact, partial perceptibility of any kind (i.e., making sound without being seen, being seen but not talking, hearing but not understanding, etc.) is an attribute of relations with demons (tunchi/yushin) or enemies (Ch. 2). When Doña Celina related the behaviour of a young Matses brought by the SIL missionary (while the memories of raids and kidnappings of his “paisanos” were still very fresh), she used the common expression for lack of normally expected sociality, sometimes taken as a sign of conflict: “mirar nomás” [just looking]\textsuperscript{xviii} (CNS01). As Celso said about the time before we got a chance to talk: “we are looking at each other like enemies.”

Apart from the persons themselves, one more aspect in the villagers’ ways of speaking about such social composition of such spaces is both knowable and simultaneously composes them. It is the knowledge and “customs” that these people live by which provide character to their inhabited spaces. These particular ways are referred to as su costumbre [their habit, custom], su forma/manera (de vivir) [their ways (of living)] or simply así vivían/viven ellos or haskari hiweti [this is how they live/their living]. They can be thought of as integral to the space created by particular people – as a general atmosphere (ambiente) or their surroundings (su entremedio). Just as the people who enact them, they are subject to knowing (conocer or saber, [ˈunanaʔi]) or accustoming (costumbrarse), both by the participants, and by the people who come to live with them. Here, the process of learning these ways (aprender) is consistently represented as imitating (imitar) or copying (copiar) from “example”

\textsuperscript{80} For example, responding to a claim by one of the families that their mother came from Contamana [a town on the Ucayali], Doña Luzmila said they “don’t know (conocer) Contamana and none of their kinsmen knows Contamana. They are... natural (natural de) Buncuyans”\textsuperscript{[ˈunanaʔi]} (LCO01). Similarly, the Capanahua counterpart [ˈunanaʔi] in the expression xaba [ˈunanaʔi] [lit. to know the light/dawn] could be translated as “the time when someone perceived/experienced dawn” (cf. Loos and Loos 1976b: 54–55; 2003: 374; Schoolland 1975: 265). Also suggestive is Daniel’s proposition that the human tooth knows (conoce) the hot peppers and salt which it bites, and this is why it transmits the “poison” of the peppers, so that if the teeth bite another person’s finger it will cause swelling (DHR08).

\textsuperscript{81} It is common to hear people say about their ascendant kin: “I don’t even know my father, when I was little, he died. I have grown without knowing my father (...) I know only my grandmother, other than that, I don’t know anyone [of my ascendant family]” (ESH03). Additionally, conocer can also be used in relation to a sexual encounter.
(ejemplo) (cf. Ch. 3). According to Don Romer, “it all really depends on the costumbre of the other inhabitants (vivientes), so that you get used (costumbrandose) to how they live. And you want to be [like them]”xxxix (RPRo8). Ideally then, the process of familiarizing (we could say “acculturation”) should lead to the state of external uniformity (igual nomás) within the space, the conviviality ideal, envisioned in Daniel’s description of the alegre evenness of the growing manioc (I will discuss conviviality of alegría in Sect. 2). On another occasion, he told me about those Capanahua descendants who move to the mestizo places or cities:

some... know Capanahua, those who go and mingle anywhere. Those who are known to be Capanahua. But... they make themselves mestizo when they go over there, to the city. (...) (L.K: How do they make themselves mestizo?) Well, just like that... talk purely... purely castellano [LUS]: you don’t talk in your... dialect anymore, in your Capanahua – you don’t speak it anymore, because those over there do not understand it. They don’t. (...) Nawa already, he talks purely castellano. (L.K: And changes his surname (cf. Ch. 5)?) He does. He changes to another. He takes up other surname, and doesn’t want this Capanahua surname. He doesn’t want to be Huaninche anymore, and assumes something different. Like this. Lots of them – leave: “He already changed his surname, is not Huaninche Chumo anymore!” (...) Changes. Why oh why does he change it?xx (DHR17)

This quote signals some particular ways or costumbre. In the Capanahua descendants’ representations of historical, mythical or contemporary socialities-clearings, these particular ways of living include the language and the manner of talking, laughing etc.xxi; address terms (tratarse) and attitudes - especially marriage rules (conocer familia); names and surnames to be known by within the space; the ways of producing a harmonious social life. Also inseparable is a specific diet, such as inclusion or exclusion of hot peppers, frogs, salt, sweets, bread, gaseosa, beer, or “the pills” (often thought to be eaten by the gringos to quell hunger). Indeed, we would often be asked if we knew how to eat particular local food: ¿Sabes comer...? [Do you know how to eat...?], and people would admit that they “did not know” how to eat certain things. For example, crepes or scrambled eggs which we occasionally prepared, how to use certain tools or the lack of certain skills, such as preparing documents, setting the time on a watch, applying medicine, and so on. It is perhaps related that such categories of knowing or the capacity to know that define specific kinds of social existence – are also used to refer to an existential quality in general, so that a thing can be said to no sabe podrir, “does not know how to spoil.”

Importantly, the space/sociality is also characterized by specific kinds of apparatus or instruments, such as bows and arrows, clay pots, signal drums, clothes,
axes, watches, perfumes, telephones or computers; as well as particular “know-how” related to producing or procuring those things, growing plants or animals, hunting, earning money, curing, writing, organizing people, creating a village, etc. The space is also created by the structures existing in the village: paved, cleared and named streets, street lamps, as well as structures such as the communal house (local communal) where village meetings take place, a well-kept football pitch, and most directly related to organizing knowledge: schools. These structures are spoken of as accomplishments or assets of the village, elevating its status as “well organized” (bien organizado) (Fig. 4). This allows, I note, for interpreting these as manifestations of the organizational skills of the people who create the village space, or perhaps their capacity to ascertain investment of knowledge or resources from the remote sponsors or caretakers of the village (expressed as saber andar, that is, to know how to walk [the offices]). Today, the mayor or municipality of the administrative district or logging and oil companies primarily occupies that latter figure.

I would suggest that the uniting, organising collections of knowledge that contain and organize participants could therefore productively be understood as ways or instruments (if not “containers”, to anticipate the topological developments of the remaining chapters) for being perceptible and living together. That is, through all these provisions that make up a “cultural” substrate of representations of social spaces, persons can make themselves perceptible and knowable, and thus, strive for an alegre ideal sociality (as discussed below). They allow creating aesthetically satisfying spaces, which enable their perceptual availability in a similar way to the physical clearings. It is now crucially important to note the usual and expected provenience of such knowledge/instruments for the villagers.82

Apart from the people who participate and grow within a particular space, consistently mentioned are also those who found, organize or sponsor it. Just as the knowledge and activity of the owner of the field – who plants the stems evenly, equidistant, and keeps the space between the individual plants clear – makes the alegre city of manioc possible, so is the founder, organizer or sponsor responsible for the existence and the thriving of inhabited space. Firstly, the skills and work of the founder of a clearing enable the physical existence of the space and literal

82 Cf. “intersubjective visual availability” (Gow 1999: 238).
perceptibility within. Secondly, “good thoughts/ideas” (pensamiento, ideas or shina), like the mestizos’, gringos’ or Shipibo’s organizational and administrative skills, translated onto the village space, as well as the sponsor’s caring provision (servir) of resources (gasoline, commodities for feasts, medicine, and more durable, like the structures mentioned above) – all enable organized, durable and harmonious structures in which to live. They (or their instruments/knowledge) also infuse unanimity inside of people, because such a leading figure convinces (convencer), teaches (enseñar), explains (explicar), advises (consejar), animates (animar) and unites (unir). Such role of the founder, organizer, sponsor or animator is important for understanding ways of making sense of social spaces by the Capanahua descendants and the topologies that these meanings evoke. It can be seen as paralleling the mythic figure of Neteanika [lit. Nete-maker], the reluctant original giver of the knowledge of manioc planting to the antiguos. That, in turn, reminds of the Shipibo-Conibo personage of Inka, who upon returning “will improve our néte [lives (vidas)/ environment (ambiente)]” (Loriot, Lauriault, and Day 1993: 287). It is therefore significant that such instruments/knowledge is often accompanied by possessives, signalling the value, as being “proper to,” as much as they are “property of.” Just as those elements that compose contemporary Capanahua descendants’ villages and living realities (e.g., cultivation of manioc or maize, sex or birth, stinginess, organization of the village, the custom of minga communal work, or LUS or Capanahua language) are conceived in old stories as received, stolen, inflicted, or gained from foreign figures or places. This includes the ancestors (see Ch. 2, 3) – so villagers seem to assume that knowledge extracted from them by foreign figures has similar constitutive value elsewhere. This could give specific meaning to local expressions such as “to have language/ ideas” (tener idioma/ideas).

For example, they were rightfully convinced, of the profitability of idioma [the Capanahua language] for the mestizo teachers. According to Capanahua descendants, but sometimes quite explicitly by the profesores themselves the attempts at learning it were motivated by the opportunity to gain better-paid, bilingual teaching posts

---

when claiming knowledge of an indigenous language. Further, this is how they explain the *gringos’* interest in learning the language, like the SIL or other linguists, and they assumed this was my intention as well. They argue that teaching the Capanahua language far away, to other *gringos* – whom they assume to be extremely interested in learning it – is highly profitable. Similarly, when Kinga helped an older woman with the arduous work of hammock weaving, some villagers advised Doña Ermisha not to teach her the technique. The argument being that we would use this knowledge for profit “in our land.” I can only imagine that the money we would make would not match the value they imagined it would. Facing this more or less continuous assumption about our presence was one of the greatest challenges for fieldwork and our stay with the villagers.

2. Approximations of ideal sociality

Here, I explore the ways of making sense of sociality. I do this by examining representations of the “space” contained between people: the etiquette or ethics shaped by similar, “clearing” trajectories in constructing meanings. I turn to another element in Daniel’s city of manioc image and concentrate on how the aesthetics of space are related to the state he defined as *alegre*, that is, “happy/joyous.” Here, it can serve as a vehicle for considering the locally conceived makings of sociality. First, by reviewing some uses of the term, I trace the way that such a state is conceived against other qualities or states. I will then look at the actions or work that Capanahua descendants postulate as constitutive of an ideal state of sociality. As I do this, I note that their postulated trajectories parallel those that construct clearings and aesthetic clarity, and the expressions used to describe ideal sociality correspond or share with the aesthetics of spaces or surfaces, as identified in the previous section.

2.1. *Alegría*: Joy of overcoming obstacles

As I argued in the Prologue, the LUS term *alegre/alegría* and its Capanahua equivalent *kuin kuini* could be taken as the leading theme of convivial or merrymaking modality in drunken speeches. Here, I explore some of the meanings these receive in broader usage. Examples found throughout the texts recorded by SIL show that the use of the term *kuin kuini*, translated in Capanahua dictionary as *alegrarse* [rejoicing] or *contentarse* [feeling satisfied] (Loos & Loos 2003: 138) generally conforms to those of *alegre* (happy, merry, joyful) in LUS which I documented in the villages. For expository reasons, below I point out two main sets of
use: one describing an affective reaction, and the other, a prolonged state of existence. Then, I proceed to probe their significance in the context of sociality: social gatherings or feasts and the state of social space.

Firstly, the emotional reaction described as *kuin kuini* in SIL texts may be caused, for example, by the return of one’s brother (Loos & Loos 2003: 138); a man who survived the flood is happy to find people he can talk to (Schoolland 1975: 210,215). As well as Herod rejoicing upon meeting Jesus, whom he had wanted to meet for a long time (Loos & Loos 1978: 152). The situations which Capanahua descendants said during my fieldwork to produce spontaneous joy (*alegría*) are mainly related to people: either to the moment (or anticipation) of an encounter where relatives are rejoined, or finding new people and establishing relations as spouses, workers, children or helpers. Furthermore, if the narrator of a myth tells us that the cannibal woman *Yawish* is “content” because she had just devoured a child (Schoolland 1975: 210,215), then likewise, receiving or finding meat or food in general was the second most often given reason that Capanahua descendants associated with feeling *alegre*. Receiving things or knowledge, and ultimately, accomplishing one’s aim or being victorious follows closely. This shows that for the Capanahua and their descendants alike, what is said to make living beings “happy,” (*alegre*) is company and food most of all. For this discussion, it is essential to note that common to this usage of *alegre* is the reference to the disposition at the moment of fulfilment of longing, hunger or desire. In other words, it could be seen as the state of relief from desire itself (e.g. of company or food) or removing the obstacles on the way to fulfilling it, such as distance, longing, unknowing, distrust, concealment of game, etc.

Secondly, the other use of *alegre* and *kuin kuini* that I distinguish here is a continuous state of being rather than a spontaneous, temporary relief or fulfilment. It can describe a particular situation or a state of quotidian existence in particular surroundings. If the above identified reasons for rejoicing are considered, it comes as no surprise that for the villagers, such an existence is associated almost exclusively with being in company, and opposed to being alone, which is synonymous with being sad (*triste*). Using it this way, Capanahua descendants most often indicated a quotidian state of satiated, contented and harmonious coexistence of people. For example, *alegría* may simply refer to being with one’s family, especially as opposed to
living alone\textsuperscript{xxvii} (VPB03). The state may mean a tranquil life – satiated and trouble free. For example, a woman, wailing at the funeral or wake of her deceased husband may tell him to give the living family “more alegría,” characterized as a safe life without tragedies, and/or without the insidious company of his 
\textit{yuushin} [spirit of the deceased]. She might also remind him to send game animals towards the living: “Just as you wanted to eat [while you were alive], we too want to eat!”\textsuperscript{xxviii} (DHR03). Other examples connect alegría as the state of harmonious being with sharing. Doña Germe told me: “living together, united, alegre. The way it says in the Bible – the life of Christ, how they used to live before. Christ [was] alegre with everyone, and that is what ‘good thoughts’ are meant to say. To share with one another”\textsuperscript{xxix} (GSR01). What Doña Elsa told me about the SIL missionary Eugene Loos when he visited various Capanahua homesteads on the Buncuya River, suggests just what is being shared:

He would stay until late. He ate, drank. They would give him the leg of \textit{hunu} [collared peccary] \textit{nami} [meat]. Alegre! They would take him to the field to fetch bananas, for \textit{señora} Beti [Loos]. \textit{Kankan, Hauen tasa, kankan} [Pineapple, their basket, pineapple] (...) full baskets!\textsuperscript{xxx} (EFN03)

Overall, then, alegre as quality of existence describes a state of being between persons in which the obstacles to perceptibility between them are overcome and the flow of food or goods between people is unhindered. Thus, goods are made available or externalized through sharing, and the needs are fulfilled, or rather, the differentiation in their fulfilment is neutralized. It is worth noting that meeting people often means receiving food (or having other desires or needs fulfilled). The state of satisfied being with others thus implies joint eating or being served food, to the point where alegría caused by food is often parallel, if not synonymous with that caused by company. Being “fat” (\textit{gordo}) might be a sign of health, that is, satisfied by being with people in a given place: we were sometimes be told in a bragging tone that by living in Limón, at no time were we destined to end up \textit{gordo}.

Further, just as the bird which lives contently, singing while it eats\textsuperscript{xxxi} (Loos & Loos 2003: 307), so – as noted in the Prologue – alegre between people also implies raucous laughter, music, and conversations during social gatherings. For a lonely man who is \textit{triste} [sad], in silence – the radio creates the impression of having company\textsuperscript{xxxii} (BRS20). This image leads us back to where we began with the drunken speech, or the way Capanahua descendants use alegre in connection with feasting, also paralleled by another Capanahua usage of \textit{kuin kuini}.\textsuperscript{xxxiii} These feasts epitomize
the *alegre* state because they combine the spontaneous joy of emerging into an encounter, satiation and the harmonious presence of joint activities in one space. These are the high points of sociality. In fact, it is these spaces and times of *alegría*, which are the stuff of memories. For example, Don Romer expressed the following reasoning by the *antiguos* for not wanting to have their photos taken: “When I am dead and gone, [the people who knew me] will see only my photograph, *en yushin* [my spirit]. They will feel much sorrow [thinking of]: ‘when we used to be *alegre*, when we used to be together, drinking manioc beer and dancing!’ They will miss me a lot”xxxiv (RPR03). Similarly, Daniel explained why he does not celebrate his birthday anymore: “It’s because I don’t get to see my dad anymore! When he was alive, that is what I would do, *alegre*: drink! Eat!”xxxv (DHR14).

Villagers affirm it is much more difficult to acquire a steady state of satisfaction as part of daily village sociality than spontaneous fulfilment or feasting. This is especially evident when *alegre* is used to describe the state of an inhabited space. It requires effort, which is attributed to knowledge and the care of specific people. This is apparently what Doña Elsa meant when she told me that Berea used to be *alegre* when her son was alive (and was the evangelical “ animator”) because people cooperated in maintaining the church. It was precisely Doña Elsa’s son who “thought” about the building and other village affairs, and he animated people to bring leaves or palm bark to fix the church. Now that he has passed away, Berea is *triste* [sad]: there is no church [which collapsed] and there is no one who “cares” about the village (fB1111 EFN). Reaching farther in the history of Buncuya, Don Guillermo described the harmonious and organized time of the old Aipena in his adolescence, and diagnosed the source thus:

> Before, there were many houses, and it was all pretty and organized. We all lived united. Everything they [the adults – *antiguos*] did, they would do together, the feasts, together, united, all at once. They would dance there, all of them, *tranquilo, alegre*. (...) They were organized because the mestizos were the authorities, like *teniente, agente*. And at the time when the *antiguos* existed, there were also *teniente gobernador* who were mestizo. That is why: the mestizos had them organize a bit... Got rid of their time of... their surroundings (*ambiente*), their form of living. That’s it. Meaning... [they made them] modernize. That’s the reasonxxxvi (GHR02).

At this point, the important feature to note is that when *paisanos* praise *alegre* sociality as harmonious coexistence, they connect it to a state of space, a surrounding that is organized by specific knowledge, again, connected to particular persons who
share, or externalize, the “good thoughts.” These may be imparted in instructions (consejo), such as “brother-in-law, do not be mad with me, live contently (kuin kuinni[sic])!” (Loos & Loos 2003: 152). Doña Elena said that her mother instructed her: “[fighting and arguing with family] is no good, no way to live. One has to live alegre: loving one’s siblings, cousins, aunts” (ESH03). These examples of alegría also link to the “personal” side of the social space and “containing” knowledge (saber, ideas, conocer) of the “thoughtful” figure that I mentioned in the previous section and which facilitates sociality. Thus, ideal sociality is the participants’ mutual perception, flow of goods, and overall conflict-free, united coexistence. One might appreciate the connotations of luminosity and openness or smoothness (against shadows and obstacles, or problems) of kuin kuini in this context. The dictionary images of the little birds “rejoicing” contentedly when the sun blazes (Loos & Loos 2003: 138), or the worm moving completely “joyously” and freely, before it is touched on the head and then it cringes (Loos & Loos 2003: 311).

In summary, I propose that all these various uses of alegre/kuin kuini have in common that they result from actions or causal movements on trajectories pointing toward clearance, removal of obstacles or differences, most evocatively illustrated in the intersections of representations of sociality and space, where perfect sociality is coextensive with perfect space. This short overview of the ways in which the villagers construe alegre/kuin kuini reveals that it encompasses the terms and ideas associated with convivial, ethical sociality (some of which, as I suggested before, are also aesthetic categories). Beauty (lindo), peacefulness (tranquilo), generosity (bueno) and equality or normality (igual nomás, normal) is widely used to evoke an ideal state of being between people cohabiting in a given place. Such an image of ideal state is presented particularly as an introduction for strangers or newcomers, or the officially declared condition of the village or homestead. For example, Don Macshu asked my visiting friend Maciej, if he saw “the people [here] siripi hiwetain [living in a good/ pretty manner]?” (fT1301). These terms are used to declare or emphasize the harmonious social coexistence on a daily basis, for example, in courteous exchanges mentioned in the Prologue, such as “aquí estamos, tranquilo nomás,” or “todo lindo tranquilo.” The reverse is living “ugly,” feo: disorganised, fighting, stingy (concealing), and overgrown.
2.2. Faces and faeces: clarity betwixt and between

The last conclusions raise an essential problem. If joyful sociality is construed as resulting from the effort of clearing, what is simultaneously construed by such action is the opacity against which perceptibility is produced at the interpersonal level? What is sociality presumed to be cleared against?

As we saw, the terms used to speak about the aesthetics of spaces and sociality overlap or converge. Just as clearings are opened against the forest, and openness or brightness is accomplished against a sombre background, so the social dimension seems to be conceived as achieved against obstacles to clarity a product of similar work as in the open space of clearings. Noticing these parallels allows for seeing sociality as if it were a space – “betweenness” or entremedio is created between any two persons in a third, containing space (clearing and/or its instruments of perceptibility). Being defined through perceptibility or knowability, creates another topological distinction, opposing such sociality/space to the internal dimensions of persons, by default concealed behind their appearances or “faces.” We have glimpsed this in the unveiling layers of drunken speech (Prologue). Briefly put, Capanahua descendants say that only the person’s face is truly perceivable and knowable, while the heart, containing feelings/thoughts, desires and intentions are imperceptible directly and ultimately opaque. I will develop this construction of inside concealed by appearances in Ch. 2, and will attempt to make sense of similar dynamics at various levels of the villagers’ explanations in the rest of this thesis. Here, I will only note that internal content might potentially be dangerous, but unavoidable for a living human being (as the desire for food or company, helpers in the work/suffering of life). This is mentioned here to propose that it is precisely this concern with the possibility (threat) of (divergent) containment, which will be discussed in the next chapter that provides the direction or trajectory to the formulations of sociality as opening, revealing, externalising or emerging.

Therefore, as much as the descriptions of sociality, as analysed in previous sections, focuses on the external (interpersonal) space of perceptibility, the local demands of knowability, require more than superficial visual input of external appearances of persons. What, then, are the actions that might fulfil the heightened requirements for knowability mentioned before, where “merely looking” is deemed insufficient? These solutions conceived by the villagers echo Peter Rivière’s (1969:
Chapter 1. This side, the outside: The social spaces

239) observation on the strategies of Trio sociality, where the lurking shadow is the fear of cursers, and “hospitality (...) is in fact a prophylactic against witchcraft”:

They do not like visiting strange villages because of this, and when they go to an unknown village, they say on arrival, ‘I am not a curser, I am good, look at my baggage. Now you be good and do not curse me.’ When visitors come to their village, they give them food and drink, and are open and laughing because the only safeguard against being cursed is openness and expression of good intent - a description of behaviour which closely matches the overture of ceremonial dialogues. (Rivière 1969: 238)

I begin to argue, and will continue to do so throughout this thesis, in the case of villagers’ sociality, the level of such ambiguous opacity can be instantiated at different levels. It does not limit itself to relations between villages, but in fact, can be found at the interpersonal level. The manifestations of sociality focus primarily on the effort of emerging or externalizing, construed as opening “the baggage,” which, as I will continue to argue in the following chapters, is also one’s internal (personal or bodily) content, such as intentions. They appear in this context as attempts to extend the perceptibility beyond the opaque surfaces, or to open the containing, concealing appearances of its participants. This seems to prove the existence of the inside itself, and thus, being a living human, and at the same time, the harmoniousness of that inside with the outside and other persons, or absence of dangerous divergences within.

Common knowledge has it that spirits (demonios, yushin) aliment on the smell or air alone. In one story, consuming food proves deadly for spirits. Therefore, guests who drink manioc beer and eat the food served by the host can be understood as demonstrating having hunger and the insides to accommodate and process food. They could be understood in this context to be proving themselves human of the villagers’ kind, desirable neighbours. Spirit helpers do not allow a sorcerer to drink alcohol or eat certain foods (see Ch. 2). Further, from this perspective, vomiting – as in Daniel’s description of the alegre feast (see Prologue), or that of people more or less ostensibly vomiting during drinking feasts or on mingas – could also be proof of having inside processes. More illustratively, explicit, common statements such as “permiso, voy hacer agua para seguir conversando” [I am going to urinate so we can

85 The visiting human convinces the pu[inkimbub] (the “no-anus-ones”) to consume the food that they normally smell. Because they have no anus, the food gathers in their stomachs, causing unbearable pain. The man, trying to fix the problem, adds the missing body cavity with a sharpened stick, which makes the hosts die one after another, until they ask the man to leave, lest they be finished altogether (GHR05).
continue talking] or “voy a puí” [I am going to defecate] are courteous ways of saying goodbye or excusing oneself in public or in meetings which we have witnessed numerous times. Eugene Loos provides an interesting example for the Capanahua in the past:

It was at one of these meetings that old Carlos got up and stood directly in front of me saying “Son, I have to urinate.” I had seen the men just go to the edge of the floor and relieve themselves, so I supposed that I was sitting (on a log that was) in his favorite spot. Seeing my discomfiture and understanding that I didn’t know how to respond, Manuel sitting next to me whispered, “Just tell him to go right ahead and do it.” It seemed risky to me, but I followed his advice. Whereupon Carlos sort of said “thank you,” (at least that’s how I took whatever he used for words), and when he left into the darkness, Manuel counselled me, “When he gets back, be sure to ask him if everything came out OK. And you do this each time he goes to urinate, defecate, or take a bath.” (Loos 2009-14)

At the same time that they prove possession of an inside itself, those manifestations reveal it to be the same (conforme or igual nomás) as in other persons – also implying unanimity and good intentions. The inside content is thus conjured to reveal itself. Again, sorcerer’s powerful phlegm is said to be contained in his throat or stomach, and Don Benigno once recalled how others warned him always to serve alcohol when asked by a presumed sorcerer, to make him to vomit or lose the evil substance. Similarly, sweating, smelling or even working can be seen as the proof of having internal functions which parallel those of others, because sweating is said to be produced by salty food (not eaten by the indios), and spirits or gringos are generally assumed not to work at all. Drunkenness itself can be thought of as such a manifestation, because through the particle s-, indicating visible evidence (Loos & Loos 2003: 320), the standard drunken speech formula “pa’en sta hai” announces: “(I am) ostensibly drunk!” as proof of being the Capanahua descendants’ kind of human. Finally, when social hierarchies start looming between persons, one may propose rhetorically “to cut oneself open to see what colour our blood is!” which is a common expression.

---

86 For a similar practice among other Panoans, the Chacobo, see Erikson 2009. Also consider the behaviour of a protagonist at a drunken feast in a Capanahua story, who seems to continue the conversation and reveals his coveted secret as he goes out to defecate (Loos and Loos 1976a: 168–169).

87 Illustratively, in one of the genre of stories about different animals tricking the jaguar – told to the SIL missionaries in 1960s and 70s (three versions of “Hotsa” in (Loos and Loos nd.a), and one in (Schoolland 1975), and to me in 2012 (RPH04) – the rabbit avoids being eaten by the jaguar by claiming he is a jaguar. The feline challenges him to prove their sameness by showing his hand, giving a jaguar cry, and then: “Hsinun, pu’iwe, ka’iset” [Let’s see what you shit, then!], or even “oo... oon múa i kun shinannun pu’imuuwe, chahin” [So that you make me think (this is) true, let’s shit together, brother-in-law!] (Loos and Loos nd.a).
Similarly, the copera/copero [the host who serves manioc beer] often challenges the internal disposition of the guest, who, like me, may be unable to drink a third bowl of the thick liquid in a row, by asking flatly: “¿Estás despreciando mi masato?” [Are you despising my manioc beer?] As I have mentioned in the Prologue, “¿Estás rabiando?” or “¿Estás triste?” similarly compel externalization of internal intentions and participation. The ideal state of sociality is presented as free from internally produced anger (rabiar, sinakin?) and “thinking other things” (pensar otra cosa) – harm or sadness (masá shinakin), envy (envidia) or stinginess (mezquinar). Instead, people explicitly declare their friendship (amistad) and care (querer) for each other. Similarly, generosity is referred to as removing an obstacle to the flow and visibility. “Opening one’s hand” [abrir su mano], is the expression for generosity, and “releasing their pay” [soltar/tirar sueldo] refers to inviting people for drinks on payday. A generous person is said to be siri huni/a’ibu or bueno, because generosity manifests openness, good thoughts and intentions.

In the external dimension, as we have seen, the convivial modality of drunken speech which epitomizes alegría formulations values the overt, externally perceivable, joint activities (or presence), which create a shared, safe space of cooperation and coexistence, perceptible surroundings, referred to as ambiente [atmosphere] or entremedio [the space between, surrounding]. Such an ideal state of sociality is considered harmonious. Drunken speeches explain that such space is free from fighting, arguing (hacer problemas, peliar) or troublemaking (ser lioso), offending (faltar), bothering or doing harm to anyone (molestar). There are no obstacles between persons, such as separation created by great distances and death. The interpersonal space is clear (libre) and people in it are peaceful and united, perceiving each other as equals [igual nomás]. They work, drink, count stories, listen to music, watch películas [music videos], dance, pass time, call each other “friends” or “family,” declare love and care (again, querer) for each other, etc.

Thus, when Daniel said the manioc stems are growing alegre, he likely means to say they are more or less even in height, equally spaced, and therefore satisfied. No one stem is in a hierarchically different position, which might cause envy and the desire to be somewhere else or be “something more.” In the case of people, the inescapable minimal differences can be contained and tamed in a third, wider space enveloping them in sociality organized by other persons’ “good thoughts.” Ch. 2 is
meant to elucidate such ideas of enveloping. Here, suffice it to say, Daniel’s manioc stems grow *alegre*, because someone thought about the stems and knew how to organize the space to be smooth and clear, just like a “city” as described before.\(^{88}\)

3. **Emerging to know the outside**

This final section traces some representations of the movements towards the social spaces as I have come to present them so far, first in the “emerging” stories, then in association with children, and closes with some linguistic categories that conclude constitution of the social space as “an outside.”

3.1. Wild people: “letting themselves be seen”

Having started with the story of Aipena, this chapter will close with the story of another historically important gathering of “the Capanahua,” whose name is the opposite to that of the Buncuya village. A few people told me about the time when the *antiguos* became civilised. It has been reported that *nawa* outsiders (the Shipibo-Conibo and members of other groups working for *patrones*) finally stopped raiding the *antiguos*. Instead, they sought out *antiguos* in the forest between the Tapiche and Buncuya rivers, proposing that the ancestors “tame themselves” (*rae’i, amanzarse*) and become friends. They agreed, and “emerged”\(^{89}\) on the banks of the Tapiche, where they began to make fields. This is how they stopped killing each other and instead united and came to live peacefully. Several people told me that because of this gathering, xi the village where they emerged from the forest was called *Monte Alegre*, “the rejoicing forest,” a name we can now appreciate more fully.

The *antiguos* themselves commemorated the event using the name *Rae ba’i* [the path of taming/friendship] (Schoolland 1975: 296), for a location near the village. If the verb *rae’i* or *rae’ati* stands for “getting used to” (Sp. *acostumbrar*, LUS also *costumbrar*) in the process of getting to know or learning (*axe’i*) (Loos & Loos 2003: 297), then it also demonstrates the consistently emphasized understanding of this and other similar events of “contact” with *indios* or *antiguos*. Thus, it conveys the...

---

\(^{88}\) The themes of *alegría* and convivial sociality respond to the constructions of “living well”, conviviality or wellbeing described for other Amazonian socialities (e.g. Overing & Passes 2000; cf. Gordon 2014).

\(^{89}\) I use the term “emerge” ethnographically, with the literal sense of coming out (*salir, tseketi*) from an entity or concealment into another entity or space rather than a philosophical category.

\(^{90}\) Based on Manuel Huaninche’s narrative (Schoolland 1975) and other sources, I estimate that this or similar events may have taken place at the beginning of the 20th century. Considering the name is associated with various locations in Brazil, and the presence of Brazilians on the Tapiche was highly marked at this time, including the family which in subsequent years owned this place, the Nogueiras – it seems that this may be an example of a imaginative and illustrative explanation of the name for the Spanish speaking generations.
essence of the process, which is referred to as amanzar [taming], conquistar [conquering], or civilizar [civilizing] in LUS.\textsuperscript{91} Such models of contact posit a movement from asocial opacity and hiding in the forest to clarity and perceptibility in an open space. Thus, it is conceived as emerging (salir, tseketi): “they emerge (...) into the clear” (JPS01), or “they [antiguos], too, allowed themselves to be seen”\textsuperscript{xlii} (CBR01). Such stories are often told with a particular interest by Capanahua descendants, and the image of the sudden, mass emergence reflects their ideas associated with the “clearings” (manera de vivir, costumbre), and participating within them, which has been the focus of this chapter. Thus they arrive at a final, important point, which is the qualification of the social space as “the outside.”

Whereas, for Capanahua descendants, this instance of externalizing or emerging into clarity is essential for social participation of the indios, it builds on the ideas relating to participating in social life more generally. Around the time (April 2012) when the attention of villagers of Limño Cocha was captured by the expedition of the evangelical missionaries in search of the isolated Remoaucas, and the possibility of bringing new neighbours to the village,\textsuperscript{92} Doña Blanca commented in an exemplary way: “Indio? One can civilize them by going [and] (...) taming them with clothes and candy”\textsuperscript{xliii} (BHR01). These two elements, clothes and candy, staples of such stories, could be seen as symptomatic of the preoccupation with reaching “the other side” of participation in social life: they become seen (outside) but they also cease to be fierce (inside). Firstly, indio neophytes are said to want to look and be perceived as everyone else in a given social space, so they adopt its things and clothes.\textsuperscript{xliv} Although they go to the forest to hunt naked – in the village they accept the clothing of the space, receive the surnames and try to speak the language. It is as though they donned another, external layer of perceptibility to participate in the new clarity.\textsuperscript{93} Secondly, the process of taming is presented as aiming to influence their attitudes, or “insides,” which can be initiated with the incense of enchanting plants (piripiri), or the use of chemical substances (química) added to food served to the

\textsuperscript{91} Here, it is worthwhile noting that the verbal form of nete, (discussed earlier as space/light/time) i.e. neteti, means “to quiet, calm oneself down” (Loos and Loos 2003: 240), invoking the image of creating common space by calming down - the tranquilo ideal of sociality.

\textsuperscript{92} These are the supposed isolated neighbours of Limño Cocha on the Maipuco River and in the Sierra del Divisor. Older villager, Don Elías, maintained that he visited them in the past, and others claim they used to find traces of their presence while exploring the source of this little river.

\textsuperscript{93} This, as well as the previous discussion echo the social representations to the “perspectival quality” of the Lowlands’ Amerindian cosmologies (cf. Introduction).
Candy always accompanies the initial contact to “sweeten” their attitudes, previously sharpened by a supposed diet of fierce “hot peppers.” Further, in a popular expression, they “learn to eat salt,” which distinguishes people inhabiting open spaces (civilizados) from the indios. It is also “explained” to the indios that one needs to live peacefully, without fighting and killing other people.

Their emergence into a particular clearing/sociality is presented as learning (aprender) or getting to know (conocer) its appearances, things, people, and diet, which leads to eliminating fear and enmity. This becoming accustomed, or the production of new desires, binds them to this domain, so that over time, they are said to no longer desire the lives they led in the past. Thus, they become “humans” and cease to be indios or indígenas. Doña Julia explained:

Once they get to know the person [who tamed them], they emerge, brother. Into the clearing, to know... the boat... (...) they make the decision, they get to know everything, and they don’t want to go back any more, they have become accustomed already. All they want then is this. (...) Clothes, whatever one has [here], that’s all they want for themselves too. (JPS01)

In sum, in this process of literal “acculturation,” the indios emerge into the external, peaceful perceptibility, by experiencing and getting used to people and tools, and they are interpenetrated by the ideas, diet or sexual relations. Ultimately, having sex can be seen as proving humanity and reality of alliance, as with the curaca who establishes relations with the indios. Indeed, the process of conquista often refers to the process of engendering children (Ch. 5). It is the ultimate point in the logic of emergence and new sociality, which seals their move and initiates new breeds, descendants in new outsides.

Here, the open space of sociality on the main rivers (“mestizo”) is consistently presented as explicitly external, afuera [outside]. For example, in the taming of the antiguos, “Juan Hidalgo and another man have put them in the clearing already - outside” (ECH01). At other times, the “outside” status is implied by the process of emerging (salir) from the forest which is associated with obscurity, isolation and ignorance. Further, they emerge into the space of the external, knowledgeable and wealthy “conqueror,” who provides, “raises” (criar) and teaches the neophytes. The features which so far have resurfaced in passing, such as the cleared outside, interpersonal space for interactions, or the movements of externalizing inner content,
etc., all suggest that the idea of “the outside” is firmly connected with inhabited space. Perhaps it is not accidental that the LUS term for the deep forest is its opposition to el centro [the centre]. As the previous sections suggest, the external status of social space is not limited to indio stories, but these stories illustrate the general basics of sociality.

3.2. Children: “thrown out into the world”

There is another movement, which implies the external status of the social space. The Capanahua word kaini can be glossed as either “be born” or “come out/ emerge” (Loos & Loos 2003: 111). While it is opportune in this context that the Spanish expression dar a luz [give light] would refer to birth, the Capanahua descendants take it further, making it into botar al mundo [being thrown into the world], salir a la claridad [exit to clarity] or salir al aire [exit into air]. To be born is to conocer [know]: claridad del día [clarity of the day] or luz del día [light of the day].

Evidently, these expressions build on the general idea of clearings, completing the scope of nete meanings (as world or day – see above) as “the birthplace.” This important movement of emergence also marks the living space as external – this time, again to persons.

The movement of emergence itself is formative of the person. On various occasions during our conversations, Daniel emphasized the transformative role of the “air” or “clarity” in the process:

At the moment of birth: plunc! - itk! – he grows with the air: now he [is] a big baby. His body, his head, everything becomes big. Fat. Aja.(...) !ploc! He emerges into clarity, and becomes big in no time. (...) (LK: So while inside the mother’s belly, he already has a yushin [soul]?) He doesn’t. When he comes out: only then does he have yushin. Inside he doesn’t have yushin" (DHR19)

While this image was not widely shared by others, I understand it as Daniel’s description of the baby first becoming visible to other people in the social space. Here, coming out conditions the creation of the outer layer of personal opacity. It is a differentiation of inside and outside with regards to facing other people, or being “wrapped” in their gaze. With time, babies’ initially soft bodies are said to “harden,”

---

94 Cf. Walker 2013. I return to this in Ch. 2, 3.
which can mean that they acquire an outer, opaque layer (I will return to this in Ch. 2).\textsuperscript{95}

In the process of bringing up, little children are said to learn to desire the particular food of the social space, speak, and how to address others in locally specific ways (tratarse - usage of the terms of address).\textsuperscript{96} Yet, there is more to the position of little children, because we could understand them as the ultimate product of sociality, the confirmation of proper social life in the given place. They epitomize the externalizing ideal of sociality as the positive content which literally emerges between the participants: “something that your children give you – they have always given you alegría!”\textsuperscript{li} (BSR01). Furthermore, progeny are not passive receivers of sociality or knowledge, because in many ways, they dictate it. I will be returning to show this active and often ambiguous role from various viewpoints in the following chapters. Here, I say this because much of what decides the character and existence of this space revolves around children, as in Daniel’s description of the growing manioc plants. The life decisions of adults are often said to be made with children as the focus. One of the most common explanations cited for migrations is “for the sake of educating one’s children” (por educación de sus hijos). Thus movement is to places where school is available. Providing for children instigates that they buscan mitayo [lit. “look for food,” that is hunt or fish], earn money to satisfy their “needs” for such things as clothes, notebooks, pens, soap, etc, and to enable the improvement of their children’s lives, so that they “get ahead” (sobresalir) by gaining a good education and a future (futuro). It is often explicitly said that little children are the owners of valuable objects bought by parents: the motor, the television, DVD player, etc. They are also the focus of the often tecnonymous terms\textsuperscript{97} used between adults in the village. The bond of compadrazgo (God parents) (Ch. 4) establishes an even relation between the parents in respect to the uneven relations of adults to children. Life and the characteristics of social space therefore are dictated by the generation of persons – siblings, cousins or promoción (peers at school or another institution, such as the army) – who are born into the given space. Children truly belong to and create this social space (authenticity is signalled by the category nacido-crecido [born and

\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Gow 1997.
\textsuperscript{97} This widely found practice in the Amazon can be seen in the Marubo onomastics (Cesarino 2008; Welper 2009), but cf. also Overing Kaplan (1972).
raised] – like mestizos who are truly of the open city spaces). They have a different status than their parents (because of the nature of settlements, as mentioned earlier, they tend to be from “other places”); to whom they gradually become “outside.” In a way, they embody social space/sociality, folding over their genitors and taking over as the faces of emerging, living sociality.

3.3. This side is the outside

Finally, the external position of social spaces is further confirmed in language: while the social space is “this side” – it is the “outside” located between people, houses and forest walls.

![Diagram of social spaces]

Figure 5. Insides and outside.

Firstly, to denote radical difference in existential position, as between mutually opaque dimensions, the Capanahua descendants might say en otro mundo [in another world]. They might also express the position as their ancestors had [ñeke – there, on the other side], en otro lado, opposed to este lado [ñeke, this side]. In a radical sense, “this side,” refers to “this world,” the inhabited and perceptible domain, as opposed to the invisible world. Still, while for the persons situated within a particular social space, it is referred to as aquí/acá [nenu or neke, here], persons with whom Capanahua descendants live in the same space are often said to be en mi lado
[by my side], as *mis vecinos* or *en henabu* [neighbours]. These deixis are opposed to *porái*/*por ahí* [there], or *en otro parte* [in other parts], or by a change in possessive: *en su lado* [by his side] (see Ch 2 for complementary perspective on the “other side”).

Simultaneously, however, often used expressions for social unity reflect the image of a given space as “united, but divided,” “each one in their house/division,” (or reflecting the same idea, variations of the expression “same *raza*, other name”). They demonstrate the conception of separation between components or participants in any common space, which corresponds to another quality encoded by the reduplication of *kuin kuini*: distribution (I discuss this term in Ch. 2). If we remember that *heman* (or *heman’i’ti*) stands for a patio, or the open space around and between houses, then its Amahuaca (another Panoan language) cognate term cuts through to the centre of the problem, with *jüma* [*héma*] being glossed as *caserío*, *pueblo*, and the adverb *jímanáqui* [*hémanáki*] as *afuera* [the outside] (Hyde 1980: 46). This usage for “outside” in general is exemplified in the Capanahua dictionary as well (Loos & Loos 2003: 306). Therefore, from this sociological perspective, the village space is not an “inside,” but rather an “outside.” I have traced its association with the representations that oppose the clear/social space to the forest, to individual houses, and to the persons who are placed within. Additionally, the two themes noted above suggest how the movements of emerging – one from the “inside” of the forest, and the other from “insides” of persons – contextually create the open space of clearings as the “outside” (*afuera*) (Fig. 5). The process can therefore be thought to parallel the externalizing of the internal content, which creates the ideal *kuin kuini* sociality.

**Conclusion**

Here I have explored the villagers’ representations related to the contexts, composites, aesthetics and ethics of sociality. I propose that what connects them is their construal as fields of openness or clarity, which enable multi-dimensional perceptibility conducive to knowability and familiarity. IN examining these representations, I noted how they are formulated as the outcomes of work or movements with shared trajectories (opening, externalising, emerging), which

---

98 This is reminiscent of, for example, the idea of coexisting difference as ideal for living well for the remote Xikrin-Mebêngôkre, according to Cesar Gordon (2014).

99 Spelling in the square brackets corresponds to the spelling in this thesis.
position clarity as an external field against the internal dimensions of the forest background, houses and persons.

It is important that the knowledge or regulations for handling interactions between persons (approximating what we might call social regulations or culture) from this vantage point could be interpreted as instruments for perceptibility/knowability. Such external characteristics are emphasized by the connection of such organizing knowledge with foreign or foreign-influenced (educated, knowledgeable) figures who provide them, and thus “contain” and “tame” the composite differences of the participants.

This perspective has two important implications here. Firstly, the status of the village space and sociality is connected to safety, as the sanctuary of human interactions and is opposed to the danger, strangers, spirits and uncertainty. This is in keeping with formulations in other South American Lowland socialites (cf. seminal use in Rivière 1969). The difference from this localized point of view is that for the villagers themselves, it is the “outside” rather than “inside” that they attempt to create. It should become an “inside” only in relation to other “insides,” or another “outsides” through the rescaling of this dynamic. I will develop this discussion in the following chapters.

The possibility of rescaling this perspective allows for noticing another important implication. As suggested, the villagers’ formulation of ontogeny is premised on the external quality of sociality or culture, and the idea that persons emerge into them and learn the “social” knowledge of clearing or overcoming differences from an “outside.” As such, it contains a dynamic, which anticipates processes conceived by anthropologists as “acculturation,” while for people like the Capanahua it is “sociality.” Their application on scale larger, historical social processes is demonstrated by the constructions of the stories of “conquest.” It would be justified to use this for thinking about contemporary participation of eastern

100 In South American Lowlands ethnographies, the language of inside and outside is usually employed in a social context, but sometimes this relates more to the ethnographer’s (external) notion of what an interior and exterior of the society is. Such use may sometimes contribute to the apparent paradoxes, wherein the “interior/domestic” of the society is associated with “exterior/albedo.” The present case identifies the “exterior” right in the centre of the formulations of what sociality is. As I have mentioned, these “topological” relations of containment should in fact sound familiar to Amazonianists, as they permeate the ethnographic material, and are connected with the perspectival quality of Lowlanders’ explanations of the world (cf. Introduction). This will become clearer in the next chapter. It is also worth noting that strikingly similar topological connections, along with the language of emerging and hydraulic flows can be found, for example, in Inka representations from the Andes (Allen 2002, 2014, 2015). Note also that the language of “this side” is used in the Northern Ge formulations of kinship (Coelho de Souza 2001).
Peruvians such as these villagers in the Peruvian state. This theme correlates with the previous suggestion, that I pick up on in Ch. 5.

This chapter introduces certain elements of a dynamic that helps outline the generative process as construed by the *paisanos*. It addresses the constructions of the perceptible in this dynamic. The next chapter approaches the constructions of concealed spheres.
Chapter 2.

The other side, the inside: The contained

While the first chapter dealt with the work on perceptibility, this chapter complements it by addressing the “asymptotic” quality of that work, and the ultimate imperceptibilities and unknowabilities in Capanahua descendants’ sociality. Here, I focus on what the villagers construe as the content (insides) of that outside, while the chapters that follow trace the way it is explained to have got there. I begin with the first impressions from encounters with the Capanahua descendants, which help to introduce the problem. In Section 1, I explore a larger perspective on what the clearings of the human socialites are, by outlining representations of “the other side” in popular stories. Section 2 returns to investigate positions construed on “this side” of village sociality, and identifies several ways of containing in human participants, or the positions of the “insides” that elude perceptibility of sociality. Consideration of some general implications of these categories follows in Section 3. The final section relates the findings of this chapter to the sociality as discussed in Ch. 1.

Surface and content

After initial conversations on what I mistakenly thought were easier topics, such as the life stories of persons and villages or stories about antiguos, the themes of recorded conversations in Nuevo Aipena (Berea) on the Buncuya River switched to more “complex” issues. It was then that Don Guillermo told me for the first time that “the body is like waste... like the peel of a plantain. The spirit is the real (legítimo) plantain”\textsuperscript{lvii} (GHR03). A few days later, he also told me about the sky, the domain of the dead:

I sometimes say [think] that the other world... that world is not far, they say. And in the story [about the visit to the world of the owner of animals], too... the problem is that our sin makes us see it as far away. It is only our forehead/front (frente) which makes us far from heaven. And that world is near, very near\textsuperscript{lvii} (GHR05).

At the time, I thought these were interesting ideas, which I did not fully understand, but as similar conversations continued after we moved to Limón, I came to think about them as focusing substantial problems of the Capanahua descendants’
world. What strikes me now is that the themes recorded in my earliest field notes from Berea, two months before that conversation, show a recurring preoccupation of the villagers with the surfaces or appearances on one hand, and on the other, the concealment of the contents and belongings behind them. Within a few weeks in November 2011 (fB1111; fU1111) these notes describe, for example, a football match in a neighbouring village, where the players wore matching, spectacular uniforms, which they received from the district mayor. At the same time, someone broke into our house, and rumbled through our bags. Another note reports that Julio, who I talked with a lot at that time, told me that the custom of this place was “minga, masato, peleas” [working party, manioc beer, fights], supporting his assertion with examples of fighting in families, ignorance, and the incompetence of previous village authorities. All of this, he concluded, gave Nuevo Aipena a “bad image” (mal imagen). In another conversation, he revealed that the goal-keeper at the match, whom I had not met before, was of Capanahua descent as well, only that “they want to hide their Capanahua descent (descendencia).” I asked why and he said it was out of shame or embarrassment (recelo, vergüenza). On the next page, a note records a practice of concealment and secrecy, which I came to notice regularly: “Doña Saida brought us manioc wrapped in a sweater, which she unpacked when she arrived at our house.” On the next page, I mention accusations against the then apu (president, jefe) of the village. It was said that he concealed his income from the villagers and generally lacked transparency (transparencia) in his proceedings. On yet another page, the notes record our journey to Iquitos (Loreto’s capital) with Julio. When the ferry stopped at one of the villages on the lower Ucayali, he said “this too, is a comunidad.” “Nativa?” I asked. “Not anymore,” he answered, and went on to explain that it used to be, but “now, it ‘changed its mind,’ and is already mestizo.” He went on to reveal the “truth” about the area with a representative mix of complaint and contempt: “Brother, all of these communities, all of them – used to be indígenas, but they cease to be. They changed their minds.”

Most strikingly, during that same journey Julio told me the story about his uncle killing his own father (and Julio’s grandfather) with sorcery. The motive, Julio said, was the envy of the old man’s resourcefulness and belongings (boat, motor, shotgun, chainsaw) and the son “taking his father’s good advice the wrong way”. Aghast, I responded that I had not been aware that the man knew harmful sorcery; he seemed very nice and had always been kind to me. Julio then said, “Sometimes, you
can see the face, but you can’t see this,” and pointed to his chest. Later, his mother, Doña Elsa, described living in the vicinity of her sorcerer brother as being in “the shadow of the evil heart” (asombra del mal corazón), conveying a stark contrast with the light of good sociality described in Ch. 1. This is the heart of the problem, so to say.101

While this selection is representative of the field notes from both villages during the entire stay, what is significant now is that these notes are the first impressions, taken two months into fieldwork, before any conversations with Don Guillermo. This was before I started to realise how his words hinted at important problems for the villagers. Later on, I came to notice these more consciously, and they eventually came to dominate my developing understanding of villagers’ experience of the world, as demonstrated in this thesis. At this point, my attempts to comprehend them led me to think, firstly, that the Capanahua descendants tend to speak and act in the world as if they assumed its inherent feature or natural tendency was concealment by various surfaces. It would imply the notion of harbouring internal contents of different complexity and scale behind these surfaces. If social space is presented as “this side,” (este lado, neke) as shown in the previous chapter, then what is its “other side” (otro lado, ſuke)? What do the villagers imagine is behind these surfaces that so preoccupies their thinking?

1. Outside of an outside: Behind the worldly surfaces

For the paisanos, all social spaces, including those in a different world, may be referred to simply as porái (por ahí) [there], otro pueblo [other village], or otra parte, wetsanku [other place].îîî There is an important difference, however, between those social domains, which are accessible through the usual routes, and those, which remain normally inaccessible for most people. Expression of “the other side” (otro lado, ſuke) or the “other world” (otro mundo, wetsa nete), which opposes “this side” (este lado, neke) is usually limited to normally concealed domains. In daily contexts, the formula otro lado is used to indicate the other side of an obstacle or divide such as river, mountain, or of a surface when pierced.îîî In the Capanahua texts, opposition ſuke/neke corresponds to spatial categories in LUS. The dictionary glosses ſuke as

101 On a related note, a large part of other events and conversations recorded in my notes, have in common the theme of flow of goods. That is, receiving or “not giving”: in reference to the district mayor, the oil company working with the village, the accusations against the apu, or how the children are going to miss Kinga and me as the givers of fishhooks, fishing lines and candy.
“behind” or “beyond,” and shows its use for indicating the opposing side or edge \(^\text{lxii}\) (Loos & Loos 2003: 165). Specific uses in the dictionary or Capanahua texts recorded by SIL show it in the function of deixis in relation to a surface or container, as “from the depths” of water, a hole, a building or an area. \(^\text{lxii}\)

In order to understand what these categories convey, I think it is firstly worth considering that while perceptibility within clearings, as discussed in the previous chapter, is heightened, any two clearings are mutually opaque. Currently, people prefer to travel by boat with a motor, which in the last decades has become more widely available and affordable. Most travel takes place on the rivers (ríos) or streams (quebradas). On the Buncuya, where the population has decreased in recent decades, the scattered nuclear family posts mentioned in SIL documents before the 1980s have disappeared along with the carretera, an open route which used to connect them. Even the path between Limón Cocha and Berea, remembered as existing since the foundation of Limón in 1980s, is supposedly overgrown and rarely used, despite personal ties between the members of these two communities. Some people say they would prefer the time-consuming journey descending to the Ucayali and back up on the other river, that is, “por la vuelta” [the roundabout way]. However, sometime before this, such routes, including the handsome, praised carretera, used to connect clearings on the Buncuya across some 10 km, and paths that led from there to different locations on the Tapiche (20-30 km). It is said that land routes were preferred by the antiguos, who were most agile in moving through the forest. In such land communication, it is necessary to exit from (salir de) one clearing, past the thickness of overgrown purmas, and “enter” (entrar) into the darkness of monte alto, the “inside” or “centre.” Eventually, one emerges (salir en) at another clearing, which can thus be read as “the other side” of the forest opacity. For example, ancestors of the Neabu from Frontera Yarina, the so-called Pahenbaqueno, who in the past had inhabited the Punga River and Río Blanco, used the term ñekenetebubu to refer to the “Capanahua” sociality of the upper Tapiche (VPB01). Because they were separated by the watershed, a larger stretch of forest and apparently hostile relations, this term may be read as “the kind [-bu-] (of persons[-bu]) from the cleared place [-nete-] on the other side [-uke-].” The contemporary language of the “other sides” and “clearings” in Capanahua and LUS seems therefore to have originated with the spatial realities of the antiguos.
Still, while many clearings are easy to get to, and are mediated by usual routes, others belong to the worlds that are normally unavailable and imperceptible. In the Capanahua descendants’ view of their surroundings, they are closely neighboured by various opaque domains, which are hidden by physical features of the landscape. This view combining the myths of the antiguos and stories of visitors from different places is based on indirect information of often-questioned credibility. For all their confusing information and explicit ultimate unknowability, some elements of these various, often conflicting speculations are very similar. They illustrate the ways in which the villagers organize and present knowledge about the world. There is no space here to discuss these theories in detail, so below I stress some common features, which I suggest can be understood as more universal building blocks of the Capanahua descendants’ representations – most of all, the relation between the perceptible and imperceptible, but salient, spheres.

1.1. The cloak of (im)perceptibility

Any reported knowledge about the other sides is connected to stories of penetrations through what can be described as the limits of perceptibility, or surfaces of imperceptibility. They therefore describe passing through opaque surfaces in puzzling ways. Entering such realms is compared to entering through the thin, but opaque material of the mosquito net used by rural eastern Peruvians when sleeping (BRS07; DHR16). Such a thin membrane separates the sides of (im)perceptibility. Thus, when limits between the sides are penetrated, they are construed as a discontinuity in perceptibility. Once Doña Germe asked me if it was true that there was darkness where the earth ended. When I returned to this in an interview, Doña Germe said that this was what her father told her – that is where the sun rises, as if it was hanging, like a bell – “I don’t know where he heard this... my father’s story...” (GSR06). Most often, this opacity emphasizes the proximity of the other side, and links to Don Guillermo telling me about the celestial domain being surprisingly close. Victor described the passageway to the world on the other side, as a pitch black hole in the ground in the forest, “just like closing your eyes” (VPB06). This impression is significant, because in other similar stories, the travellers are accompanied by guides from the “other side,” and advised to close their eyes briefly, so that when told, they open them again, and are already “on the other side.” Another way of getting to the skies or other worlds is simply to “die” (morir): that is, for Capanahua
descendants, to close one’s eyes and have the spirit leave the body at the moment of
dying, as if falling asleep or losing consciousness.

The surfaces of the sky, water or the darkness of holes act as cloaks to the other
sides. For example, versions of the Wishmabu [“star man”] or Kanamari\textsuperscript{102} story
(Appendix 6.61) relate an accidental visit to the celestial world, apparently the
paradigmatic “other side” for the Capanahua across SIL texts (cf. Thompson 1997). A
man travels by river to plug the hole through which pestilent black flies are emerging
onto this world. He ends up either tripping and falling, or entering below the surface
of the water where it meets the sky – in either case, finding himself “on the other
side” of the surface (\textit{otro lado}, \textit{\text{"u}ke}), or “in another world/land” (\textit{wetsa nete/mai}).
Later in the story, his host invites him to peer down through a little window in the
ground. It is “down there, inside” (\textit{naman, chichu}), as the narrator confirms (Loos &
Loos 1976a: 140) – that he sees his family astonishingly close. If the sky in these
stories is close, (the window in the star-man’s ground opens just above this world), it
used to be closer still and was lifted up according to other stories of \textit{antiguos} (Loos &
Loos 1976a: 12, 44). When I asked Daniel why we do not see the celestial world of
heaven, hell and the dead, which we talked about at length, he answered that the blue
surface is the outer layer (\textit{capa}) of \textit{el Cielo}\textsubscript{15} (DHR21). Other stories speak of visits
below the surface of the water, and Capanahua descendants sometimes talk about the
water people/demons, the \textit{yacurunas} living under the water superficies. The
\textit{shapingo}\textsuperscript{103}, or forest demons, people say, live behind holes in the ground - dark but
clear outside - or within tree hollows (DHR24). Doña Germe recalled a story where a
man in his dream went to the domain of the \textit{madre del carnaval} [Mother of carnival]
on the other side, accessed through the hole leading to the \textit{curruhuinsi} ants’ nest
(GSR07).

\textbf{1.2. Outside in the inside: appearance and truth of social space}

Furthermore, what can be found behind such curtains in every case seems
disappointingly “normal.” Yet it is precisely this discovery that interests the villagers
the most. The narrators consistently stress essential sameness of the social

\textsuperscript{102}This intriguing usage of the name indicates a connection of the Capanahua ancestors with the people from the East, in the
Javari River basin in Brazil. This is an ethnonym of a Brazilian group. For the Marubo, eastern neighbours of the Capanahua,
separating them from the Kanamari group, Kanamari is a powerful being from the sky (Ceará 2008). Philippe Erikson also
suggests historical relations between Matís and the Kanamari or Katukina (Erikson 2007).

\textsuperscript{103}The words combine alternative names \textit{shapshico} and \textit{yashingo}, widely spread throughout eastern Peru (see above).
perceptibility on the other side: visitors find that “the beyond” is “just the same” as this side (igual nomás, nekebi keska)! Its inhabitants look and behave “just as on this side,” living alongside neighbours and feasting. Their space is “just as good,” bueno, siri. Recalling Ch. 1, it means that the other side is equally cleared, and therefore, essentially social. Thus, the surfaces in the surrounding world are assumed and expected to conceal other social domains - other “clearings/worlds” (nete). Because of this similarity, one can talk (conversar) to the inhabitants and establish relations such as the flow of goods or knowledge. They are a “different kind of ourselves,” or nukebu (Loos & Loos 1976a: 114).

Yet, these are but opaque social appearances, and the qualification of kind is most important. In versions of a story about an antiguo or a brujo, who visited the underwater people, narrators, always amused, explain how people there used aquatic animals or fish as tools that people know on the side. Hence, the alligator (lagarto) was their motorboat, or their taxi (fT1301 DHR), boa was their hammock, taricaya turtle – a seat; anguilla fish – sword club; charapa turtle – mortar; lápiz-challo fish – pen; and stingray (raya) was their hat (GHR05). In another example, again in the Wishmabu story, a house on the other side of heaven resounds with music and pá’en hui shouts with their internal, descent affiliations (neabu!) just as on this side: the alegría of a feast. Yet, when the man from this world enters the house, he encounters silence. He can only see little flies circling around the beer pot of a foul-smelling beverage. Thus, although it sounds like a regular feast and looks like manioc beer; it is of a different kind. They belong to people he can hear, but not see. In fact, he is later informed that they are dead people, invisible to the humans from this side. Theirs is an “other kind of masato” (ORB01). Similarly, people wonder what the masato (DHR21) or the tobacco of the forest demons, for example, might be made of (DHR28; GHR04), and participants of some otherworldly socialities aliment themselves with the smell of food alone, as the “no-anus-ones” (see Ch. 1). As common knowledge has it, the tunchi, especially pure spirits of little children, or angels, feed on the smell of flowers. Their hungers, or internal composition, are of a different kind.

Such concealed “natures” of social appearances of both the “instruments” (see Ch. 1) and participants of the other side’s socialities are often connected with a mismatch between the appearances similar to this side and the knowledge-skills or
capacities, which are divergent. In many stories, their efficacy is much higher, and this difference constitutes their “power” (*poder, miraculo*). An axe which fells trees by itself; a mysterious container which holds fire and clears the field; a dish which refills itself; an owner-figure who gives away manioc for free; the ability to produce ready-made tools solely by felling a *pijuayo* palm tree; or instantaneously drying the lake to gather all the fish just by shooting an arrow, etc. The stories of relations with the “beyond” often have the visiting people receive or take some of the tools or knowledge-skills-capacity away with them. The layered, concealed character of their true efficacy is established upon crossing back to this side, and secrecy is the condition of maintaining it. If it happens to be explained, this efficacy is usually connected to imperceptible, or contained helpers, an added presence, the “soul” or “spirits,” a relation of adoption or “borrowing” (see Sect. 2). Their original owners’ instructions in such cases are as follows: “Do not look inside!” “Do not utter my name!” “Do not say where you got it from!” “Do not look back!” “Do not shout out in amazement!” The cost of revealing their provenance, and thus the internal, true nature, is the loss of power. Similarly, knowledge or tools for performing certain arcane activities (sorcery, love magic, planting, etc.) may generally be referred to as “*sus secretos*” [their secrets] in LUS, and their power lies in the concealment from the outside.

1.3. **Inside of time: temporal opacity of antiguos’ clearings/times**

It is remarkable that the Capanahua descendants use similar language to speak of their *antiguos*. There are no stories of “entering” those domains. Yet, what is spoken of by Capanahua descendants as the “bits and pieces” (*partes-partes*) of knowledge about their domains and *costumbre* was transmitted through persons who have known others who have “been” there. I return to examine these in more detail in Ch. 3, and what is important in this context is the relation of these worlds or perceptibilities to the contemporary “outside.” Rather than assuming a continuity with their ancestors, villagers position themselves as unable to imagine their ways of living and understanding. Such “*anticos*”104 lived just like the contemporary *indios*, “inside the forest” (*dentro del monte, en centro*) in their own clearings, and avoided being seen by anyone (*“no se dejaban ver”*). They not “know” how to live in modern villages, their “village” being a big longhouse (*maloca*). Their tools had lower efficacy

104 An informal, diminutive and slightly derogatory way of referring to the “*antiguos*.”
and were more fallible than contemporary tools. “Their axe” was actually a stone, “their cooking utensils” were made of clay, their “bed” was a hammock, and “their LUS (castellano)” was Capanahua. They went about naked, married little girls and their own siblings, and ate their own kind – this was their “alegría.” On the other hand, they are also attributed with some heightened capacities or knowledge, such as strength, stamina or “purity” which is attributed to the absence of salt, or big animals like tapir in their diet (see Ch. 4, 5), familiarity with plants, and moving through the forest without paths.

The costumbre related in those stories about stories is presented as incomprehensible, opaque and sometimes repulsive or laughable and bizarre, just like alligator as the speedboat. This information is often interspaced with exclamations of bafflement: ¿cómo quizás (vivían)! [How they have they lived!]. If I brought up elements that I found in historical or ethnographic sources, such as certain categories, explanations, or practices, e.g. addressing family, they appeared opaque, amusing or confusing to the villagers. There is, as I often heard, no one left to know and explain them. Therefore, although I have not heard of ancient spaces and times being explicitly referred to as “the other side,” it would make sense to compare the opposition between their opaque, contained clearings/times and contemporary milieu to that between the latter and worlds on “the other side.” In fact, antiguos are said to belong to a different time, otro tiempo, and, as I suggested in Ch. 1, “world-space” and “time” can in Capanahua both be expressed using the same word: nete. Therefore, for Capanahua descendants, their ancestors – often including their own parents – appear as people from essentially another social time/world.

2. Insides in an outside: Behind the faces of participants

In this section, I shift focus from relations between “outsides” to the surfaces and the contents hidden from external sociality at the level of interpersonal
interactions within any “outside.” I concentrate on the positions or conditions where internal difference is postulated. Some difference is inherent to all the living, and connected with the necessity to work, reproduce and eat. This is important, because here we face the asymptotic limit between perceptibility/sociality, and imperceptibility/traces of generative processes. In Ch. 3, I discuss the mythic origins and some details of this condition. Here, I focus on its consequences for perceptibility at the level of human bodies.

More specifically, the example of the “heart/mind” and its containment offers a chance of imagining how the villagers construe the opacity that articulates inside (imperceptibility) and the outside (perceptibility) dimensions at the level of the human form. Further examples demonstrate the increasingly troubling complications of the ordinary corporeal topologies by introductions of subsequent levels or distortions of internal containment of willing, hungry forms: from the foetus, through perverse desires, to powerful helpers.

2.1. The heart of the problem: Inside of an outside

Generally, whenever the location or source of blood, spirit, ideas, feelings and desires is speculated, paisanos point to the heart (corazón, huinti). One of the most important contents habitually attributed to the heart is querer (keeni), which describes wanting, love, desire, or will. In a popular expression, they explicitly attribute appetites to their hearts’ desiring specific food or things. Longings for the themes, which are most appreciated in spontaneous joy (alegría): other people, food, goods and knowledge (Ch. 1) are habitually presented as inherent to the condition of living humans:

Who is dead is dead. Does not want anything. Those who want are us. (...) What we want, look: we want our money, some sugar, your rice to drink mingado\textsuperscript{107} – all of this we want, the dead do not want anything! Nothing-nothing, not even to eat: already yushin [“spirit,” see below] (...) the dead do not want anything. The only ones who want are us. Once we are dead, we will not want anything either. Not anymore: “What will I buy my clothes, my pants with?”\textsuperscript{lxxi} (DHR10)

As I will show, it is possible to connect thoughts to the heart/mind space. Pensar, literally “thinking,” refers to a stirring of the mind, caused by worry, the state of separation (Prologue), or the frustration of desire. It is used synonymously with

\textsuperscript{107} Rice cooked with milk and sugar (all bought commodities).
being sad, stressed or preoccupied – wanting to be somewhere else, having something else. Further, the socially preferred state is “not thinking” at all, equal to being empty of the presence of such non-exteriorized content, the eventless “just the same” (igual nomás), or tranquilo (Prologue, Ch. 1). Then communicational interactions where misunderstandings or conflicts occur can be described using the expression “pensar otra cosa” or “pensar cosas disparates” [to think other/divergent things]. It parallels “merely looking” (mirar nomás) (Ch. 1), that is, not externalizing one’s intent, being silent. This silence, in turn, may be interpreted as hostility or “getting mad” (rabiar, sinati) (see Prologue). Most often, villagers associated pensar with harmful content, and significantly, rarely talked about the “good” thinking introduced or springing up within the heart. Any such stirring therefore causes the internal dimension of persons to become externally opaque. Therefore, if spoken about, these harnessed thoughts/feelings tend to be presented as ambiguous, potentially harmful content. Villagers say that evil spirits enter the heart of ordinary healthy persons (“entran nuestro corazón espíritus malos”) and make them do or want certain things. The appearance of intentions, ideas, feelings, desires, is thus compared to, or explained as, penetration or influence. This may be the reason why, when I asked how many spirits a person’s body, Doña Ermisha answered impatiently: ¿ichara! [perhaps a lot!] (fT1208). These examples mean that thoughts/spirits can be imagined to be contained within the body/heart. They also have another implication: inside is a (containing) space.

It is worth dwelling a while on these representations, because the presence of such desire/thought content is correlated with existentially crucial differentiation into external and internal spaces which articulates the opacity of the human body itself. For those who are more fluent in Capanahua, such internally differentiated content, thought-feelings (shinan) is more accurately contained within “teká,” whose LUS equivalent is “mente,” mind. Capanahua descendants locate this within the heart and/or brain (seso), and the Capanahua dictionary (2003: 346) tells us that teká is “heart, mind.” On the other hand, the word for heart in Capanahua, huininti, shares the root with the verb huinai [to breathe, pulse]. It is not hard to imagine its connection to the verb hui [to speak of, mention], and finally hui [language]. A link between the mouth and the heart, tied at the centre of the chest and breathing air is thus imaginable. A sorcerer also works with his breath (blowing smoke, air or shooting darts) and voice (songs or curses) after swallowing his helpers with yachai [potent
phlegm] that are lodged inside his throat (I return to the sorcerer’s containment below). Such connections evoke an idea of the internal “space/air” of the heart.

It is important to note, firstly, that what emerges from these characterisations of inner content is that the thought-feelings, rather than objects, might be considered as “voids.” Such “content” is hunger or desire, which can only be accomplished at the cost of other beings, beginning with one’s mother. According to paisanos, the very presence of bad thoughts or desires is enough to produce what they call “sin” (pecado, ʼuχáhú), which is always qualified as harm, guilt “against” someone. In a story by Amelia Romaina from 1969 (Loos & Loos nd.b), the word ʼuχáhá is used once as “sin” that people commit against their owner (God) by disobeying the rules of his place-time (En Papaki ʼuχayamanawé! [Do not cause harm to (i.e. sin against) my Papa!]), and the second time as “harm” that he delivers to the people (Nuke ʼuχayamanawé, Papan! [Do not harm us, Papa!] through sending floods in punishment (Diuseñ kastikani [God’s punishment]). Therefore, sin and punishment are presented as harm and revenge, or retribution. Therefore, when the baby demands milk from its mother and does not let her rest, or when the child does not obey her – it “sins” against the mother, causing her to in turn “sin” against the child by getting annoyed. Inner space would be completely clear and thus, nullified, only if there was no such vacuum (that is, the persons were “filled/satisfied” – compare with the meanings of alegre in the previous chapter), or if the condition for their existence, life, was extinguished. Clarity here is as asymptotic as the clarity of external space, because recurring desire is, as indicated above, a basic condition of living on earth. The idiom of “already not wanting anything” (ya no quiere nada ya) is synonymous with grave illness, anticipating death.

Secondly, the position of containing a single void element, the basic elemental hunger, in which the heart/body becomes opaque, constitutes the body and the person. It might be plausible to infer that “mind” (teká) is understood in this context as the internal, externally opaque dimension of the “heart.” Further it would be followed by the presence of other active, wanting forms, such as additional

---

108 Cesarino (2008) connects the idea of peitopensar, “chest-thinking” as the internal space of the person’s body, and maloca, the longhouse. The association of blood with spirits, soul or intellect can be found in other Amazonian representations (e.g. Carneiro Da Cunha 1978, Owing 2006, Costa 2007).

109 Dictionary defines ʼuχáhá as sin, guilt (pecado, culpa) and ʼuχakín as cause harm (hacer daño; perjudicar) (Loos & Loos 2003: 163).
thought/feelings/spirits within its space. Just as the people who open a space or those invited by the founders create their “outside” in the forest’s “inside” and strive to keep it clear (Ch. 1), and as the “other side” of holes or surfaces (Sect. 1) contains the “outside” spaces. Such containing elicits further problems, which I set out below. For now, I focus on the first hunger and differentiation which is diagnosed as the basic condition of human being. Just as hunger or desire is inseparable from human existence, to live is to want, and that is, to “sin.” The expected progress of life as suffering is the inescapable strain of sinning (viviendo en la tierra pecando), which can be understood as wanting and expecting from others, and refusing or guarding from others. Thinking other things/sinning might be understood as disjunctive attitudes or desires concerning others, a difference between the external state of affairs and personal expectations. It can be said to be a continuous gathering of such “sin” between one’s desires and expectations and their fulfilment by others, and vice versa. In other words, differentiating inside from the outside, owned and coveted, in a process similar to Gregory Bateson’s (1935) schismogenesis, whereby inside and outside stimulate each other to progressively differentiate into increasingly separate opposed spheres. Here, this differentiation is articulated in the volume of opacity between them, which is what a body is: a wrapping or container of desire, which is the result and cause of desire.

This is how I explain Don Guillermo pointing to the “sin” as separating living humans from the ideal world of heaven, constituting “our front,” or “faces” that is, opaque bodies. The process of accumulation and differentiation “hardens” the bodies
(cf. strengthening of the baby’s body in Ch. 3), gathering what from the external perspective of other worlds or Dios, appears as filth or garbage. On the other hand, enclosing the mind/heart-space voids, which demand to be filled at the cost of others, creates “naturally” increasing mutual opacity between persons.

In the next chapter, I look into how such a state comes to be explained as having been constituted and reconstituted in time as an infectious infliction. It begins to illuminate the predicament guiding the insistence of sociality on transparency, to which I return in the last section of this chapter. Here, I restate that in kuin kuini sociality, attempts are made to demonstrate the clarity of such internal space. Extreme, excessive desire can be represented as dangerous and uncontrollable voraciousness which is ridiculed: in mischievous children, Inchinka the demon in stories of antiguos (who swallows masato along with the pots), or jaguars – whose large, open mouth provides the metaphor for the unwanted appearance of a person photographed with their mouth open in laughter or worse, while eating. Being stingy or envious would also be a corollary of excessive desire. A frightening release of divergent, dangerous contents/voids of ordinary people is imagined in several contexts. Drunkenness or violent drunken speech was presented as strong and potentially dangerous, bringing forth internal difference (Prologue). Another scary context is death, and the older the person is, the more voluminous and dangerous the released hungers, sins and grudges. We experienced this when Don Elías passed away at noon. Because such “spirit” attacks or harasses only people who are alone, the news went around all of the houses and all of the fields where people worked. Within an hour or two, all the inhabitants were back in the village, huddling together in groups, as if looking for shelter during when it rains. Then, because of the same explicitly stated fear, they all went to accompany the dead body at the all-night vigil (velorio) (fT1205). Possibly the most deeply frightening context is the idea of brujería, as acting on precisely such accumulated evil of harm and thwarted desires. The standard motive attributed to sorcery (either on the part of brujo himself or his clients) is “envy” (envidia or venganza), a violent form of desire. The expression for cursed illness or misfortune is mal de gente – “the evil of people.” Below, I will continue with the frightening distortions of the already complicated human condition, until we get to cursers or sorcerers.
2.2. Troublesome insides

First, this discussion brings me to the introductory metaphor of the plantain peel, which exemplifies quite standardized ways of representing the body. The usual image is that of a vegetable or fruit peel, shell (carapa, xaká), shirt (camisa), or clothes (ropa). If the state of death is permanent (see below), this container is left behind as useless (bagazo) and worthless (no vale nada), to rot and turn into earth again. This would be similar in Capanahua, where the prefix xaḥ- refers to the body as an empty container, so that xaˀkin’u may describe the inside of a suitcase as “the cavity of the body” (Loos & Loos 2003: 375–76). For the human body, Don Baudilio explained:

(LK: But they say when you are asleep, the spirit leaves to walk somewhere else?) That’s what they say, brother. It leaves, but how could this be...? One doesn’t feel this. But they say our spirit leaves. Lots of people say that it leaves to roam in the world. How could this be...? And when it returns (...), once it re-enters, that is, into your shell – that’s en xakati [my casing], in our language you say xaká, a shell, they say. Like this one [pointing to a coconut shell lying on the ground] – this one here – covered, see? That’s it. It is comparable to... what your body is. But this one here, what you cover [with], is left empty there [inside]. This is how it enters... our yushin (LK: And it stays inside?) Inside indeed, brother.

Significantly, these explanations are associated with contexts where externalization of the living human being’s spirit, that is, desire and volition, is assumed to take place in her/his sleep, dreaming, loss of consciousness, or the moment of death. Let us now proceed to explore what the spirit is said to be by using several examples of trouble with contents and containers.

2.2.1. Detached content

In the first set of examples, I suggest that the relation spirit-body becomes subject to expression in a state or process wherein manifestation or influence is spatially detached from its originating body-container. Something is said to have a spirit because it affects others without changing place, directly making the work or being fully present.

For an ordinary person, the process of externalizing one’s spirit from the body is undesirable and potentially harmful. This is implicit in the idea of the detrimental effect of missing someone (pensar and tristeza) construed as being partly elsewhere (Prologue). Also, having one’s spirit lured and detached during sleep in order for it to be attacked, hurt or killed by the sorcerer initiates illness and can result in death.
Furthermore, being suddenly frightened causes the spirit to leave the owner’s body, and is a condition called susto [fright], which needs to be treated. Further, being suddenly frightened causes the spirit to leave the owner’s body, and is a condition called susto [fright], which needs to be treated. Therefore, Newborns are especially endangered because their bodies are said to be soft and permeable. Thus, their spirits slip out easily and become prone to kidnapping (e.g. by the yushin of the earth, or by the “owner” of the pona palm, which is used to make the floors in houses) or wanderings (e.g. following its father who leaves for the forest).

On the other hand, brujos and a variety of animals, plants, or persons with “strong” characteristics (e.g. nocturnal, or especially loud, big, noisy or sleepy) can cutipar, that is, penetrate and influence another living form with their own strong particularities. Such efficacy is an indication of “having a spirit.” This happens through smell, tobacco smoke, blowing, voice, curse, look, touch, ingestion, proximity, or the “helpers” or “workers” – for example, through quietly flying invisible darts and spines (yachai) blown forth by the sorcerer, or other objects and animals that he commands to penetrate or bite his victim with their teeth (vipers, peccaries, etc.) (I return to this in Ch. 3). Again, because of their soft body-containers, newborns are particularly vulnerable. Further, spirits of the dead (tunchi) are said to be air (aire) for humans. These can only be perceived as displaced manifestations, or remainders without the actual body-container: smell (or aerial presence, causing sickness, malaire or choque del aire [bad air or air-blast] in living people), sound (one can hear them touching things), or partial appearance (in the shadows or with their face turned downwards). Although they can see people, in waking life people cannot fully see or hear them, as they are said to be looking in from “the other side” (darkness, forest or through the cracks in the house wall), and their voices are at best a mumble. This idea seems to be the reason why photos and voice recordings or transmissions are often, with amusement, referred to as yushin or demonios, and the act of recording the image or voice as sacando yushin [taking out the spirit].

2.2.2. Mismatched content

In another set of examples, reference is made to spirit when the internal composition is said to be mismatched with its body-container. It is related to either

---

109 In contrast, the powerful sorcerer’s body becomes hard and impenetrable, that is why hard wood trees are powerful brujos, and powerful brujos have bodies-containers as “hard as steel.”
110 The gesture describing brujería is a short blow made through a ring created between the fingers.
putting on another body-container, internalizing other influences or qualities, and/or developing irregular and socially aberrant desires and behaviour.

Firstly, “doing demons” (haciendo demonio) refers to the activity of persons who put on the masks and clothes of the forest demons during carnival (Ch. 5). In the same way, the souls of the dead that reach heaven are made to wear new “clothes” and become new persons. In this case it refers rather to stripping away the sinful, aged peel to reveal a young, healthy and purged presence. Another fate awaits evil or incestuous persons (mostly in reference to antiguos), who may be made to leave the grave and wear the shirt (camisa) of the jaguar. This change also happens if the blanket wrapped around the buried body is floriado-floriado [covered in spotted or flowery designs] reminiscent of jaguar fur. Such a post-mortem condition is called “doing a jaguar” (haciendo tigre, ḫiːnûː), and results in prolonged suffering in this other form. These always hungry, thin and bad smelling people-jaguars (huni ḫiːnû) kill domesticated animals and sometimes attack people, until a second death at the hands of their former neighbours ends their misery. It is worth noting that the animal skin (sometimes implying shape generally, with its designs, feathers, fur, claws etc.) is normally referred to as camisa [shirt] or carapa [peel] and, as in the case of the human body, is differentiated from carne (meat, muscles).

Some living humans are “accompained” by spirits. This state is also called con demonio, endemoniado. This means that their internal content is discordant with the outer appearance of their human bodies and this is the fate of incestuous persons. Their spirits are said to leave their bodies during sleep in the form of a monstrous animal, such as the horse-like mula [lit. mule], which, borrowing the owner’s head, grazes on weeds and farts fire. This condition is similar to that of the people-jaguars, and to the brujos, whose spirit, detached from its purged body, is said to be able to travel long distances at night in the form of birds or bats in order to kill, cure, or steal more knowledge-skills from other sorcerers. Such detachable and aberrant internal contents (demonio-demonio or puro demonios) could be related to perverted desires and behaviours identified above: incest or cannibalism developed or invited on the inside (more about sorcerers below). Also comparable is the condition of a person who is nearing death. It is said to have its spirit leave the body during sleep and either

---

112 Although there is no generalized assumption that the animals are also human or see themselves as humans. Only a few species are considered demonios.
walk about whistling as the spirit of the dead (tunchi) and visit places which the
person passed through in her life (recogiendo paso), or visit and eat with the dead
relatives. Daniel’s beloved father had done so before his death, and did not want to
eat after waking up, announcing that he had already eaten with his deceased family
“on the other side.”

Similarly, some beings from the “other side” are capable of detaching
themselves from or concealing their original bodily containers by putting on another
layer-clothes-appearance which come to form the presence of persons on “this side”
(the process is described as formarse, presentarse, or apersonarse). In other words,
they are “doing humans” (haciendo gente). As Don Jorge told me in the context of
such occurrences, commonplace in stories of the antiguos: “Way in the past, all kinds
[of species] would do this... Not people, but they say its people. Well! But... it goes out
there: not people!”lxxvi (JRR03). The river dolphin brujos are said to be capable of
this, occasionally showing up at a party in the form of a tall gringo. Similarly, the
shapingo supposedly emerge as family members or friends to kidnap our kind of
humans, or use voices of people and animals to lure them astray. Therefore, it is
initially impossible to know the actual nature of the person met in the forest or an
arriving stranger. The dictionary records a description of the forest demons: “[they]
are like humans, but are not; [we] do not know their house, we just see” (2003: 401–
2, my translation)(compare with aspects of knowing in Ch. 1). Another example is
that of persons, tools or knowledge from otherworldly domains which have a
divergent or higher efficacy than their “ordinary” appearance.

Therefore, a person (or being) acting strangely or in discord with her
appearance can be qualified as “demonio.” For example, I heard exasperated parents
scorn particularly misbehaving children: “You are like a demonio!” The dictionary
defines yushini (with -ni adjectival suffix) as a person who does not look for a partner
(Loos & Loos 2003: 402) that is, as acting aberrantly. Similarly, unsettled Doña
Germe told us one day about Ronal shooting a choro monkey that had wandered onto
his chacra. Along with the aberrant behaviour of visiting human spaces, the
unusually long agony of the animal (still breathing while having its fur singed) that
she witnessed, was to her an indication that this was not a true animal, but a
demonio, and as such she would not hear of eating its meatlxxvii (GSR11).
Therefore, such changes are conceived as putting on a new skin-container (“body”) or appearance, or internally diverging from one’s own – rather than a gradual transformation of one’s actual body. The ubiquitous grammatical category marked by the suffix -ska in Capanahua and the temporal adverb ya in LUS, both meaning “already,” mark such changes, as shown in several examples so far. Because of the assumed intransformatibility, it is most often used sarcastically in the context of people (“they are viracucha/mestizo already”), as when dressing up or pretending, yet underneath remaining what they actually are and where they come from. As it is, the outer human body, the Capanahua descendants uniformly claim, is no more transformable than the coconut shell that Don Baudilio showed me. This theme returns in later chapters.

![Figure 7. Some variants of the relation between form and content – spirits (demonios, yushinbu).](image)

In summary, for the villagers, a “spirit” seems to be defined through a heightened difference between the container and its expected content. It is created by surplus, remainder, divergence, displacement, etc. – much like a shadow, which is another meaning attributed to yushin in the dictionary (2003: 401–2). On one hand,
therefore, it seems somewhat problematic for the *paisanos*, both ontologically and sociologically, to say that an ordinary person, alive and well, has a spirit - which is tantamount to saying he/she is harbouring significant, asocial divergence. On the other hand, I argued that internal differentiation and desires are the basic condition of living. Therefore it is possible to understand “spirit” as a radical differentiation related to such displacements or perversity of the inherent desire, which is openly dangerous to the surrounding people.

2.3. Insides in the insides: Internalizing other beings

Let us now set focus on the status of persons containing other hungry and wilful beings – first mothers and then sorcerers – and closely examine such alterations of internal content.

2.3.1. The swollen belly

In his drunken speech, N. mentioned that a woman’s part in conception is to drop the baby into this world (Prologue). Indeed, habitually her role is said – by both men and women – to be that of a container and caretaker. This is because a pregnant woman holds in her “guts” (*tripa, puku*) or *placenta* (*xama*) the “worm” (*gusano*) or “seed” (*semilla*) externalized into her by a man with his blood/semen. The foetus illustrates how that contained creature influences the hunger, which internally diversifies and makes life difficult for the owner of the belly. They say: “[it’s] dreadful! It wants to eat *ungurahui*, and if you don’t oblige it falls out” (DHR06). The ambivalent position of the foetus is comparable to that of other hungry beings within. Such as another “worm,” the tapeworm, to other guests within the bodies of an ordinary person or a sorcerer (see below). The tapeworm gets annoyed when the owner drinks alcohol and “bites” his intestines. Daniel made an explicit parallel
with other situations regarding the of containment of human bodies, referring to the pestering hunger:

Her baby wants to eat something else. Wants to eat bread, wants to eat another thing, they say. It asks from inside. Because the little one wants to eat. So that’s how our spirit (kaya) is too – it also wants to eat, our body does. Mhm, just as with the little one and the pregnant woman. It wants to eat the fruit of the ungrahui, aguaje palms: “Let’s go and cut them down!” (…) When [the mother’s] blood is weak, [the baby] beats (pega) the mother – makes her skiiiinny!^lx

Here too, the internal diversification by containing space or content is opposed to the “outside” like the potentially harmful yushin content in swollen trees, large animals, or the football (Ch. 3). The puffed belly of a woman is considered dangerous. It may influence (cutipar) a sick person and make him/her worse, causing the imitation of her own swelling (DHR20). This, Daniel explained, is because the pregnant woman “contains a lot of blood” (DHR23).

2.3.2. Trees and sorcerers

In other places or times there are said to have been widely known strong, practicing sorcerers, but there were none in the two villages where we lived. A few men, mostly married-in outsiders, were approached for minor curing, or to diagnose sorcery. What did exist, however, were the accusations and the tangible fear of sorcery. The acutely felt position of potential victims – eloquently described as “the shadow of the evil heart” by Doña Elsa – makes sorcery highly relevant and equally interesting as terrifying to people. Sickness or misfortune are habitually attributed to the supposed concealed evil practice of such men, or to services of professional sorcerers elsewhere, often commissioned by fellow community members. Therefore, although the theories on sorcery are based on other people’s stories, and conceded ignorance is the demonstration of one’s innocence (cómo quizás!), Capanahua descendants quite uniformly share them. I will return to the workings of this surreptitious influencing in the next chapter, and mention here several aspects relating to the opaque and containing “bodily” forms.

Firstly, as various people told me, all the plants have spirit owners (dueños). They can be spoken of as persons, with the equivalents of a human body parts: the

---

114 I will elucidate the imagery of procreation further in Ch. 4.
115 As far as I can tell, they are also shared, as many other ideas, by local mestizos. The system bears the general traits of the eastern Peruvian riverine shamanism (cf. e.g. Regan 1993).
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tree base is a bum, roots are feet, and in the case of ayahuma, the fruits are the head(s). Importantly, the resin flowing in the tree is “his blood” (su sangre, himi), and in Capanahua, the trunk may be referred as yura, or “body” (Loos & Loos 2003: 94). Some of these, especially the large, swollen trees such as pucalupuna, or those that are hard or spiny, such as huicungo, as well as those with a strong fragrance, like ajosacha, are said to possess higher knowledge-skills for influencing or penetrating. That is, they are considered as sorcerers (brujos, yubwe).

Secondly, what follows from this is that the tree can be a subject of relation and quench the adept’s desire for knowledge-skills. Establishing such a relation of aprendizaje [lit. learning, actually comparable to transfusion or downloading] is what becoming a sorcerer means. Anybody can try, although women are said to not be usually accepted by the trees as “students” (DHR16). The adept pierces the tree in order to access “the blood” inside (“heart”) or strips the bark itself. While doing this, he is “consejando,” that is, explaining his intentions and expressing his wish to be taught. He also leaves some tobacco as a gift. Then, in accordance with the idiom generally describing the process of becoming a sorcerer, he “takes in the tree/plant” (tomando palos/plantas/vegetales) in the form of fermented resin, bark tea, colourful worms that breed in the concoction, etc. This puts him in direct communication with the tree owner, who can also be referred to as su madre [its mother] or su yushin [its spirit], etc. In a dream, the owner presents him/herself in human form, and strikes up a conversation, “just like anyone else.” In a standard exchange, the applicant declares his needs when offered the choice between skills for curing (curar) or for killing (venganza). If the owner likes (querer) the adept, he/she may decide to “teach” him. It is said that sometimes the adept may need to fight and “dominate” (dominar) the owner.

Initially the bestowing of knowledge begins with the student swallowing an object, such as a dart, spine or phlegm from a brujo (tree or human). This is accompanied by instructions for the waking life. Most importantly, they include dieta, or specific restrictions for the flow of this-worldly substances. The diet is limited to small animals or fish with a little blood (grilled, never boiled - and with no salt), and avoidance concerns menstruating women, sexual penetration, or the warmth of fire (the tree owners are cold and do not like warmth). This process is construed as cleansing: the brujo plants are also called purgatives (purgas), and the
sorcerer – purgero. These cleanse the body, and remove associations (sucio, dirt) of this-worldly transferences. The aim of this purifying seems to be to prepare an internal space for the crías [pets, familiars, helpers, or spirits] from the tree to be introduced in the applicants’ inside. The subsequent taking in of the substances, which are vehicles for the crías, is described in terms of knowledge (saber) and learning (aprender), so much so that “to know” is a popular euphemism for sorcery skills. Importantly, as the result of this procedure, the brujo achieves a state of being “with a demon” (con demonio).

Figure 8. Brujos.
The adept takes in the resin of the tree, thus incorporating its blood, its qualities. As the process of “learning” progresses, the pupil receives all of the blood-knowledge into his body. At the same time, the teaching tree dries out, having transferred all of its content into the adept. Thus the human now contains and becomes the owner of those skills-capacities: a brujó, or the yushiman apu, “chief of (his) spirits.” The eyes of some of the most powerful brujos, who have ingested large amounts of the plants, may change to red, the same colour as the seeds of the huiruru sorcerer tree. Another way of containment refers to internalizing the yachai or virote, which is said to be the sorcery substance or darts, swallowed and lodged in his throat or stomach. The word yachai can also be used interchangeably with criás [pets, familiars] or demonios [demons, spirits], which are hosted within the sorcerer’s body, serve him and do his bidding.\(^{117}\) That is, so long as he provides them tobacco smoke (or space inside), and blood or souls of human victims which they can feast on.

A running joke when a smoker is running out of tobacco is that he has to keep smoking, lest all of his virote falls out of his body (va salir mi virote). Grimmer is the common idea that in the absence of victims, brujó’s helpers proceed to consume their host’s body. It is these demons which force him to kill people: “he/his pets want to eat” (él/su cría quiere comer), as the usual commentary explains.

It is worth pointing out some important elements of this relation. Firstly, working qualities (“children”) are externalized from within the trees, and then internalized or adopted within the purged, cleared internally human bodily form of the brujó (like the cleared outsides of social spaces of host people). Secondly, the hierarchical relation of receiving sorcery skills is a transfusion between containers.\(^{118}\) Thirdly, it is also one of replacement, or reversal, as the sorcerer’s status of owner folds back on the original tree and its extensions within the sorcerer’s body, and the original tree dries out. In the process, the brujó comes to host the tree’s gift/parts/children, and in turn is threatened by their hungers. This dynamic will be reflected in the generative processes which are discussed in Ch. 3 and 4.

\(^{117}\) What such demons are is not clear in these theories. It is, however, reminiscent of the image from one myth, where a boy glimpsed into the nature of the powerful squirrel man’s (kapabu berunan) capacities, because he saw a multitude of squirrels of all kinds, helping their “owner” to plant maize (Appendix 6.40). The description of a powerful brujó in the Capanañahua dictionary (2003: 398) is yushiman apu [lit. leader of spirits], “one who commands spirits”.

\(^{118}\) It can also be transmitted or stolen between brujos. This also flies to penetrate victims’ bodies, who become the receivers, yet in a passive position, as containers who have their contents (again, blood or souls), consumed by predator brujó.
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Normally, these complex, divergent internal contents are concealed from other people behind the brujo’s “face,” that is, the opaque human appearance. It was again in this context that I heard for the second time the expression used by Julio. Doña Germe told me about the usual suspect of sorcery in Limón, a friendly and hospitable man in my view: “(LK: and he seems really nice, doesn’t he?) He does seem nice... But you can’t see... inside of him. (...) you can see the face, but not the heart” lxxiii (GSR01). Considering the previously described, containing-differentiating nature of living humans, we should understand the sorcerer’s condition as only an extreme demonstration of the common imagery associated with human life and bodies. What Doña Elsa told me about her brother refers to the extreme alteration of his internal content, so that he ceased to be a human, and became a demonio himself, whose hunger diverges so radically that it forces him to devour his own family.

3. The other side inside

The above examples outline two general sources of opacity that I noted in Capanahua descendant's representations of the social space: one (Sect. 1) at the level of domains, that is beyond the bounds of the inhabited space, and the other at the level of bodies, beneath the external surface of the participants creating this space (Sect. 2). It seems to me that their significance for understanding the language of sociality presented in the previous chapter is fundamental.

For one, they could be seen as providing a literal background for its imagery and topology. It conditions the qualification of the social space as this side or the outside, against the surrounding opacity of the forest and the participating opaque elements, be it bodies, houses or instruments. The single, common external social space is opposed both to its opaque background, as well as to the multiple, private internal contents.

Furthermore, as we saw, both domains and bodies (as well as other objects in the social space, such as houses, community buildings, tools, bags, etc.) are also presented not only as opaquely surfaced, but importantly, containing. The assumption of containing is based on the external manifestations: swelling, depth, sizeableness (indicating internal space); sound, warmth, movement (indicating internal life); or heightened efficacy of work providing subsistence, wellbeing, influence on others, protection. They are attributed to added assistance from
imperceptible, contained agents related to knowledge, skills or capacities (saber, poder), blood (sangre), spirits or helpers (crias, demonios, etc.). These agents are said to belong to the container that they inhabit and can emerge from it to roam or work. Containing and controlling the values or forms is equivalent to being the owner (dueño, ṭişu) or “Mother” (Madre), as in the case of the imperceptible masters of animals. Valuable objects or tools also seem to be imagined as “contained” by the owner, under his protection, control, or in his house, bags, hiding places, hand or, metaphorically, inside of his body. Thus, when Blanca told me the previously mentioned story of Julio’s infamous sorcerer uncle killing his own father, she explained it with the habitual expression that the sorcerer “wants to eat” other people, his family. Remarkably, she illustrated this with gestures representing the act of drawing out from her chest, adding that the killer extracted (sacado) the chainsaw, the shotgun and the boat engine from the victim (FT1203). Similarly, we were asked to “open our hands” (abrir mano) to release the wealth that people imagined we possessed.

I have demonstrated such widely attributed physiognomy of containment as I argued, is connected to internal differences that set their owners/containers – persons – apart from each other by producing internal diversity and external opacity. For this reason, the “inside” is also the “other” side, disjunctive from the social “outside” in terms of moral disposition. Hence, paralleling the previous chapter, it could be said that for the Capanahua descendants, the spheres construed as “the inside” are “the other side.” I need to note that I have not heard anyone referring explicitly to the inside of bodies as “the other side” in the way that domains are. Still, the practice of ascribing “different thoughts,” “different desires,” “different blood/origin” etc. to the internal dimension separated by opaque surface, the “face” of persons - justifies discussing both general types of opacity as variants of similar reasoning.

4. Containing insides in an outside: Social implications

In the social dimension, as demonstrated by problems recorded in my initial field notes that open this chapter, the very possibility of containing and owning divergent content, actual or suspected, influences all relations conceived and enacted between persons or other potential containers. The imperceptible contents of other people’s minds, pockets or domains are unknowable. They are sources of anxiety, and
external surfaces or appearances are the object of suspicion and speculation as illusions or trickery (engaño). The challenge for coexistence of such opaque containers is the handling of their contents and the flows between them. I start this section with a general reflection on what the physiognomies of containment imply about making sense of connections between people. Then, I move to the position of children, who were said to epitomize the social space in the previous chapter. From there, I bring focus to what this chapter tells us about the villagers' formulations of sociality described in the previous chapter.

4.1. Across surfaces

One especially important implication of such ontological arrangement concerns the nature of relations between containers. As we saw, the examples above represent in a similar manner the acts of giving and receiving, feeding and swallowing, teaching and learning, wanting and satisfying. They might be understood in specific Capanahua descendants’ context as externalizing and internalizing across the opaque surfaces. They result in often secretive containing, and establish lasting links. Thus, in the otherworldly domains, visitors receive food, and importantly, gifts whose efficacy (channelling the connection with their original owners) is conditioned by internalization and concealment (Sect. 1). From the antiguos, the next generations receive stories of the old times and of the beginnings. They are transmitted personally, along with shelter and food from their grandparents or parents. Similarly, brujo’s body internalizes crías or knowledge extracted with the blood from the tree owner (Sect. 2). It may also be noted that the prohibitions of the brujo’s dieta are aimed at stopping transferences between bodily containers from the sorcerer’s earthly domain, or at nullying the desires that drive these transferences. Thus, for ordinary human bodily containers, traces of these transferences and desires create a bounding association with the original domain (nete as birthplace) and its other participants. As we saw, this “filth” in fact creates the external opacity, which is the “front” or “sin,” and differentiates persons from each other and from other domains. Therefore, in a world made up of containers, the flows and transferences of internal contents-belongings between them condition the persons’ existence and coexistence. This is the best candidate for what we may call “social relations.” The timing, quality,

119 It is the transference or flow of goods that leaves a link between those involved, comparable to the memory of being cared for and fed (Gow 1991, cf. also Fausto 2007, Costa 2013).
quantity and trajectories of these flows determine the kinds of positions of containment/owning - or “kinship” between persons. I will develop this in the following chapters, and consider here how this adds another aspect to the children’s position within the social space.

4.2. Generative hierarchies: children “inside” the parents

The previous chapter depicted the progeny as embodying the social space as the “outside.” But some aspects of the “emerged” children’s relations with their parents or caretakers can be understood through parallels with the positions of other living, willing and hungry forms in someone’s containment. Therefore, although I will be discussing the positions of the “contained” (\textit{ínabu}) in the later chapters, mentioning here some implications of such relation will allow a complementary perspective on children’s status in social spaces.

Firstly, they are habitually said to be en su poder de [in the power of] parents, and the expression \textit{criar}, to raise, applies equally to children as to familiars or animals, whose position is that of \textit{crias}, pets. The relation is based on unidirectional flows of substances (blood, milk, food), belongings (clothing, tools) or services (shelter, protection, care). It is thus inherently hierarchical and contrasts with the social ideal of egalitarian neighbouring and the generational groups mentioned in previous chapter. In fact, having children can be seen as responsible for the differences and separation between households, thus putting the adults in the position of having to accommodate the desires of their hungry and wilful living beings, just like the divergent contents of their hearts.

Secondly, such containing is, like all forms of mastery construed by Amazonians as an ambivalent relation (Fausto 1999), and the indelible subjectivity (desire) of the contained being presents a recurring problem. Thus, parents usually find themselves unable to influence or control their children, just as any other people, and refuse to be ultimately responsible: “what can you do” (¿qué se puede hacer?). Much of the mischief (most notably theft of food, fruits, etc.) going on in village daily life is attributed to the \textit{muchachos traviesos} [mischievous, naughty children] and their uncontrollable wilfulness and unstoppable voraciousness. Indeed, the usual explanation is that children are \textit{travieso “por instinto”} [by instinct] (the way \textit{indios} may be said to be unpredictable), and often said to be \textit{ninkayusma}, they do not know how to “listen,” that is, obey (\textit{hacer caso}). Therefore, it is not accidental that – with
their divergent needs and wills – they should be called *demonios* in exasperation. I often heard parents expressing expectations that schoolteachers are responsible for containing – sometimes through violent punishments as in the old days – and complaining that such methods are no longer allowed in Peruvian schools. School, in any case, is seen as playing a cardinal role in taming, disciplining or formatting the “*muchachos*” into the space on which they emerge.

Finally, this means that the fact that children define the social space, as mentioned in the previous chapter, takes on an ambivalent twist. In the most illustrative example, the intractable wilfulness of “*los que crecen*” [lit. those who grow] is commonly said to determine the character of the social space, so that, for example, their lack of desire (*querer*) is given as one of the popular reasons for the language shift. Much remains to be said in the remaining chapters about the relations between parents and children, and their folding back on the original inhabitants of the social space – the previous generations – and more generally, such contained, or *íñabu* positions. Here, I return to the idea of ideal sociality with these developments in mind.

**4.3. Beautiful equality**

The ideal of social clarity discussed in Ch. 1 can now be understood as one possible response to the recurring opacity and internal differentiation inherent to life. It should be noted that invoking the *kuin kuini* ideal, the villagers postulate equality across participating bodily containers through balanced, even externalization and internalization of contents. It is the ideal of neighbouring: parallel containers, optimally equal within and without.

Optimally, absolute clarity – as complete elimination of opacity – would amount to elimination of bodily form and hungers that constitute it. In Don Guillermo’s words, it would be the removal of “the front” that separates people from the heavens. As the villagers repeat, it is only permanently possible for those who have abandoned their earthly forms and find themselves invited by the side of “our owner” (*nuestro dueño, nuken í’bu*) or “father” (*papa*) *Dios*. In his heavenly realm, they experience a continuous satisfaction (*alegría*) by this “Bearded One” (*Barbón*) who provides everything. This state can therefore be understood as a lack of

---

differentiation into an outside and inside, a liberation from the condition of container or a wanting being, because the needs are being satisfied instantaneously, or even before they arise. Instead, for living humans, achieving such Amazonian ideals of “land without evil” is doubtful, although it is sometimes imagined that there are such pure ones on this earth. For example, the Hermanos [Brethren] or mestizo evangelicals, who live in the cities, and keep themselves “apart” from problems and temptations (see Ch. 5). As we learned from questions asked about “our land” – the far-away gringos are theorized as not working and still having everything, and as free from the problems infesting ordinary villagers’ lives. Those ideas redirect the focus to the literal meaning of kuin kuin.

First, kuin, glossed as “true, real” (verdadero) (Loos & Loos 2003: 138), seems to be interchangeable with “good” or “proper.” To illustrate this: Don Benigno never missed the opportunity to poke fun at his interpretation of a name assumed by another Peruvian population of Panoan descent. “They say a Cashinahua is now ashamed when others say he is Cashinahua. ‘Better change it – he says – let it be Huni Kuin!’ [laughs hard] ‘The Good People’ already (gente buena ya)! He’s no longer Cashinahua!” (BRS03). On another occasion, he explained: “they are just like us, and now they want to be huni kuin, or the “real mestizos” (mestizos legítmos)!” (BRS14). The (city) mestizos are sometimes said to be “pure,” connoting, I propose, the exemption from concealed difference, such as indigenous language or recognizable descent. Further, in local terms of authenticity as mentioned before, they are not from “somewhere else,” but are “born and raised” in what villagers see as highly cleared, durable cities. In another example, “Huni kuin ka’en siri shinanya,” [lit. The true people are obviously those with good thoughts] (Loos & Loos 2003: 138), the association between kuin sociality and harmonious organization is revealed, because as shown, the latter can be seen as a projection of “good thoughts/knowledge” (Ch. 1). I noted the “nobility” of urban spaces in Ch. 1, and will

---

121 The tierra sin mal myth or ideal (Regan 1993; cf. Villar & Combès 2014) was familiar to a man of Cocama descent settled in Limón Cocha. He was just as sceptic about the possibility of achieving it by humans on earth as Capanahua descendants are convinced of indispensability of opacity, sin and difference.

122 For example, mai kuin is “tierra buena” (Loos & Loos: 195) or “good soil.” According to Kensinger, for the related, Panoan Cashinahua, kuin category designates “real, true, known, familiar, actual, primary” (1994: 84). There is no room to recount the extensive analysis by Kenneth Kensinger or Barbara Keifenheim and P. Deshayes (2003). I will briefly return to the idea of authenticity and truth in the next chapter.

123 Translated, interestingly, as “Mature persons are the true humans” (Las personas maduras son gente verdadera).
return to the attribution of synonymy with the “real” quality in the context of descent in Ch. 4 and Ch. 5.

For most ordinary living humans, the solution for social life needs to consider the bodily condition of opacity and containment. We might therefore consider additional propositions of translation. The term kuin kuini is created by the reduplication of kuin.124 This grammatical feature in Capanahua and LUS can denote emphasis, yet it can also point to a state of scattered distribution; intermittent activity; an emergent or intermediate quality; or smell. In this sense, kuin kuini might define a “really real” or “really clean/pure” sociality, but it might as well refer to intermittent clarity both on the inside and outside of persons-containers, or to the harmoniously neighbouring clarities of containers. In other words, it may correspond to the image of “united but separate” (juntos pero separados) which the Capanahua descendants often use to describe peaceful social coexistence. It would mean a coexistence of minimised opacities and open, explicit content achieved through actions and representations of externalizing, or of opening the opacities, described in Ch. 1. The “clarity” here would be invoked as “thinking nothing,” “needing nothing,” or “being nothing” (“else”) – the same (igual nomás), between a person’s external and internal dimensions, as well as across persons. This signifies neither wanting anything (from others), nor being stingy (malo, lit. “bad”) nor concealing something (from others).

Yet, a condition for such existence or the disjunctive unity, is a third space, the clearing and composites of social space discussed in Ch. 1. As with children and their peers, this equality is only made possible by reference to encompassing, generative hierarchy that would take the problems related to recurring desires and divergences off the level of peers, or co-containees, and allow them to coexist peacefully: joined but separate. It would make them equal through a shared, hierarchical relation to another entity, enveloping the diverse “natures,” as between – returning to Daniel’s image of the manioc city – the stem cuttings brought from other fields, and between those wildly seeded and those planted by owners. Thus in human terms this can be understood as: between people of different origins, that is, descent or “blood.” This third space needs to be guaranteed by someone else, from another position, 124 With -ni adjective suffix (Loos and Loos 2003: 241).
hierarchically higher, so the knowledge and conditions should come from elsewhere. It may come from old knowledgeable people, but their knowledge, creating the spaces of antiquos with their stone axes and forest skills, is gone, and even the old ones “don’t know” (Sect. 1), or are stingy or ashamed of such knowledge (cf. Ch. 5). The contemporary externality is made through children, in other spaces, and requires other means and “cloaks of perceptibility.” The villagers explicitly expect that a flow of apoyo [help] to be provided by the people who originate the knowledge organising contemporary spaces, the municipality or the government, as I mentioned in Ch. 1.

4.4. Abandonment

From this perspective, participants in a given sociality have an internal position towards their “outside,” which is someone’s “internal” sphere, as a pen (cerco) or a house might be, by the virtue of providing the “good thoughts” organizing the village space and resources to create and maintain its structures thus enabling perceptibility/sociality. Therefore, because of the complicating, internally differentiating and desiring condition of human being depicted in the sections above, they are, in relation to this space and knowledge, like the wilful children towards their caretakers. They “sin against” it, that is, its provider, God; or break the laws of the community, against the authorities that create them. If the organizing knowledge is too weak, or lacking, they find themselves “abandoned” (abandonados) or “forgotten” (olvidados) and “sin against” each other, by desire, envy or fighting.

This is not so much an anarchistic opposition to the state, but a dark view of a human capacity to live truly united, and the fear of the opaque capacities of fellow humans. It was common during our stay to hear people complain about the quality of life with their neighbours in the village. With a sense of helplessness – referring to life on “this earth,” but also specifically to their own village – they would say publically or privately that it is impossible to live well in their community. They pointed to the painful problems created by internal contents and opacity: the lack of unity, unanimity, cooperation, organization or generosity, and the prevalence of gossip, stinginess, lies, conflicts, thefts, jealousies. In extreme cases, it was the covert release of the “evil of people” (sorcery) against one’s neighbours. Accordingly, the people’s criticism (crítica) is regularly complained about by the authorities, and actually given as the reason why many reject the cargo (authority function). On the other hand,
villagers complain about the supposed corruption and lack of sharing by those who function as authorities.

When people were especially hurt, they would say they will leave this place and this bad life. While some actually do, others prefer to settle apart from the main village with their nuclear families, in their own puestos, or next to their fields – the way they remember their antiguos lived. Then, they are close enough to send their children to school, participate in mingas, visit on Sundays or join in celebrations, but separate enough not to experience the problems of daily coexistence. They explicitly say that they do not accustom (costumbrarse) well to the village life, that they want to avoid problems and live quietly, raising their animals. Again, we could understand acknowledging and accepting the distance as another solution for living united but also separate.

Thus, when at a community reunion, the president (apu) of the village explicitly diagnosed: “We do not know how to live well!” (No sabemos vivir bien), he was repeating an expression we often heard in the village. He then asked the gathered villagers, echoing Julio’s concern stated at the beginning of this chapter, “What image (imagen) [of the village] will hermano Lucas take to his land?” The image I hope to convey is the human plea to other humans, searching for answers to humanly universal problems, rather than portrayal of the “bad” qualities of life in Limón or Berea. That the villagers are shown here to be deeply lodged within the condition, which they themselves diagnose as human existence. They oppose this to a remote, everlasting ideal of faraway places or heaven, and present themselves as utterly humanly imperfect and complex.

Conclusion

This chapter confronted the leading theme from the previous chapter, producing perceptibility, against the ideas associated with the “internal” dimension of opaque forms and the dynamics that produce them. It demonstrated their trajectories to be quite the reverse of the human work on social spaces. I argued that for the living beings, as known by the Capanahua descendants, it is impossible eliminate opacity and internal containment completely. I have identified an important aspect for

---

125 The historical, genealogical-geographical data I have gathered confirms the preference for one or two-family settlements along the river, and the existence of larger communities (Berea, Limón Cocha, or historical Monte Alegre or San Antonio) as attributed to external organization of mestizo employers or SIL missionaries.
understanding opacity as the ultimately void nature hidden behind and producing such opacities. Hungers, desires and wills are articulations of that void, and their kinds and levels determine the “internal” nature of humans and other beings. I have suggested those ideas to be are related to the language of containing/owning, which produces the impression that one of the important metaphors for organizing the world by the villagers is that of containers, and the quality or “nature” of their contents or hungers.

The aim of this chapter was to situate in a broader context the conceptual work behind sociality’s ideal perceptibility presented in the first chapter. Considering the implications of such ontological ordering, I suggested, most importantly, that internal containing of voids is inherent to the human condition and produces ordinary social problems. Yet, it is conceivable, for the villagers, to live in an “external space” where the inherent and recurring differences, or “internal contents,” can in turn be contained in a larger, “third” sphere of non-differentiation that organizes and enables coexistence of divergent elements: a containment of joined-separate elements. As in Daniel’s opening image of manioc cultivation, based on the aesthetics/ethics of social spaces, an “outside” sociality is made out as a way of handling the “insides” or differences, allowing an encompassing, uniting quality.

An important implication concerns the position of contained elements, whose ambivalent position I have outlined in various contexts. I have suggested, and will continue to develop the related ideas in this thesis, that this ambivalence concerns the progeny. While children epitomize such transcendence of social space as an “outside” (in Ch. 1), considering the dynamizing constellations of positions of containment in this chapter, I have pointed out that they can also be seen as the “inside” which eventually folds back onto previous generations. That, as will be argued, is a profound point and hints at the mediatory role of progeny, between inside and outside, alternating generations, or father and mother, etc. The following chapters will attempt to develop this trope by considering the temporal existence of these topologies and their relation to the generative processes.

Finally, in a related dimension, I have suggested that the villagers occupy an “internal” position in relation to a larger, organizing, and transcending knowledge that comes from elsewhere, and belongs to someone else, because the knowledge and conditions that create it are always attributed to specific original providers, or
“owners.” Thus, while for Capanahua descendants, sociality of neighbours (alegría) encourages equality and sameness, then, as the examples of this chapter show, and as I will continue to argue in the later chapters, disparity in quality and quantity of contents-belongings is indispensable for living and reproducing. It determines the kinds of relations or transferences, established between persons, and results in the ubiquity of differences and hierarchies. If the relation between parents and children is conceived of as one between containers (givers) and containees (receivers), then it is marked by a fundamental, explicitly acknowledged unevenness and hierarchy. Because such hierarchical relations of transference in specific conditions define “real kin” for Capanahua descendants, what we may call kinship is opposed to what we could call village sociality, which is defined by equality (as neighbouring). It is this process of procreation and production of hierarchy, reflecting the more general ideas of causality that is addressed in the next chapters.
This chapter is devoted to analyzing the nature and terms of the generative or causative processes in the Capanahua descendants’ formulations. The key category in this chapter is *ejemplar*. The initial two sections present alternative analytical viewpoints on its meaning, firstly as telling or giving account, and secondly as incepting. The first introduces such tellings and the way villagers treat these and the second outlines the commentaries that accompany retellings, making sense of these as accounts of inceptions. Further, some general features of the Capanahua descendants’ ways of making sense of originating or causality emerge. These are contextualized in section 4, which exits the sphere of narratives and outlines some parallels in explanations of daily life. Section 5 offers general conclusions about the characteristics of time and generative processes that emerge from all these explanations, and relates them to topologies presented in the previous chapters. As a whole, this presentation lays out some basic dynamics that prove helpful in approaching the imagery of generative processes in persons that is the subject of Chapter 4.

1. Giving account

*Wetsa hui xeni, wetsa ehempuru* [(That’s) another old story, another example], Amelia Romaina explained to one of the SIL missionaries in 1969 (Loos & Loos nd.a) as she began to tell another of the many stories they recorded together. In 2012, Don Benigno, who is the husband of Amelia’s granddaughter, explained the nature of the *wini ii* lament in the recording of a Sharanahua woman that I played for him (see Prologue):

She cries recalling the past. What had taken place, her fathers, mothers... One stays behind to make an example (*ejemplo*) of it all. This is it, “exemplifying” (*ejemplando*) the ancient ones (BRS15)

---

126 *Hui* also stands for speech, word, language. In general, we might say “ways of speaking” (cf. the connection with the heart in Ch. 2).
This first use of *ejemplo/ehempuru* is closer to the meaning in Medieval Spanish or English *exemplum*: “a moralizing tale, parable or illustrative story” (Oxford English Dictionary). Like its Capanahua counterpart *hui*, it can be used for a particular story: *Wishmabu ehempuru* [story of the star man], *xakú ehempuru* [story of the earthworm], *Xaʾeya ʾinu hui* [story of anteater and jaguar] etc. More broadly, these stories belong to a genre of narratives spoken of as *yuwan xeni* [talk of old], *xeniban hui* [stories of (our) ancient ones]. Such stories are also called *cuentos* [stories] or *historias* [histories] of the *antiguos* [the ancient ones] in LUS. The New Testament (Loos & Loos 1978) in Capanahua also received the title *Nuken ṭbaan Hui* – “The Stories of Our Owner.”

These are accounts of the old people, referring to what, as argued in Ch. 2, could be understood as the other “worlds” (time-places) that existed before the existence and experience of the listeners. Such accounts are introduced to the present by those who have “known” them in the same sense as described in Ch.1, or by people who “knew” such persons. These are usually attributed to a specific person from earlier generations, who imparted them to the narrator. The older the person, the more he or she is expected to know about the *antiguo* domains. Doña Anita illustrated this when she told us that when she admits to not knowing much of the past, her daughter says: “You have got old in vain if you don’t know anything!” It is, because – she explained – her own grandmother used to tell her stories, but “not all of it” (ACH01). Similarly, Don Romer, who had never met his grandfather, would say: “Why is it that the old one does not exist anymore, the old-timer, my grandpa, so that he could explain to me how the *antiguos* were – of the pasts (*pasados*), of his times” (RPR07). Thus the stories refer to:

The ancient ones, what they... When we are not (yet existing) – like this, what they have done, how they lived. Like we live today – how they lived before! Aha. What they did. Like that, so that’s why what’s-her-name... grandma Ermelinda used to tell those.”

The stories might reach the “ancient ancestors” (*antiguos-antiguos*), living in the remote past, before grandfathers and their grandfathers, and are then comparable to myths told by other Amazonians and Panoans. Their protagonists can be described as *primera generación* [first breed], and in the biblical stories, as *ʾepa kuin* “first
fathers” [lit. “real fathers,” also FFF]. However, “exemplifying”127 may also speak about the “ancient ones” (antiguos) whom the narrators or their parents knew, and the old ones may also be counting their own experiences. All of these remote times related by the old people are assumed to be closer to the “beginnings” (principio) or “origins” (generación).

Capanahua descendants understand that the stories were imparted from such remote “worlds,” and were meant to be passed on, even forcefully:

“Listen to what I’m telling you!” – [my dad] would tell me in the evenings. I was a little girl so would drowse off: [demonstrates how her dad would hit her lightly] “Listen to me!” – He would tell me. “Listen or I will not tell you anything. So that you may recount it when one day you have your own kids” – he would tell me. He would frighten me in this way. “I am listening, papi!” – I would say (lying!) [laughs].xcii (GSR04)

As I noted in Ch. 2, the times of the “old ones” belong to an obscure, bizarre dimension, and this lowered trust seems to reflect the assumption about their ultimate unknowability. Because these are experientially removed, villagers questioned the veracity of the stories. When I inquired about the perspectival details of the stories, which Don Guillermo had just finished telling me, he explained:

Those are stories! What happened to fishermen (fisgeros) or hunters (cazadores) or ajuasis, aha [laughs]. (...) Are they true (cierto) or just stories?... Like with the Incas,128 the legends (leyendas) – it must be similar. I don’t really (know) myself.xciii (GHR05)

Indeed, stories of antiguos are often said to be “just stories” (cuentos nomás), for example; “my mother used to tell this [story] – I don’t know if it’s true (cierto) – as it’s a story (cuento)"xciv (AFC01). The extract of conversation with Doña Germe, who had earlier asked me several questions about the world far away, including its limits (cf. Ch. 2), illustrates this attitude further:

(LK: Why did you ask me if there were any people on the moon?) (...) Well, wondering... is it true that the científicos [scientists] go there. (...) (LK: Do you think that this used to be a man who lived with his sister?) whooooooknows... (LK: was it made like this?) ——— How?! — But in the Bible it says that God created the moon, the sun... Mhm... well, this [the Moon myth] would be a story... (LK: just a story then?) I think so... (LK: So what the Bible says would be more true?) Well, I

*127 It needs to be remembered that this use of the word is an attempt to translate the villagers’ conceptions, and is not borrowed from philosophy.
*128 “Inca” in this context refers most likely to the school curriculum and Peruvian common knowledge, rather than to the use of this name in Panoan myths (see above). In the latter context, the only mention of the Inca name is to be found in connection with the manioc miser (Appendix 6.49) in Victor’s version from the Frontera Lower Capanahua cluster, and in Emiliano Freire’s version in (Loos & Loos 1976a).
don’t know. What do you think? (...) If Bible says that God has created everything: moon, sun, stars, the earth... Mhm – how could it be made out of (formar de) a man? – That’s what makes me think sometimes. (ŁK: So the stories may be wrong?) I think so... – (ŁK: why were the [old ones] telling them then?) I don’t know... That’s why I say: it’s a story! That one is. A... nothing but a STORY!xcv

As such, these stories could be treated as “shenanigans” (engaños). When I came by to listen to the stories promised by Don Jorge, he greeted me saying blithely: “Ok, let’s lie [engañarnos] for a while!”xcv (JRR05) referring to the stories for which he said earlier, the younger generations had ridiculed the old, tattooed grandma Ermelinda as the “demon things” (cosas de demonio). Thus, when Don Benigno told me he was glad to be reminded about these stories, it was precisely because they were amusing: “I do like to laugh remembering how my mother would tell me how they [antiguos] used to have sex [showing his joints] – (see Ch. 4, Appendix 6.55)] [laughs]. She would make me laugh (...): ‘How could they be doing that here, mum?’.” His mother was also apparently at a loss, and would respond: “Well, the antiguos...” – as if this already explained a lot – “They would do it there.” She also commented “Hawera nuken xenibu hapunishki, ihun [How indeed could our ancestors have been doing this like that, son...].” In any case, “That is what my mother used to tell me” – added Don Benigno as is usual with reported speech, especially such stories – it was “what (...) her mother used to tell to my mum.”xcvii (BRS09).

Notwithstanding the doubts and scepticism, such stories are expected to speak of origins. As one of the now antiguos, Emiliano Freire, explained to Loos in 1955, they take place when “the people and the earth were still fresh/new” and there were no diseases.xcviii They can be described as matian huibu [the stories from the ahead/first times] (Loos & Loos nd.b). It will be easier to proceed to this idea with one “example” in mind that will be especially helpful here, because apart from offering a first glance into mythology, it introduces the imagery of the stems and branches that will play an important role as the argument advances.

**Origin of manioc**

Among the stories most often recorded by both SIL as well as myself is one that can be referred to as “the one who was stingy with his manioc” (yu’a yuwashiti) or “the creator/maker of the day” (neteanika) [lit. “the one who makes the world” – see Ch. 2 for meanings of nete]. The story’s outline, largely consistent across versions, deals with the relation between an owner of a manioc field (the creator, Neteanika)
and a group of *antiguos* living next to him. They are under his care, and whenever they need it, he provides them with manioc (sometimes also other staples, and in Victor’s Lower Capanahua version, additionally, metal axes). Yet, the *antiguos* cease to be satisfied. They develop the desire to plant on their own and to have what their hitherto provider figure has. If the creator is called “the stingy one,” it is because he refuses to share the effective way of planting manioc with his wards. A condensed version told by Doña Eloisa (c. 75),\(^{129}\) went like this:

There used to be this one. He had his things only to himself. The people did not have anything. So they would go and ask that he give them, like this - like one eats manioc. He would give to them. So, they would do that and then one man said: [for myself!]. He himself wanted to plant his field. He went to break off a branch of manioc. There were wasps [Wilma (c. 50) chuckles], vipers, all kinds of animals, *isula* [bullet ants], aall of these stung the man. Bit him. *Jergón* [pit viper], wasps... He snatched one little branch of manioc. He went away running. The wasps following behind him! With all of that, he left it, inserting it into a rotten tree trunk. There he left his stalk of manioc. And there goes the owner, furious – why, he says, did he touch it!? He wants to be shown it, they say. He wants to be taken to where the manioc stalk was put [Wilma chuckles]. They go to look: tremendously thick. It looks like a *lupuna* tree. Its branches – on all sides. Then he taught [the thief] how he was going to do it – every branch had its name. In doing that, he left for the sky, too. With his whole house. There it arises. Mhm. He took off. And that’s why we plant manioc. Mhm. (ŁK: And what was the name of this owner?) Whoo knows! They didn’t say his name.\(^{130}\) What [kind of] people might he have been!?\(^{xci}\) (ECH01)

In a move of resignation or anger, the owner gives in – the only attitude that Capanahua descendants seem to consider possible towards someone’s intrusive nagging. When taken to where the thief planted the stem, he teaches the thief the manioc cultivars kinds/names, as well as how to plant and harvest the crop. Having done so, the owner orders a large quantity of manioc beer from his wife and begins to drink day and night, pounding on a drum, feasting. Every day, his house on poles is elevated until it is no longer seen, and presumably ends up in heaven (Appendix 6.49). The story ends here – as the Capanahua descendants say.

2. Explaining ejemplos

Before they finish, however, a commentary is usually added which relates the story to the present condition. This section is devoted to these commentaries. It is

---

\(^{129}\) She told it hurriedly in LUS to a slightly confused stranger, a Polish man whom she saw for the second time in her life, and who came asking about her grandparents and parents.

\(^{130}\) Repeating the story his stepmother Doña Hilda Chumo told him, Daniel associated the figure with *Dios* (God) or *Jesús*, and the protagonist who steals the manioc is *Adán*, while *Eva* is Jesus’ wife. Victor Panarua, the Neabu of the Lower Capanahua (i.e., Pahenbaquebo), recalled that his paternal grandfather calling the figure “*Inka*.” Interestingly, Don Benigno associated this figure with another ancient figure living in the sky domain, *Wishmahu* (Star man).
also here that the second use of \textit{ejemplo} becomes important, and allows insight into what the villagers expect these stories to be (accounts of origins for elements of the present world, regardless of their admitted veracity), and how they make them meaningful. At the same time, they introduce some basic ideas about the villagers’ constructions of causality. In this section, I outline several characteristics of such explanations of the stories of \textit{antiguos}, and will turn to their instantiations in other spheres later in this chapter. I show that the \textit{ejemplos} as stories are made to talk about the actions seen as making \textit{ejemplo} or \textit{ejemplar}, which have lasting consequences for the future.

Here, it should be noted that stories recorded by the Looses and Thelma Schoolland between the 1950s and 1970s with previous generations of the villagers are accompanied by strikingly similar commentaries. This may suggest that interpretations are transmitted along with the stories. While the extent of related representations in contemporary applications to various stories testifies to their vitality, it is impossible to locate them in the broader context of Capanahua representations from 50 years ago. Therefore, by reaching out to these old comments, I can only read them through contemporary contexts, just as the Capanahua descendants are doing.

\textbf{2.1. Precedent}

Consider how Don Benigno and Don Romer, at different places and times, explained to me why Jesus died on the cross:

\textit{Making an example, so that... we suffered (for) the sin. He pays [pagar] [us] for the sin with his death, it says in the Scripture. So that we, [his] “children,” later pay [for] this sin.} \textsuperscript{c} (BRS19)

\textit{“Dirt of the earth! The day you die, you will turn into the dirt of the earth. (...) To the hole in the ground, you shall return. The grave!”} – said Jesus Christ to Adam [who has just eaten the forbidden fruit]. Therefore, it is that they bury us. Because he left the example, dying on the cross at Calvary, only because of our sin.\textsuperscript{c} (RPR07)

The illustrative force of this example lies, I believe, in the difference between the way Christ’s death tends to be interpreted in other parts of the world, and the interpretation provided by these two men, which, in turn, is similar to the way stories of \textit{antiguos} are presented and interpreted by the Capanahua descendants. Firstly, for Christians elsewhere, the cross of Calvary stands for the sacrifice, which cleansed
humans from primordial sin. Here, suffering and death are endured by the annoyed, departing Jesus in order to impart continuous reproduction of this state in humans, as punishment or harm “repaid” for their ancestors’ disobedience. Secondly, the use of *ejemplo*, which underlies this interpretation, echoes more broadly in the villagers’ ways of explaining the processes of generating. This broadness makes it important as a guide to contemporary representations of causality.

In such commentaries, the original occurrence of a feature is referred to as *ejemplo*, and the producer’s innovative action, *ejemplar*. It is closer to the several aspects of English “example,” according to OED:

3. A signal instance of punishment intended to have a deterrent effect; a warning, caution; a person whose fate serves as a deterrent to others. (...) 6a. A person’s action or conduct regarded as an object of imitation (...); b. In generalized sense: Action or conduct that induces imitation; hence, ‘influence that disposes to imitation’ (...). A pattern, design to be copied.

Here, both uses of *ejemplo* converge: *ejemplos* give account of the acts of “making ejemplos.” Commentaries interpret the stories as origin accounts of specific features of the world, tracing them to their very source. Sometimes, when talking about some object, people would tell me: “this one too, has its story” (*ese también tiene su cuento*). Therefore, protagonists are interpreted as the originators, a described event as the cause, and the presently existing feature, as the effect. The present thus owes a specific attribute to its single, original author/event; it is “because of” (*por, kupi*) them that it exists. It permanently alters the previous state, conditioning the present. Consequences of that original event are present and felt by contemporary people. The feature is thus a trace of the original event and its producer in the present. It is, as Moises told me apropos the Moon story, a *recuerdo* [memento], or *herencia* [heritage], and significantly, *castigo* [punishment] of its producer:

He stayed on the moon, until now. That’s why it has that stain. And from then on his punishment is: that every moon [month] a woman menstruates. All because of this [incident in the story]. (...) (In what way perhaps,) [The moon] they say, has imparted his memento on [the woman], leaving her pregnant: so that every month she... For all the women! He left his heritage, the punishment.\(^{123}\) (MHC01)

\(^{123}\) All the villagers declare themselves Christians. Christian content today comes from evangelical church sermons, reading the Bible, or the LUS mestizo tradition, or “folk religion” (Regan 1993: 13). The protagonists (Adam and Eve, Noah, and Jesus or God) or entire stories directly or loosely associated with the Bible are presented in accordance with the general way of constructing other stories or explanations of the *antiguos*. This use has not been recorded in the published SIL material, save for a few mentions of *Dios* in the apparently more “local” stories.
2.2. Conditioning frustration

The *ejemplo* precedent may be formulated as conditioning and frustrating. It is formulated as conditioning because an event/protagonist is pointed to as establishing a feature of the contemporary world: “if it were not for [the precedent], there would not be [the feature].” It is frustrating because the event prevents continuity of a previous or potential condition: “it would have been [a condition], had it not been frustrated by [the precedent].” Usually, *ejemplo* is associated with a harmful outcome, working in a differentiating way similar to the instantiation of internal contents in the previous chapter. This is already evident in the reversal of the way other Christians interpret their Messiah’s death, suggested in the above comment regarding the Moon story, and indeed most prominent in other similar comments to the different origin stories.

The villagers’ readings of the manioc theft story are equally illustrative. First, it needs to be kept in mind that manioc is vital to the Capanahua descendants as a staple crop. Additionally, for the past 30 years, on the Tapiche (in Limón Cocha), the fermented and roasted manioc which is the *fariña* (manioc flour), buys clothes, children’s school utensils, DVD players, etc. One might therefore think that the story is read as a heroic acquisition of an important, life-sustaining plant. Yet, if the story was told with commentary, narrators focused not on the acquisition of an asset itself, but instead on the cost of suffering that this acquisition inflicted: the heavy labour associated with cultivating manioc, juxtaposed with the potential of living peacefully – to each his own, joined in the owner’s care, but separate (cf. Ch. 1 and 2):

He [the owner] took off, leaving us. Because of that we are like this, look: suffering, weeding... taking the manioc out, carrying it to drop in the water, roasting. If it wasn’t for this, it wouldn’t have been this way. With only his power: there’s your *fariña*. There’s your... the whole of your field, already done! He would give it in this form, all done. To everyone his own field: [here] field, [here] field. But this one [field] you (...) don’t have to look after it at all. All with his power. And again the manioc will be there [after harvesting] – it’s not going to end, ever! Never-never is it going to end. Like this, like this – it’s going to be living [continue regrowing].

(DHR07)

Even the laconic commentary in Doña Eloisa’s extract of the story is to such an effect: “And that’s why we plant manioc.” Further, the story is also often read as the origin of thievery:
In those times there used to be no wicked people. (But) as they stole that manioc stalk... because of this they steal today. Aha, he had set an example (ejemplado), the thief. (BRS13)

2.3. Devolution

It is such ambiguous, causative-frustrative character or rather the focus on ruinous, frustrative consequences of the altering incidents associated with the processes of generating, that I find common in the villagers’ commentaries on the stories. While ejemplo can be either conditioning or frustrating, the features it is most often interpreted to condition are burdensome if not harmful, and the elements interpreted as frustrated by it tend to be advantageous. I suggest that all the stories susceptible to construal as accounts of origins tend to be employed by the narrators and listeners to answer the questions embedded in their views of the present world. Therefore, the originating elements that these comments focus on echo the very problems that Ch. 2 suggests be diagnosed as inherent to life by the Capanahua descendants. On the whole, they are made to explain the unnaturally broken nature of the world on this side.

I have already mentioned that the Capanahua descendants tend to characterize life on this earth as suffering (see Ch. 1 and 2), so it should not be surprising that the features for which their comments most often hypothesize origins are human misery and finiteness. Suffering, as noted in Ch. 1, is in fact equivalent to “labour.” The comments therefore make the stories explain various dimensions of the contemporary condition marked by necessity – in the often-repeated expression – of “suffering to have” (a tener sufriendolo (AFC01)). This includes not only being forced by the living conditions to work on the field and produce one’s food or tools, make the effort to travel, etc., but also to suffer the labours of childbearing, birth and childcare. Overall, these features diagnose the contemporary predicament as the responsibility for the labour of reproduction (either of plants, goods, people or united communities), related to the finiteness of the earthly condition (death, overgrowing, breaking of tools, etc.) and recurring hunger, problems or conflicts.

Even if the conditional interpretation refers to the origin of a useful element or an asset, it does not escape ambiguity. The downside is the price paid for it. Acquisition of manioc is one example. It could be compared with the comments on the story of the squirrel lad (Kapabu) (Appendix 6.40), who re-introduces maize to the starving people. The side effect is that upon receiving it, they cast away packages
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filled with clay. They had been carrying them long distances to eat. This dropping is explained as giving origin to the hills which make travelling on land tiresome on the upper Tapiche and Buncuya. In yet another story, a human woman receives the knowledge of a plant from a mouse woman. It enables her to deliver children, and thus evade the services of the *endemoniado Nawishnika* midwife, whose method consists of tearing the women’s belly open, extracting the baby, and consuming the patient who passed away in the process (Appendix 6.47). Yet it is also the reason for the curse of “giving birth through their arses.” Although it becomes possible to deliver children without dying in the process, the downside is one’s own labour and suffering associated with it.

The previous or possible states before the precedent are juxtaposed to the contemporary world. Therefore, there is no suffering or work, either on the field, or in bearing children. To reverse the previous expression, they illustrate a state of “having without suffering,” where there is no need to reproduce anything, no hungers, no internal voids/contents, because someone is already taking care of us.

If such questions testify to the Capanahua descendants’ concerns with the present world, they also suggest a general diagnosis of the flow of time on this earth from an ideal to one increasingly flawed. It is marked by devolution as a consequence and echo of the original frustration by *ejemplo*. It is worth noting how this opposition between the ideal past or potential future reflects, in a temporal and causal dimension, the concern with opposition between the social ideal of the outside and the inside incapacity to “live well.” Therefore, *ejemplo* could be understood as morally ambivalent, if not negative, and the result could be called, as Moises showed, “a punishment.” The protagonists are hardly interpreted as heroes who have made life possible for people. It is precisely because of them that humans suffer.

3. Inceptions in stories

In search of the villagers’ ways of representing causality in the generative processes, I review some elements of those stories that tend to be accompanied by comments on inceptions.\(^{132}\) I look at their content through the above comments, which I assume suggest the way in which they might be of any interest for the

\[^{132}\text{There are other thematically distinguishable types of stories told by the Capanahua and their descendants. The most salient themes/genres are: animals outsmarting each other; “historical” stories involving the kidnapping of wives; ghost/demon stories or people who turn out to be animals or/and cannibals; adventures with yashingo, the ineffective hunters, and so on.}\]
descendants of the Capanahua within the broader context of specific, local representations of the trajectories of time and images of creation-destruction involved in generative processes. Therefore, approaching the stories as describing critical moments of ejemplar, I focus on the specific terms and conditions (events, entities and relations) that allow the villagers to see these as accounts of inceptions. What kinds of stories respond to such commentaries? How do they make sense in the wider lived world of the Capanahua descendants?

3.1. Basic techniques of exemplifying

Firstly, I present some common ways of imaging inception, or ejemplar, which I identify as teaching and learning, embodying exemplification and compulsive mimesis, and naming the future, or cursing. The next sub-section introduces another “technique” of producing a similar effect in stories, which is central to developing the argument.

One of these techniques is illustrated in the story of how people learned to have sex (Appendix 6.55). It explains, to the amusement of listeners (Sect. 1), that at the time, men ejaculated by copulating with the closed armpits, elbows or behind the knees of the women. They did not penetrate vaginas, because, as Don Benigno repeated after his mother, they took it for an open ulcer (sipiwan, llaga, uta [Lupus vulgaris]). Women gathered the sperm released in this manner in gourd shells, which they, as external caretakers, hung high, initially close to the ceiling. Then, as the foetus was growing and forming inside, the container was gradually lowered. After 9 months, it would brake and the child would emerge and receive the mother’s milk. It is in this context that one man discovers the brown capuchin monkeys (generally associated with mischief, travesura), copulating through the vagina (see Ch. 4). On his return home, he tells his wife about his discovery and they try it out. This goes well and soon all the women want to try it. Thus, the new way was “taught” and is still imitated today. Yet, this “teaching” is contextualized, for example, by a sorcerer’s “learning,” which relies on “downloading” substantial contents (“blood”) with specific qualities (Ch. 2) and subsequent bodily practices; or by “knowing” place-times and “learning” them, “getting used” or “tamed” into them – all based on the premise of interpenetration (Ch.1). Such context bridges the distance to another way

133 In one of Amelia’s versions it is the earthworm’s son who tells this to his grandmother, but there the story stops (Loos & Loos 1976b).
of “exemplifying.” In other stories, widespread and enduring features such as being stingy or envious, and stealing, are instantiated by a first, single act, in a similar way to the manioc theft story.

More illustratively, a young man was publically disgraced when his close female relative (in various versions, sister, (parallel) cousin, or a niece) revealed her discovery that he had surreptitiously impregnated her. In the story, he decides to leave the earth and become the moon. Before climbing to the world above, he swallows a bowl of achiote soup, so that he can spray the blood coloured diarrhoea on the world that he leaves behind. In this way, through an embodying exemplification, the man who became the Moon inflicts menstruation – the memento or punishment (see above) – which encumbers all the women left behind in this world (Appendix 6.58). Christ’s death on the cross for Don Benigno and Romer is similar, in that it inflicts the compulsive mimesis of suffering and death into the condition of the humans left behind.

The hybrid child of an earthworm (xakú bake) uses a different, but conceptually related technique, to which I devote more attention below. The wives of his mother’s brothers, having found conta or shapaja (xebun/ xebun nuwe) palm fruits in the forest, insist on consuming these on the spot and ignore the boy’s hurrying. Finally, growing impatient, he shouts towards the women: “There goes a troop of monkeys!” Whereupon his aunts let out monkey cries, and transform into white capuchins and squirrel monkeys. For this reason these species bear designs said to be tattooed on the antiguo women’s faces. What Moon accomplished by physically instantiating the condition left behind him, the earthworm’s son does by the power of voice, language or naming or in other words, by naming their future state – cursing (maldecir). Jesus (qua Neteanika) does something similar: “In that way he cursed us (maldecido): Thus you will live, making your fields, stealing, betraying!”cvi (DHR07); likewise, Nawishnika: “Thus you will live! Delivering your children through your arses!”cvii (RPH02).

---

134 Culo, pu’inki - rather than chishpi, vagina.
3.2. Another technique: insemination

The novelty of ejemplar is juxtaposed to previous states of place-times where these features were not “known.” Their newness implies difference, and the introduced element is connected in virtually all cases with the input into a lived space from a foreign or divergent figure. This is significant, and opens the way for seeing ejemplar as moments in which difference is introduced. As I mentioned, these can be compared to the appearance of contents/voids which incept internal differentiation described in Ch. 2. Furthermore, the above images of exemplifying difference can be understood – in the broader contexts for local formulations of learning or knowing as interpenetrations – as paralleling one more “technique of exemplifying” as imparting content or quality: inseminating.

From this perspective, another kind of story told by the villagers and their ancestors is closely related to those stories which trace the origins of the world’s features or blemishes. Yet, their substantial difference may assist in ushering a perspective proposed below: in these stories, the frustrative action is taken before imparting can take place. These are the stories of clandestine sexual relations with animals: a woman having an affair with a boa (Appendix 6.53), another with a tapir (6.3), and another with a giant earthworm (6.62), as well as a man with a sloth (6.47), a deer (6.12), or a tapir (6.4.). With one momentous exemption, all these relations are discovered early enough to kill the animal and prevent insemination, or at least the birth of a hybrid child. These liaisons are brutally laid bare in the stories: the heads of the sloth and the boa are hurled before the devastated lovers, who are ridiculed by their families and the narrators. My point is that these stories could be seen as examples of frustrated introductions of significant difference – in other words, frustrated actions of ejemplar. This becomes especially evident once we are familiarized with the only hybrid child to survive, the son of an earthworm (xakú bake) (Appendix 6.62). This one exception produces events, which transform a regular story of human-animal liaison into a story of conditioning frustration (“originating”). It also becomes important for my argument on the nature of the

---

135 It may be noted that the stories of undesired insemination tend to refer to animals, and not, for example, celestial beings. Also consider that xakú is from another, concealed domain – the underground – so may have a status other than regular animals, and thus explain the eventual turn of the story. Further, all of the animals portrayed in such stories of liaisons are reported to have been harmful when eaten, and thus excluded from the diet by the antiguos.
generative process, as I understood it among the villagers. The next two sub-sections are largely driven by the retelling of that story and its wider implications.

3.3. Childhood of the Earthworm’s son: exemplifying divergence

Sequences from the earthworm’s boy’s life make it into one of the longest stories told by the villagers’ ancestors, and the “fullest” version has been recorded by SIL (Loos & Loos 1976b). Here, preventive action is taken, and the animal father is found and killed by the woman’s mother. Alas, it is too late. The woman gives birth to a multitude of little earthworms, and the last one to come out is in human baby form. Another attempt is made to get rid of the anomalous, “demon” (see Ch. 2) child: it is thrown out into the bush. However, this attempt, too, is thwarted. The woman’s mother takes pity on the infant when she hears it addressing her as grandmother and she picks it up. The baby boy grows extraordinarily fast, and soon his skills are revealed when he dries out a lake to allow the fish to be collected. Yet they soon turn against members of his mother’s family who ignore or mistreat him. I have already mentioned how he cursed the aunts into monkeys. He does the same to his grandmother and his grandfather, producing a tapir and a deer. Growing up, xakú bake, or hijo de gusano, wanders off, and uses his skill to produce a future by naming (cursing). He creates various lines of named descent groups suffixed as -bu [kinds] or -bakebu [lit. children – descendants] which narrators listed as their contemporary kaibu, Lists vary depending on the narrators and the breeds they were familiar with.  

We can see that in this early stage of the story, the boy’s actions seem to explain why animal inseminations have been so vehemently prevented in the other cases. Here, the successful hybrid insemination initially wreaks havoc. The boy is presented as a wilful, easily irritable child, whose “mismatched content” or heightened efficacy (poder, power) produces serious damage. Although externally he appears as “one of us” (nuke kuin) to his mother’s kin, yet, being a child of a radical stranger he is actually a potentially dangerous foreigner himself, whose diverse capacities (content) harm members of the “outside” that he emerged onto, and who at least partially took care of him.

136 Lists vary depending on the narrators and the breeds they were familiar with.
This opposition to the outside, here inflicted by insemination by a foreigner, parallels other situations described in the stories. There, this original “outside” being thwarted is explicitly associated with an owner figure, either in the form of a single domain (e.g. Neteanika’s or Nawishnika’s), or in the form of support through a gift “internally” and secretly linked to his hyper-efficacy (Kapabu, Wishmabu, dueño de animales). The frustrating point, however ambiguous the owner figure, consists of an act of disobedience towards the owner’s instruction or established rules. Numerous examples of such divergence leading to rupture have already been mentioned. In Neteanika’s story it was the theft of manioc (Appendix 6.49), and in Jesus’ (God’s) garden, the disobedience of the prohibition of eating the fruit (6.6). Similarly, it was finding an alternative way to give birth against the rules established by the horrific stellar midwife Nawishnika (6.48), or ignoring the hurrying of the earthworm’s boy and, later in his story (see below), disobeying his instructions regarding the handling of his gifts (6.62). It was also the refusal to go along with the Moon’s intention of having children with his relative (6.58). In earlier chapters, I mentioned revealing the origin of hyper-efficient tools in the story of the Star man (6.61), and so on. The list goes on, and posits internal contents/voids – desire, envy, ambition and claims to have and produce by one’s own, curiosity, pride, lack of self-control, etc. – as the reasons for opposition.

Thus, seen from the perspective of his mother’s receiving social space, the young Earthworm’s son’s mischief might be taken as representative of the “sin/harm” (Ch. 2) of a will divergent from the containing figure or space, a seed of disharmony which harms the pure place-time or the connection to the sponsor through his gift. As Germán explained, there is always un borracho, a drunk, who speaks “unnecessary things” (ERS01)(6.40), or as Celso said, “there is always a jealous one” (CBR02)(6.61), etc. There is always something, which prevents people from following the rules established in the external space that hosts them (adj. ninkayusma, lit. “unable to listen, abide by” – cf. children’s position in Ch. 2). Although the owner is not killed in these other stories, as in corresponding motifs of stories told by other
traditions – he is offended or disappointed, and ultimately he/she always goes away.

In some cases, the departing owner leaves the element alienated from him- or herself, but causes an alteration or void that gives it the form of a punishment (castigo). It becomes an invalid remainder, harmful rather than useful, causing pain and suffering rather than maintaining life and nurturing wellbeing. A reminder of what could have been the very image and memento of reasons for the human condition of imperfection and finiteness. That state of desperate desolation caused by this disobedience is movingly described in Doña Florentina Romaina’s (Don Romer’s mother) story. After the Star man (Wishmabu) withdraws his power/helpers from the tools provided to his earthly friend:

“This is how he [the Star] did it...” – [the man] said while he marked the boundary of his desired field. He struck with the [previously self-working] axe, but nothing happened [the spirits helpers of the Star did not come to work]. Nothing happened anymore. Nothing was done, there was no field. His manioc stalks dried up. So he marked the limits by himself and began felling the trees, but the [wondrous, stone] axe broke. Aha. It broke. With his own strength he then cleared a little space, but it came out ugly [cf. Ch. 1], and when he planted some manioc stems, they grew small and unhealthy. [To make holes] for planting, he used the wooden lever [that he received from the Star], but when he put it in the ground, it broke as well. That was the punishment (kastikani) of the Star [man]. He already needed to suffer to plant. We have to do it in the same way now. We too have to work hard to make a field. Just like he did. It ends there, brother. Here [the story] stops. (Loos & Loos 1976a: 171–72)

Overall, the human divergence, in representations mentioned in Ch. 2 – the inability to live well – is portrayed both as a reason why these stories usually go wrong for the people, and as the cause of the present state, or “example” internalized by later generations, the *chini bakebu* [lit. children that follow behind, “the youngest/last children,” that is, descendants]. Ejemplo in such stories could be presented or understood as either the *antiguos*’ embodying exemplification, their “sin” against the owner, which is imitated by descendants – or as the owner’s returned harm, his “sin” against the people, that is, his vengeance or punishment.

Alteration of the world is associated with separation or differentiation between the

---

137 The stories discussed here are often versions of the stories told by other Panoans, such as Shipibo, Yaminahua, Cashinahua, Chacobo (e.g. D’Ans 1975; Bardales Rodríguez 2008; Calavia Sáez 2000; Córdoba 2005). In some of these versions, ancestors kill the owner, or “Inca” figures to take their belongings.

138 Compare definition of sin as “harm” and “returned-harm” or vengeance in Ch. 2. The abandonment by the Star man in Florentina Romaina’s 1974 story is diagnosed with the expression “Wishin kastikana.” – “punished by the Star” (Loos & Loos 1976a: 172).
past or potential states (domains) connected to powerful “owners” with its present or future wards (participants of the domain).

3.4. Adulthood of the Earthworm’s son: the potential of foreigner and containing divergence

This presentation of stories of conditioning frustration, or “originating,” approximates a profound feature of the villagers’ representations, a switch of perspectives on the social space across time (I elucidate this in Sect. 5.3.). The illustrative force of the earthworm’s son’s story lies precisely in transiting through that switch.

Before this, it should be mentioned that in these stories, the original owners provide their hierarchically dependent wards with living place-times or ways (“domains”) where they receive anything they need, thus keeping them full and satisfied (alegre, opposed to hungry). The need to reproduce does not affect the wards. This is because the owner figure produces them, and guarantees their immortality (Appendix 6.49) or in a drastic way takes care of birth, without any effort on their part (6.48). Other “sponsors” provide tools, which do not require labour to produce effects: the miraculous instruments that clear the fields with the owner’s power, and skills to effortlessly find animals, etc.

Returning to the story of the xakú bake, the earthworm’s son, observe that however harmful he may have seemed initially, he was also powerful in a beneficial way. Firstly, by becoming hyper-independent and hyper-efficient in extremely short time. Early on in his life he was capable of providing food for his mother’s family by using his divergent capacities/knowledge. This presents the earthworm’s son in a different light, that of a powerful provider, similar to other mythical owners. From this perspective, it is the older, wilful family members who frustrated his benevolent attempts. Such as the aunts that would not obey his hurrying, the uncle that was especially hostile towards him and refused to eat the fish he caught. This positive aspect of the boy’s capacities becomes increasingly important as the story progresses, and the boy becomes a young man – perhaps signalling a change in his disposition. His last act mentioned above, calling into existence diverse, named kaibus, could be considered transitional, as it forms people instead of transforming existing people into animals. In any case, after these events, in the advanced stages of the story, he attempts to bestow onto his uncles some special gifts. Here, the ill-disposed uncle
fails to follow his counterintuitive instructions on how to handle these gifts: catching the falling palm tree, avoiding opening a container with hidden contents, holding a big, cold vegetable in the chill of the night. In this manner, the bad uncle ruins the miraculous gifts: the self-producing tools of the hard pijuayo palm, tame prey, wives for all men. His failure exemplifies the frustrating conditions known to this day: the bad disposition of some people, labouring to produce tools, timid animals that hide in the forest, or the difficult lot of wifeless men. We could say he frustrates the potential of a self-supporting, suffering-free domain provided by the son of the earthworm.

From this perspective, xakú bake shares frustration by disobedient, envious, wilful people with other potential owners, whose emergence we witness in the stories. For example the Kapabu, or the squirrel lad, who brought people maize and his capacity to work the fields without labouring (Appendix 6.40), the star man (6.61), or the star woman, who intended to make children from cotton and her human husband’s semen (6.60). The establishment by the Moon of a lasting, lustrous, clean domain in the sky only tainted (literally) by human opposition suggests his was also a failed attempt to create a better, unending domain (see Ch. 4). While we meet other mythical owners, such as Neteanika or Nawishnika, as already established, the earthworm’s son’s story along with the other examples of emerging owners, shows that while frustrating the old space, the introduction of difference can eventually be positive and conducive to a new, better domain. I propose that this possibility conditions the villagers’ openness to powerful difference, or the hope that another owner will come to reverse the condition of abandonment, suffering, and division resulting from failures of previous domains.

Meanwhile, in Sect. 5 below, I address some general implications of these “examples” for understanding local formulations of causality and the generative process. As I argued, the ejemplar dynamic is a powerful tool for explaining and constructing stories, as can be seen in the example of Jesus’ story. But if stories are “just stories,” how does their causality relate to other dimensions of villagers’ lives?

4. Inceptions in daily life

In this section, I briefly explore a handful of contexts, which invite the villagers to envisage causality in daily life. They illustrate the standards of explanation or commentary on alterations of a spatial-temporal state or “conditioning frustration” in
contemporary realities. Here two main sets of examples concern the ways of influencing the future (4.1.), and human bodies (4.2.). The parallels between these representations and *ejemplar* suggest some features that will allow, in the final section, to situate those formulations in topological categories as discussed in previous chapters, and in the end, venture to generally characterise the processes of causality or generation.

4.1. Inflicting the future

4.1.1. Maldecir: “to name harm”

Daniel told me how he remembered the death of Don Elías’ father. This was “because of ‘the evil of people’ (mal de gente) [sorcery]. Harm [i.e. sorcery] was inflicted on him because of his plantains. There used to be one trader (the brother of a famous sorcerer from downriver), to whom the old man wanted to sell good plantain bunches for 8 or 10 soles. The *regatón* (trader) however, wanted to pay only four soles, so the old man said, “Well, in that case, I’m taking them home with me, upriver. I can at least make *chapó* out of them when they ripen.” As he was leaving, the trader shouted behind him: “For the rest of your life you will eat ripe plantains!” Sometime later, when the old man was travelling with his wife and two grandchildren, their canoe capsized and all the passengers were drowned. This, in Daniel’s story, was the result of the *regatón*’s curse (f1204).

In fact, cursing (see Sect. 3.1.), or *maldecir, ruakin* (Loos & Loos 2003: 317), is commonly associated with situations where *brujó* is offended. It is most often caused by someone’s refusal to share something, especially alcohol. Doña Elsa told me about the event that caused her son’s death. He had refused to present another bottle of liquor to the owner of the evil heart that, as she said (Ch. 2) casts shadow over the Buncuya:

Right into his face he [sorcerer] told him this; because of a bottle of trago. (...) “That’s how I will see you all your life – that you may live selling! You will believe!” [The sorcerer] laughed when he said this (...) “You think yourself [more] because you’re selling one [bottle] of trago... (...) And my son told him: “You’d better kill me! I am not afraid to die, what does it matter to me if I die! – he told him – Neither are you made of iron, so I’ll tell you as well: ‘You’re going to live!’ Even better for me if you kill me, [I will be] dead and peaceful (tráquilo). Not like you, suffering and sinning on this earth!” (EFN01)

139 Sweet plantains that have been cooked and mashed.
Julia recounted how her mother-in-law found herself in a similar situation. They had been feasting in Aipena after a good minga, having pulled out a new beautiful canoe from the forest where it had been made. An ucapalino arrived, who was reputed to be a brujo, and whose eyes had already turned red. He asked the woman to sell him her pet monkey. “Ay, señor – she told him – I can’t, I am raising this monkey!” After a while he said “Grandma! Sell me your canoe!” “Ay, señor – she answered again – I can’t sell you my canoe because I need to go fishing, and travel with my children...” “Ah, ok, then – said the ucapalino – So they will bury you in your canoe!”140 – then he left. Soon afterwards, Doña Rosa had an accident and passed away after weeks of agony (fT1301).

4.1.2. Mal agüero: “to show harm”

Mal agüeros, translatable as “bad omens,” sometimes called señas, signs, and in Capanahua expressed with an intransitive verb ruati (Loos & Loos 2003: 317), represent a broad spectrum of images. Although Don Benigno told me that his father produced mal agüero by saying he is making a new house to die in, it is usually associated with the behaviour of animals, or with natural phenomena. Some refer to weather, others to future events in people’s lives. Most often, they spell death or diseases.

A telling example is an inconspicuous incident that took place when Doñas Ermisha and Estefita came to our house. As we were talking, they noticed a dog had dug a hole on the patio in front of our house. It was the work of Pintada, a bitch who chose to live and rear her pups under the platform of our house. The two ladies became very upset and scolded us: “Why haven’t you chased her away?! She was making mal agüero!” When I asked what kind of an omen this was, Doña Ermisha answered “Huni mawani! [person dying!] Don’t you see? She’s digging the earth: wants (quiere) a grave to be dug!” (fT1212). Now, I thought it was interesting that chasing away the dog might prevent the future it produces, just as killing the omen bird, or washing one’s open eyes after a bad, portentous dream might, as I later learned (compare these frustrated omens with failed hybrid inseminations in myths, Sect. 3.2). When I talked about it with people, some did, others did not agree that a mal agüero could be frustrated or reversed. What is more important for causality in

140 The canoe is often synonymous with ataúd, the coffin. In stories I heard, old canoes are said to have been used for burials instead of coffins, and Loos (1960: 13) mentions this practice in the 1950s.
the villages is that a single event initiates the movement that grows into a harmful future. It does so by physically “exemplifying” the effect (cf. Sect. 3.1.).

There are further examples of incepting of harm, such as: any animal or insect entering the mosquito net; the call of the ataúdero bird which sounds like a nail being struck while making a coffin. Similarly, a dog howling at night “exemplifies” the human cries at a funeral; the eyes of a corpse opening at the funeral wake mark the dead’s “wanting to” take a companion, etc. According to Doña Germe:

I hear people say that when the vacamuchacho [smooth billed ani] sings: kuinkuinkuinkuin – it’s making mal agüero. When it shouts like this, it is for people dying. (...) When you kill it: someone in your family will die. Huancahui [laughing falcon] also makes mal agüero. When the dog digs at your patio, that too. All kinds of things... (...) When the dog cries, howling alone, that’s a bad sign. For people dying. (L.K: And when you dream?) When you dream of an airplane coming and landing here, that’s because someone from here will die. If you see it passing high, you will hear news that someone has died in another place. If a tooth comes out in your dream, when it hurts (...) this means a member of your family will die. If it does not hurt then others will die. (L.K: When you dream of pulling your canoe?) Yes, that too means you will see a coffin. They say. (GSR10)

Other non-standardized mal agüeros were identified when unusual events happened, for example, when roosters crowed in the middle of the night (fT1212), or when a sick dog entered a boat on which the mestizo traders live, the dog was recognized by them as a bad omen and chased away (fT1302). It is the uncommonness of these events that gives them a demonio quality. Indeed, what upset Doña Germe as a yushin quality when a pair of monkeys entered a human field (Ch. 2) was unsettling for Daniel because he read it as an omen of death, mal agüero (fT1302).

It is important to note here that this imagery focuses on movements of inserting (often literal perforation, penetration, digging) of difference into the living space: a mosquito net, a field, the ground, etc. It parallels the imagery of picar (piercing) in sorcery – as the penetration of surface and the introduction of a foreign element into the victim’s body (Ch. 2). It is therefore not only the abstract idea of implanting a seed of the future in an uneventful, easy presence, but often literally initiating a movement of internalizing by implanting sickness, death and other misfortunes. Although I cannot argue this here, I would also suggest that because of the nature of voice or language in the villagers’ representations, maldecir is based on a similar premise.
In fact, *mal agüero* and *maldecir* can be used synonymously. Recall that the man who became the moon, when getting upset, drinks and shits blood-coloured liquid to initiate menstruation in women. Doña Germe described this act precisely as *maldecir*: “[the Moon] went up farting [achiote], my dad told me. This was so that women have their period. (...) he went away... cursing (*maldiciendo*) the women” cxii (GSR05). Yet another manner of expressing the Moon’s *ejemplo* leads us to other ways of referring to origins of (usually harmful) features. In Pedro Tomás version: “¡Sssshac! – shitting blood: ‘This way, every new moon, every month, you’re going to live like this!’ – [he had] *shinguriado* like this, see” cxiii (PFS02). Celso (CBR02) cxiv and Don Benigno (BRS13) cxv used the same expression. The LUS verbs *shingurear*, cutipar, or *chuntear*, are used by Capanahua descendants, as well as other eastern Peruvians, to describe an act of contaminating or influencing. This can be understood as defining the basics of their aetiology.

4.2. Aetiology

4.2.1. *Shinguriar*

*Shinguriar* is generally used in reference to inhibiting an ability. For example, if *tamshi* vines are not pulled down with one strong movement, the plant will *shingurear* the person and thus he will not be allowed to collect them in this particular place anymore (fT1301). The same might happen when a bunch of *pijuayo* palm fruit is not picked with one pull (fT1302). When the *boa* is not killed with one blow of a machete, the blade is dulled and *boa* gets away (DHR20). cxv In other situations, impediments can refer to walking, as when someone is *shinguriado* by *shapingo* forest demons (DHR17); cxvi success with other women – by one’s ex-wife (fT1212); or the growing of fruits – if fruit is picked small and green, the example is set and the fruit continues to grow small and green. Doña Germe jokingly told me about the level of drunkenness at a party at the other end of the village: “They are already well *shinguriados*!” (fT1212) – in this case, influenced and impeded by *trago*.

---

141In a LUS vocabulary list: *shingurear*: “make ineffectual or ruin someone’s luck” (Aucayacu 2015).
142 According to Jaime Regan (2011: 156), the verb *cutipar* comes from Quichua: to deliver, to return, and to interchange. In another LUS web list, *cutipar* is glossed as “to infect; to pass the physical or behavioural characteristics of an animal to a person” (Wikicionario 2015).
4.2.2. Cutipar

In some cases synonymous with shinguriar, the verb cutipar usually refers to initiating a trajectory of differentiation within the other entity which follows or copies the originator’s property. Examples of this commonplace infliction are too numerous to describe in any detail here. Mostly, it causes post-partum restrictions, because newborns, whose bodies, as “shells” or containers, are too soft to prevent an entry of other qualities within them, are especially prone to such imparting (see also Ch. 2).

In adults, this can happen in critical moments, most of all, when suffering from snakebites or other open wounds (but also during the initiating sorcerer’s “diet”). At these vulnerable times, an adult can be cutipado by the presence or the gaze of a pregnant woman (the quality of her swollen belly may contaminate the wound), men who have recently had sex (the state described as maldormido, which no one was able to explain, and which I connect with the act of penetration), or drunk people. The gaze or sight of some beings, such as jaguar, or yacurunas (water people) can also cutipar or shinguriar. It is said that noise has a harmful influence on the sick. The smell of faeces could cutipar the wound (causing rotting and bad smells) (DHR23). To contextualize further, manioc beer is processed by women chewing – and therefore the addition of saliva (i.e. process of endulzar, sweetening) – is called masato cutipado. Also, Don Pablo said jokingly that the hen with unusually short legs that walked about his patio has been cutipado by the only little man we all knew (fT1208).

Similarly, affliction by malaire (lit. “evil air”) or the state of being airado (“aired through”) operates on the same premise: permeation by the “wind,” draught of evil, cold air or the smell of the invisible spirit of a deceased person, tunchi. This is sometimes described by using the verb shingurear (DHR20).

The distinctions between the above terms are not very rigid. In all cases, I understood them as paralleling ejemplar in describing ways of influencing another entity’s fate by implanting a differentiating content, similar to maldecir or mal agüero, or in fact, “the thoughts/feelings” and so on in Ch.2. It is therefore interesting to note another way of describing this influence, which connects with ejemplar as “paying” or “vengeance” (Sect. 3).

---

143 Cf. senankin, “infect with a quality” (for example, laziness) (Loos & Loos 2003: 323).
In 1960, E. Loos quoted an explanation of a Capanahua person: “If we don’t see any other reason for [disease] we blame it on the spirit of the deer or tapir and call it ‘deer disease’ or ‘tapir disease.’” He explained that people he knew on the Buncuya often attributed disease “to the presence of one of these foreign spirits within the body of the sick person, especially if no outward cause can be observed” (Loos 1960: 14). Recently, he (2009-14) informed me that these afflictions would literally be called “diseases” in Capanahua: e.g. *awapan i’sin* [lit. disease caused by tapir]. Yet, Doña Ermisha used a more simple way of expressing the cause of a baby’s illness: “*shinun kupini.*” Doña Germe explained this expression as “the capuchin monkey *cutipa*” (GSR06), thus, literally, “[state] owed to the capuchin monkey.” This likely refers to an adverb *kupi,* “because of,” which might also express gratitude in Capanahua or in LUS as used by the villagers: “*Mia kupi ta’ en pi?i*” [because of you I am eating] (Loos & Loos 1976a: 78). But it could also come from the verb *kupikin,* “to avenge, return, reciprocate, correspond” (Loos & Loos 2003: 141), which is not limited to vengeance, but expresses a more general idea of exchange or transmission of a property. It is indeed a Capanahua equivalent for expressing the idea of *ejemplar* or causing (*por*). Here, that would be a “property” of the capuchin monkey’s fidgetiness introduced into the baby’s body.

**4.2.3. Curar**

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning some examples of how people attempt to harness a similar process of imparting. Such action can be called *curar* [lit. curing]. As a poignant example, Daniel told me about a particular communal work party working on a cut-through on the river that would shorten the trips made upriver in the flood season. According to Daniel, some time before that day, Ronal went upriver and drew a line on the land separating two fragments of the river, using the claw of a giant armadillo (*yacunturu*). When the party arrived on the chosen day, it turned out that this procedure did not bring a result. There was still work to do, so everyone grabbed a shovel or machete. Some said that the proper way to do this would be to repeat the procedure three times. Then, as Daniel explained, “the *yacunturu*” would begin to dig and work. The effect would augment – the line would get wider, water

---

145 Or *Mia kupi ta’ en hiwetai* [“Gracias a ti, ahora voy a vivir,” lit. “Because of you I am alive” (Loos & Loos 1976a: 52), or *Mia kupi ta’ en pi?i* [“Muchas gracias,” lit. “I eat because of you”] (ibid.: 78-79). A common expression in Spanish used by Capanahua descendants is: “Por tí estoy comiendo/fumando etc.” - e.g., “You were going to die, (...) and I have cured you,” she said. ‘Yes, thankyou, I told her. I am alive because of you,’ I said” (DHR19).
would flow in and the edges would start to crumble inwards, eventually creating a passage (fT1212). I understood that a detached property (that is, *yushin*), of *yacunturu* – which is the animal’s capacity to dig with highly efficient claws – would with this incepting or planting procedure be applied to the line and would work on augmenting it, like the wondrous tools of the powerful mythic owner figures, or like the bodily exemplifying, *mal agüero* or *cutipar* infections.

There are many other similar ways of transmitting or introducing desired properties. Daniel told me that if a pregnant woman roasts plantains, the fruit “know” the sex of the foetus. If it is a girl, the plantains signal this by splitting the peel. If one prefers a boy, then a small stick can be put inside the split to imitate a little penis. Another way of influencing the sex of the future foetus is for the woman to eat the roasted penis of araú turtle (DHR20).\textsuperscript{cxxxiv} The tears of caiman or vulture, animals said to have clear (*lindo*) eyes, are considered a cure for conjunctiva degeneration in the eye. In the procedure, one catches the animal, and then pricks its eye with a needle, so that a tear flows. This is then dropped into the patient’s eye, and the animal is set free. As the default state of clarity of the eye returns, so too does the eye of the patient (fT1210). The condition is also cured by using the urine of a newborn boy,\textsuperscript{cxxv} Don Benigno heard on the radio. In yet another example, a hunter chews hot *aji charapita* peppers, so that additional pain is inflicted when the pellet he shoots hits the game animal. Even if it is only wounded, the pain will prevent the animal from fleeing (fT1209).

For similar reasons, my *comadre* Meri asked me to clip my godson’s first long fingernails. The purpose, I learned, was to convey the properties she and her family perceived in me, to my little *ajihado* (see Ch. 4). The same is achieved by his first haircut. As Doña Germe (Meri’s mother) told me at this occasion: “They say it is so that he will be like the one who is cutting, if he is a hard-worker, [the child] will be the same – or if he’s a learner, the same”\textsuperscript{cxxxvi} (GSR11). Likewise, powdered claws, blood or the fat of the giant anteater, southern tamandu, or giant armadillo – animals said to posses extraordinary strength and strong claws, are given to little children to ingest or are rubbed into their bodies during the new moon, so that they develop strength. The same goes for the black agouti or squirrel teeth (rubbed on the teeth) or chambira palm fibers (tied around the ankles), and other such treatments.\textsuperscript{cxxxvii} My *comadre* laughed as she told me that when another woman heard her worrying that
little Lucas was losing his hair, she asked: “Well, why did you take that kind of a padrino?”—referring to my shiny scalp (fT1212).

4.2.4. Implanting knowledge

Examples of this kind are numerous. They demonstrate that Capanahua descendants use similar premises to explain the origins of diseases and their cures or preventive measures (4.2.), as well as misfortunes and ways of implanting future states (4.1).

Further, in most cases, the implanting does not seem to be intentionally malignant, but instead is attributed to the “strength” of the originator’s characteristics or the weakness of the affected person’s blood (sangre débil). At the same time, the fact that something is able to cutipar or shinguriar is a reason to say that it has a yushin or dueño [owner], as some of its quality “exits” in the container (Ch. 2). Daniel would therefore say that a thing has a yushin because it is able to implant its quality into something else. For instance a football has a yushin because it cutipa newborns, causing their bellies to swell (DHR20), and peach (pijuayo) palm has an “owner” because it shingurea the person who is not skilful in picking the fruit with the first pull (fT1302). Similarly with the giant armadillo’s detached property working on the line drawn by Ronal.

The ability to intentionally implant or infect sickness as described above is the distinctive attribute of a brujo, be it a human, tree or animal such as the river dolphin. It is what an aspiring sorcerer aims to master. In fact, the harm made by a sorcerer can also be described as effected through shinguriar, or chuntear. One morning Don Benigno found out that someone cut the very bottoms of the coconuts hanging on his little tree, drank the milk and left the empty shells on the tree as if they were intact. While he laughed at the audacity, Don Benigno was also upset. Too bad, he told me, that the purga (knowledgeable plants) does not “like” him (i.e. the owners of trees refused to visit him in dreams when he “drank them” [their concoctions, or “raisin/blood”] as a cure) and therefore he cannot become a brujo. He would shinguriar the tree so that whoever touched the coconut would end up with their hands paralysed in an upward position. He would then tell them: “So, did you plant these coconuts?!” (fT1212). For non-specialists, the only thing left to do when revenge is required is to approach a brujo, either in human or tree form. I mentioned before that the human brujo’s service can be contracted. Similarly, one can address
the tree brujo: leave a piece of someone’s clothing in a hole made in the pucalupuna (sorcerer) tree and cover it again so that the bark can heal. A gift of tobacco and a short explication to the owner of the tree is in order. As a result, the owner of the clothes takes on the swollen quality of the sorcerer tree and dies in agony with a swollen belly. In every case, brujería consists of imparting a differentiating element or quality, that could be said to rely on a mastery of “knowledge” of such implanting (cf. “knowing” as synonym for sorcery skills in Ch. 2).

5. Some generative-frustrative patterns

The aim of this chapter has been to present examples that illustrate the nature and terms of the generative or causative processes. This overview demonstrates that the dynamics of ejemplar (Sect. 1-3) are closely connected conceptually with those of implanting (Sect. 4), and indeed use the same “techniques.” This discussion could be extended to representations of causality in historical accounts, such as the “example” of minga drinking introduced from the Buncuya that afflicts Limón, or the “example” of stinginess “taught” by the mestizos. It could also be identified in daily life, as when being in a certain state or not is said to be “because of” someone or an event, or when sickness of a sick dog is referred to as God’s castigo to the animal, and so on. In general, I would argue, these formulations by the villagers share a reliance on the imagery of the transferences of certain pathogenic elements. This presumes the containing quality of the entities and results in specific dynamics, which can be understood in relation to, and further explain, the topological categories discussed in previous chapters. The points below draw out some of these implications.

5.1. Production of containment

It is important to summarize those examples of implanting that are at the centre of the causal imagery. As seen, the process of the introduction of difference, insemination, exemplifying and implanting can be understood in terms of the introduction of a pathogenic property/element into another entity. Such language operates on the assumption that surfaces are penetrated and internal fields are created behind them. This is the act of penetration between entities, which entails the transference of properties, sometimes through substances, across surfaces.

It occurs across the examples of this chapter, when the entity is still “fresh” – that is, not yet hardened on the outside, thus permeable. This would be the case for
children, especially newborns (see also Ch. 2). It may also correspond with the way the condition of the world is presented in stories of the antiguos, as the time when “the people and the earth were still new (be’matian).” Many prescriptions for curar (of children, dogs, tools, etc.) also emphasize the need that they be undertaken during the phase of a new moon. In all these cases, it is a state of permeability and thus exposure to the introduction of foreign elements. Internalization also happens when the entity is open, for example, when people have open wounds, especially snakebites. Introduction may also take place through regular routes of internalization: consuming, smelling, inhaling, listening, seeing, touching. The introducer may also teach, plant, inseminate, shoot, feed, cut open, extract, permeate, curse, point, look or be perceived, blow, spit or shit, etc. Foreign agents enter into a guarded field of manioc, or when little animals like the squirrel or mouse enter houses to become the teaching “owners” of knowledge, or when animals enter mosquito nets, or human spaces, such as the choro monkey mentioned before.

These dynamics are actively used by the specialists in such infliction, the sorcerers, and to some extent by other people, in producing or avoiding it. In every case, the critical importance of moments of penetration means that the manner in which it is accomplished also influences or incepts the outcomes. Therefore, one needs to bathe before planting pineapple, so that the fruits will grow clean and/or juicy (fT1204; fT1202). Seeds of the peach palm should be planted after being scraped smooth so that the tree that grows has little spines on its stem, or they might be painted with achiote, so that the fruits will be red. Similarly, if a baby is conceived when parents are drunk, it is said to come out “ugly” or deformed. The mother is advised not to walk outside at night because the spirits of the dead might cutipar the breasts with which she feeds the baby (DHR06). An interesting reverse example from a story is where the antiguos get together to eat their dead and all present are warned to close their ears so as not to hear the crack of a skull being opened, that, I suspect, would cause harm to their own heads (DHR19).

In the receiver, these processes of penetration produce an internalization of a content, resulting in an internal differentiation, swelling, mimesis of the introduced
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146 Thus there is a connection between the newness of the moon and the state of the rest of the world. One way of interpreting this is that new (luna verde [green] or nueva [new], or luna be’nat [moon new]) is soft (suave), as the babies’ bodies-containers are said to be. The other is that it is “open” – I heard, for example, that an increase in rainfall accompanies the position of the moon wherein the “open” side points downwards.
element, an inception of alteration from the original state of non-differentiation, which is not only ambivalent but, as the examples show, usually ruinous. As mentioned before (Ch. 2), the appearance of the internal containment of difference, or “sin” articulates as the opacity of human externality, the body. This would further explain the representations of concealed containing that lie at the heart of preoccupations in Ch. 1 and 2, where internal containing is opposed to external unity, and containing radical difference, beyond the normal human voids, is dangerous.

With the idea of penetrations as potentially ruinous, and yet defining the human condition, we can return to the words of Don Romer, and appreciate the ominous significance of orifices as gates for such infections in the parting curse of Jesus Christ:

“Why have you eaten from the forbidden tree!? From this tree that is the most prohibited! Oh, yes, you have blemished the earth (...)” – to the woman he said – “Eva, from now on [adelante, ahead] you, too, will suffer. Your husband will command you to wash the clothes, to cook and carry water. To do everything in the house and to raise children. And when you give birth, you will feel lots of pain (...). You are going to suffer greatly. And so you, Adam, who is of the hole in the ground (...) The day you die, you will turn into the dirt of the earth. You have five senses – he said – through a hole you breath, through a hole you urinate and through a hole you shit. And to the hole in the earth you will return. The grave.” – said Jesus Christ to Adam. And thus they bury us. Because he left an example, dying on the cross of Calvary, just for our sin.cxxi (RPR07)

5.2. The implanted elements

The last observations in section 4 are crucially important for identifying the transferred “elements.” The basic assumption that brujo masters the “knowledge” of implanting can be opened further, because the process itself of acquiring such sorcery “knowledge” consists of implanting it (as a substance/quality) within an aspiring sorcerer (Ch. 2). “Knowledge” in this context is a quality or characteristic that may be transferred or imparted. We could infer that it is this “knowledge” itself (blown darts, spirit helpers and the substance are all glossed as yachai) that is being implanted into the unprepared recipients, and which proceeds to consume them. It is also such quality/characteristic/knowledge that is implanted in the other cases discussed in section 4, furthering the significance of voice or words in cursing as carrying “knowledge.” This observation could be extended to the discussion of ejemplar (Sect. 1-3) as implanting qualities that have not been “known” before and thus condition frustrations-origins, or “secrets” or “instruments” conditioning the power of efficacy (Ch. 2). Further, if we consider that interpenetrations have in Ch. 1 been shown as
Chapter 3. Introducing the end: The conditioning frustrations

constitutive of “knowing” between persons or place-times, “knowledge,” with its substantial-qualitative connotations revealed here, comes to stand as one of the most important existential categories in the villagers’ explanations. It could act as a lens to look at the instruments of perceptibility or sociality contained in or composing specific place-times (Ch. 1). Further, if the quality of a being is its “knowledge,” it would concede more substance to daily expressions such as no sabe podrir [doesn’t know how to spoil] (Ch. 1), etc. Generally, then, from this perspective, the world would appear to be composed of containers of such “knowledge” (qualities), and relations between them to be the function of flows of such “knowledge” (substance), with the needs or voids they create constituting them as separate, differentiated containers, or owners (Ch. 2). In this context, referring to a “quality” as “property” validly plays with the genitive connotation.

Furthermore, from the viewpoint created in this chapter, at the cosmic-temporal level, such “knowledge” or specific quality of being could be seen as the being’s particular punishment, castigo, inflicted by another “owner” in the past. A mangy dog can be said to be castigado by God because of his “sins,” as Doña Germe once did. More generally – the human condition, menstruations, “suffering to have” – are the results of such “punishments.” Thus, for the villagers, admitting to possessing a specialized “knowledge” is also ambiguous, just as having a separate “spirit” or divergent “inside” (Ch. 2). The reverse is being tranquilío nomás, normal for the outside – not differentiated, not being a “radical” container and not “knowing” too much of the other domains (Ch. 1) (although it needs to be remembered that some containing is natural).

This view, finally, allows us to notice how the homonymy of ejemplar as telling and making “ejemplo” collapses into a synonymy. If we consider old people’s stories to be words from other, imperceptible place-times, we could actually think of the acts of telling those stories as implanting the specialized, diverse “knowledge,” that is, “inseminating” new places or generations of people with the specific kind of passed knowledge. Following this thought, I would note that in Capanahua, these stories are called hui, synonymous with “the language.” The villagers’ ideas about the language construe it as “words” (hui, palabras), understood as the “names” (nombres, hane) of specific things, and the names of groups of people or persons that can be referred to as their “words/language.” From this perspective, talking to children in the language,
telling them old stories or bestowing names\textsuperscript{147} can be understood as the parallel activities of bestowing, introducing, “uploading” that would echo the kinds of non-substantial, containing or uniting heritage or “descent” in the form of names, souls or prerogatives, in other parts of Amazonia.\textsuperscript{148} Interestingly, more explicit connection between these stories of origin and descent is made in the expressions to “know/tell origin/descent” (\textit{contar/conocer generación/decendencia}), where the latter are as much stories, as referring to a category/name and the genealogical connections (Ch. 4). In as much as it can be seen as a form of reproduction, such transmission or implanting of “knowledge” (as “words”) also parallels other such processes of transference (as “properties”). In fact, the connection of language, \textit{hui} with heart and blood (Ch. 2), leads to the next chapter, where I explore the connection between an idea of “blood” and (sur)names. Here, I will note that stories, language, or words of the \textit{antiguos} – as other kinds of “descent” – are expected by the villagers to be fading and forgotten in present spaces, while new stories, names and languages appear from other “foreign” place-times. In any case, possessing another (different) language, just as knowledge or spirit, is internally complicating and shameful in the outside. It is an infliction of the past or the origins.

5.3. Reversal of containment

There are further implications of this imagery that are essential for the discussion of generative process in persons and between generations that I develop over the next chapters. The first is replacing.

Firstly, refining the idea of the inceptive production of containment in the presented “examples,” I suggest that it consists of a transference of the level of containment, that is, of the very status of “owner.” The “original” constellation includes co-contained, neighbouring bodies, joined but separate, as in the image of \textit{alegría} sociality (Ch. 1 and 2). Their coexistence is mediated or “contained” by a transcending, external entity. They are either being fed, contained and provided for by the external sponsor or “owner,” or reproduced through an external “container” such as the shell in the story of the origin of sex (Appendix 6.55). This “third” entity focuses or mediates the relations or exchanges and frees the wards from mutual

\textsuperscript{147} Among other Panoans, alternative generations reproduce by bestowing names and creating relations of replacement, \textit{xutabu} (cf. McCallum 2001, Townsley 1988). I return to this relation and surnames in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{148} Cf. Introduction.
interpenetrations and “suffering.” Therefore, the critical move of stealing or inseminating consists of changing the level of containment or “owning” to the level of persons, which forces mutual relations between participants. They now become responsible for maintaining manioc, or for their internally contained foetuses, and “suffer” the labour and woes of owner/container. In other words, former containees develop internal voids and are directed towards each other to fill them, developing relations of containment (pregnancy), producing more containment (children).

Furthermore, this idea can be further fine-tuned if we notice that this transference is also essentially a switch of containing positions. I have signalled it apropos the difference of perspectives on children as either inside or outside of the social spaces of their parents (Ch. 1 and 2). It is a crucial moment/place, where the perspective on the social space is everted. As I noted in the “adult” phase of the earthworm’s son’s story, it can be seen as portraying a transition from a wilful child of a potentially disastrous foreign descent, containing the radical stranger “inside,” to a potential benevolent “external” owner. This is where the folding back between the contained and containees (i.e. generations) or the switch of inside and outside perspectives takes place. In this new position, xakú bake attempts to become the creator, sponsor of an “outside” for his maternal family, and to contain their divergence. In other examples, transference of the level of containment can similarly be seen as such switch. The wards take over the space, and come to contain the remains of the original owners, such as the knowledge of manioc cultivation, for example. This is where younger generations come to contain older ones alongside their own children, who are also the “seeds” that these predecessors left. I will return to the reversal of containment between the old and young in the in Ch. 5, and the replacing will become clearer in the next chapter’s discussion of kinship imagery.

The parallels of relations between inside and outside with those between the figure of the owner (dueño, ñbu) and the wards, or containees should by now be obvious.

5.4. Diminishment

Finally, for the villagers the last implication of causality and temporality in these formulations of “originating” is diminishing. Although the claimants to ownership in the stories eventually succeed in all cases – the “property” that they receive or stay with is already broken, less efficient, a reminder of what it used to be
by the power of its original owner. The annoyed owner’s “parting gifts” are drained of their self-perpetuating power: the earth domain exerts self-reliance, manioc cultivation and human reproduction require hard and painful work. As Doña Florentina’s image of snapping instruments powerfully illustrates, they become mortal. As much as their transmission could be seen as the transition of ownership to the claimants, the new owning positions are already faulty. The frustration and diminishment of the original owners by their containees is “exemplified,” and thus reproduced – as “punishment” or “memento” – when these claimants themselves become (always lesser) owners/containers/parents. Humans are themselves compelled, by whichever original frustration, to reproduce this very frustration again and again, and are ultimately incapable of living perfectly well and clear on this earth (Ch. 2). Therefore, that originally created void or diminishment (abandonment by the authentic owner) is replicated and enhanced with every consecutive switch, thus reproducing the original loss. This means that the switch between domains and perspectives involves their “natural,” increasing diminishment. This, I suggest, is responsible for the “devolutionary” tendency of the villagers’ interpretations (Sect. 2.3.) of the expected, given the flow of time in general. Every next generation is conceived of as the small fragment of stem broken off by the manioc thief from the original manioc plant’s stem (see Ch. 4).

Conclusion

The previous section summarizes the presentation of this chapter. In general, it shows that the dynamics of ejemplar, synonymous with causality and generative-frustrative processes, can be made meaningful in terms of movements of penetrating and introducing differentiating elements, parallel to the movements responsible for distortions of health at the level of the human body. Therefore, as much as causality of ejemplar can be thought of in terms of inseminations (Sect. 3), it can also be compared to curses and/or pathogenic infections (Sect. 4). The next chapter shows that these two parallels meet in the Capanahua descendants’ explanations of procreation. Here, I conclude by saying that the villagers diagnose the present human condition, with its perishability, recurring voids and the necessity to labour and reproduce in pain – in short, the suffering in life – as the “unnaturally natural” condition of the world. In other words, it is an infliction, the sickness or curse transmitted by (or rather, “as”) the generative process itself. With such nature of the
world, reproduction itself, as much as it is a generative or originating process, is essentially pathogenic, “conditioning frustration” – it is an inception of the end. From this viewpoint, time is a devolutionary story of death and perishing.

These general characteristics of the generative processes, causality and temporality can now be checked against, and elaborated, in the imagery of human generative process, the production of children and its traces as “descent” in the following chapter.
Chapter 4.

**Between the tree trunks: Articulation and taming of infliction**

The focus in this chapter, shifts from the general formulations of the frustrative-generative dynamic itself presented so far, to the terms and idioms expressing it in the human generative process. I trace the consequences of this dynamic for human reproduction and formulations of descent and kinship (Sect. 1). Here the perspective is located in the mediatory and transitory position of the pathogenic-generative “third” element, articulated first between the formative entities or originalities, at the level of human bodies in procreation, and then at the “group” level in broader reproduction. It relies on the identification of the devolutionary pattern illustrated in the imagery of the tree trunk and the branches, which results in wide reaching hierarchic explanations of kinship and sociality. Having identified these formulations, I examine their relevance for ways of participating in sociality. I approach one ideal strategy conceived by the villagers as possibly capable of harnessing that process by taming its products (Sect. 2). That strategy shows the necessity to assume a larger temporal or cross-generational perspective, transcending the relations directly involved in marriage and procreation, in order to tame the destructive aspects of the process embodied in children. I also signal another solution to the problem in the last section.

In the example of the drunken speech that opens this thesis, N. invoked identities that he associated with the acts of procreation by his parents. His surname was Rojas and Áyubu because his father “engendered” him, and he was a Pehchabo or Neabu because his mother “dropped him into this world.” He also mentioned that his father was denigrated by others as the supposed recipient of the “noble” surname from a foreigner as his godson. Yet, for N., he was the very “tree trunk,” “knowledgeable” (cf. Ch. 3) Áyubu and a legitimate viracucha. It placed him “ahead” (adelante) of his cousins, whose surname order is Pehchabo Rojas, with the noble name “behind” (atrás), making them and some others, ñabu [pets or slaves] or cholos [peons] in relation to himself. This introduction is representative of the way of
tracing and speaking about identities. This chapter approaches the meaning of such statements.

1. Procreation and its mortal consequences

Here, I concentrate on how the above, standard ways of defining identity (as name or surname), and “real kinship” (familia legítima) through “blood” or “birth” operate on idioms of procreation used by the villagers. When I asked about how these expressions related to the imagery of conception, the matter was not unequivocally formulated, and people used several ways of explaining and discussing these representations. I argue that their ultimately problematic, discussed character forms an important feature, based on the underlying, inherent problem of a procreative dynamic that corresponds to other infections discussed in previous chapter and containments mentioned in Ch. 2.

This section is devoted to reviewing some of the most common ideas on this range, as well as to kinship/identity categories, which tend to be associated and debated alongside. Starting with the procreative mechanism, I look at the specific formulations of the inseminating dynamic and its terms, and then proceed to consider some of their consequences for people’s identities. In a larger perspective, this section addresses the articulation of the generative-frustrative relation resulting from interpenetration at the level of persons.

1.1. The “making” mechanism

The villagers associate conception with sexual intercourse, and this singular act is normally deemed sufficient for conception. In LUS, this is described as hacer relaciones [making relations] or simply hacer [making], relacionar [relationing], as well as convivir [live with] or darle [give her] (cf. transferences as “relations” in Ch. 2). It is also expressed in the violence-based idioms of usar [use], violar [violate], chocar por ahí [smash there]. In Capanahua, having intercourse is described by the verbs chutakin, to have sex; ʔakin, which is a multivalent verb, also used for consuming food or drink, creating or making, saying, piercing, shooting, killing, etc. (Loos & Loos 2003: 147); the use of another complex verb ʔkin also connotes a state of being/living (with) (Loos & Loos 2003: 156). The imagery that this vocabulary
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149 People sometimes added, laughing, that continued lovemaking with a pregnant woman is unadvisable, as the continuous poking of the foetus by the penis may result in the baby developing a deformed head. This is contrary to other Amazonians’ idea that repeated sexual relations are necessary to form the baby (cf. Beckerman & Valentine 2002).
already evokes relies on the transference associated with penetration. Its construal appears to be another instantiation of exemplifying, infecting, cursing, or inseminating discussed in the previous chapters. The following presentation confirms this, and I return to draw out its implications for understanding kinship in the villages before moving to the next section.

1.1.1. The infliction

The act of conception is described by the verb engendrar [engender], and bakeati [to make offspring] in Capanahua. Another idiom occasionally used is merani [to find], reflected in LUS encontrar [encounter]. In either case, it is commonly associated with the male, and the temporally primary role of the father.\textsuperscript{cxxxii} The real (legítimo) father is the one who engendered the child, that is, placed it in the mother’s womb. In Capanahua, men can be referred to descriptively as the “makers of offspring,” bakeanika’\textsuperscript{bu}\textsuperscript{c50} (Loos & Loos 2003: 68).

Specific explanations of conception conform to the imagery revealed in the above vocabulary of transference. Overall, it is described as the placement of an element extracted from the man’s body within the body of the woman. Identifications of this element vary. However, after hearing spontaneous expressions similar to the one made by Daniel: “[his real father] only placed him, with his larvae, his egg”\textsuperscript{cxxxiii} (DHR21), I began to notice that many of the representations of conception reverted to the imagery borrowed from a dynamic of parasitic infection. In Don Baudilio’s words:

\begin{quote}
(LK: How did your dad explain it to you – what happens when they have sex, what makes the baby?) (…) He would tell me: for your child to form, you drop your worm. (…) And this already becomes… it grows, as a human, a human being grows, from this worm (…) (LK: is it like \textit{xakú}? [worm, cf. Ch. 2, 3]) \textit{Xakú}, yeah, that’s it. Exactly. This is what a human being drops, the man. (…) If you drop two inside [of the woman]: two grow. If your drop one, one. That’s what my dad used to say. \textit{Haa ta nun kaicha’i} [that is how we multiply/reproduce], he would say. (LK: So the mother does nothing?) Noothing, she only keeps it in her belly, that’s it. There it grows, the \textit{xakú} that you gave her.\textsuperscript{cxxxiv} (BSR01)
\end{quote}

Therefore, the popular explanation makes sense of the pathogenic-generative element as, quite explicitly, a parasite. The father implants (poner [place], botar [drop], etc.): a worm, larvae or an egg [gusano, shinguito, or huevo] inside the woman’s body. Some people consistently identified this element as microbio

\textsuperscript{c50} From bake, child; -\textsuperscript{o}, to make; -\textsuperscript{niku}, nominalizer describing actions or states which are habitual; -\textsuperscript{\textit{y}bu}, a set of entities “being referred to as.”
[microbe] (BRS18; RPR06) (which in other situations might be associated with dirt that causes sickness), or célula [cell]:

(LK: So how is a baby made?) The baby appears from a cell, from a cell of a man (LK: What’s a célula [cell]?) It’s the microbe that a man has... (...) [the baby] is made in relación [sex]. There’s a number of these microbes, (...) but there is one that is going to stay. (...) From this one the little creature forms (...). The microbe is like a little worm/larvae, it goes on growing. First, its eyes [grow], then its body (...). Still others questioned these identifications: Ronal laughed when I asked him about the term gusanito (RPH05), and Don Benigno did not seem to recall his parents talking about the larvae or microbio (BRS18).

Secondly, the most literal identification of the introduced element, “semen” (semen, huru) which may also be referred to as the “father’s milk” (leche del padre), and most importantly, as “blood” (sangre). In fact, the villagers may speculate that semen, just as mother’s milk, is quite literally “blood,” as I demonstrate below.

Situating “blood” alongside the other formulations of the introduced element, parasitic infection, facilitates understanding the position of blood in the categories it produces, which has profound consequences for the dynamics of tracing and postulating descent. This is elucidated in the following sections. Here, in simple terms, the genitor’s blood is understood as an extracted element, which assumes a foreign, often ambivalent status within the host body, as does the worm or larvae. For one, this is claimed whenever people spontaneously declare that it is the father who engenders children, while the mother “merely” contains and releases the baby, as asserted by N. in his speech. Secondly, it is often mentioned that the offspring possesses predominantly, if not exclusively (this is debated), the blood of the father. Don Benigno initially told me about a specific way of formulating a certain relatedness category by his Capanahua speaking parents, and his elderly, mostly Capanahua speaking aunt living in Limón, and Doña Olga, later confirmed this (ORB02). This category, en himi [my blood] related, according to these initial conversations, exclusively to the patrilineal kin:

I don’t have my mom’s blood. Only dad’s (...). I am the milk of my father, the milk that we are, blood of the real father. For example, you are the milk of your father, right? A real himi of your dad. Of the mom: no, not so much. Mom drops us into the
world, into the light of day. (...) But our dad has engendered us and we are... we carry [his] blood. Milk of your father, that’s what it says (BRS11)

Here, the separateness of introduced blood is the most explicit, and seems to be grounded in the idea that a man’s contribution has exclusive role in the creation of the foetus. Even more exclusively, for Don Benigno, ‘en himi referred only to his adjacent generations, so that father, sons and daughters were his himi, but not his grandfather or grandchildren (BRS11; BRS13).

1.1.2. The host

Complementary descriptions of the woman’s role in conception and procreation concentrate on containing, quite explicitly comparable to a “nest.” This is how Don Benigno explained the Capanahua idiom bakeatibu, which I found in the dictionary (2003: 68): “because we can enter into... well, inside of them, that’s why it says a’ki bakeatibu [lit. inside of those in which one makes children] (LK: So a woman is just like a nest?) [laughs] That’s it! Of course” (BRS12). As related in the story of the antiquos mentioned in Ch. 3, the bad example of the mischievous brown capuchin monkeys led to the transferral of the container status to the women’s bodies (Appendix 6.55). Thus, again, when people say today that the mother contributes space within her own body, but not the blood, the imagery parallels that of the men’s “milk” stored in gourd containers by the women in the times of the antiquos.

Moreover, there is a further idiom of containment in both LUS and Capanahua, which produces another category of relatedness and evokes an important image. While the villagers may distinguish umbilical cord (umbliego) from placenta (placenta) in some situations, they tend to refer to them jointly with the same term for intestines, tripä. The corresponding Capanahua idiom is xama, used for both the placenta and umbilical cord, and similarly, also interchangeable with puku, the intestines.152

---

151 From a’ki, towards/of; bakeat, a nest [lit. bake children; -a- to make; -ti: nominalizer], and -bu, plural or generic.
152 E. Loos’ notes (Loos nd.d) differentiate xama as placenta from hawen puku, the umbilical cord (or intestine). I note the conceptual connection between the generative and gestational system reflected in Nawishnika’s curse for women – to give birth through their nwink or culo (anus, rather than chishpi, vagina) (see Ch. 3) – but I am not able to explain it at this point. Interestingly, xama has been used for the base around which a basket is “weaved,” but I have not heard explicit connections being made between the two processes.
This idiom provides ways of speaking about relations between siblings. For example, when Daniel defined a connection with a “real” sister as based on having been born igual (the same [way]), he was making use of a category referring to the successive births between siblings: “we have the same umblio - you can be a piece of my umblio, then another, and another”\textsuperscript{cxli} (DHR27).\textsuperscript{153} More specifically, a sibling born directly after the ego could be referred to as “his piece of intestine” (havén puku teke, su pedazo de tripa/umblio), or simply “his piece” (su pedazo), and the ego may be said to be “a piece”\textsuperscript{154} of the directly preceding sibling.\textsuperscript{cxlii} As with the “blood,” this category only applies to adjacent positions. Here, the ubiquitous temporal hierarchy of front and behind or before and after (cf. devolution in Ch. 3), is found by the villagers even between twins, as suggested by Don Benigno’s musing:

First, one comes out. The other stays behind there, inside. After a while, the other comes out. Like that (ŁK: Is that puku teke?) Well, I’d say not, because they come out the same... [But] the one who comes first, the older one has the other one as his puku teke, right? Like that. They come out, but not together at the same time. First one comes on the path, then the other comes behind.\textsuperscript{cxliii} (BRS12)

Such “intestine” also stands for the reproductive-containing organ per se. A barren woman may be said to have her umblio malogrado [spoiled]. By counting knots on an umbilical cord one can also find out how many more babies the woman could still bear, which is associated with the number of “eggs” in her ovaries. The latter is explicitly compared to ovaries of birds or turtles (huevera, pusen), and Don Benigno described this as an “intestine.” What these representations evoke, therefore, is an image of a string of containments by the mother. The status of the “real” mother is associated with the woman who has contained the child in her intestine and released it to the world.

Yet, there is more. While the father’s role as the inceptor, or “maker,” is “active,” it seems to be construed as essentially “passive,” while that of the mother as the “recipient,” is quite “active” – it is she who suffers the labour associated with caring for the baby. Therefore, while the father’s role is compared to dropping the semen, “like a rooster,” according to Doña Luzmila (LCO01), the mother is attending to the demands of the foetus, and then to those of the baby after birth. In Daniel’s suggestive illustration, while the mother gets up at night to attend to the sick baby,

\textsuperscript{153} Note that a sibling of the same sex is simply “another,” wetsa.
\textsuperscript{154} Interestingly, the idiom of “part (of a whole)” is used by some northern Ge people in Brazil to refer to one’s kin (Coelho de Souza 2001).
the father remains in his bed and complains that he cannot sleep because of the crying\textsuperscript{dlix} (DHR14). Most of all, the mother’s containment is related to feeding. Thus, while the primary condition for recognizing the status of a “real” mother is having contained and dropped the baby into the world, in addition she [mother] has fed it. Once a woman becomes pregnant (embarazada, preñada, \textit{tu'uya} [with a belly]), she is “screwed” (jodida).\textsuperscript{clxv} Don Benigno often said pregnancy is a frightening state because of the potential complications or death resulting from difficult births. The mother also needs to feed the hungry, demanding being inside of her. This epitomizes the ambivalence attributed to all such contained living forms (cf. Ch. 2, especially the angry foetus). Although it is agreed that the foetus receives alimentation from the mother, the invisible mechanism of nurturing the child is a source of speculations.\textsuperscript{clxvi} Some say that the child actually eats while the mother eats, and her \textit{cría}’s demands explain the mother’s cravings (cf. Ch. 2). In any case, the word \textit{criar} (rearing) for villagers is often synonymous with feeding.\textsuperscript{clxvii}

This leads to an important issue, since the grounds for the mother’s “right” (der\textit{e}cho) to the child are sometimes argued based on an understanding that she has not merely carried and raised, but she has also transmitted her blood into the child. This contradicts the above agnostic definition. When I talked to others, especially women, about the idea of exclusiveness of the father’s blood in a child, they were sceptical of such an extreme unilateral transmission of “blood,” which I understood to be associated with the Capanahua \textit{antiguos}. Doña Luzmila and Germe reacted strongly:

...but to me that’s between the man and woman – it [the baby] has the same blood, of the two. Mhm... Because there is no way that it’s only from the man (...). It would be a different thing if the baby were to be born of you alone. Then it would have your [blood] only!\textsuperscript{clxviii} (GSR07)

What!? Who lied to you saying it does not carry the blood [of the mother]! It does, of the two! (...) I say that it does carry [blood] of both [parents]... (...) Well, it is right that the man engenders, but the mother rears it!\textsuperscript{clxi} (LCO01)

Here the transference of the mother’s internal content, blood, to the baby is construed as rearing, which means feeding. It might be speculated, as I mentioned earlier, that a man’s semen is literally blood, just as with the mother’s milk. This was explained to me by Don Benigno himself, and confirmed by others (GSR02; GSR06)\textsuperscript{cl}:
(ŁK: How is it that they say semen and mother’s milk are blood if they are white?) It doesn’t have another colour, the same. It’s the same (ŁK: But milk is white) Yes, white, but if you add some lime juice, it becomes blood. The mother’s milk is white, as from a cow (…) normally it stays white, but add some acid, and it changes colour. It ends up red⁴⁰ (BRS09).

“If you don’t believe, go on and (…) squeeze some mother’s milk into a bowl (…) Then (…) pour lime juice [into it].” There it is: blood, they say. Already blood (…) Many people told me this, many times: so you could see for yourself, do this, they would tell me”⁴¹ (BRS12)

From this perspective, the “real” mother is not only a container, she also introduces her blood into the baby through feeding. It is important to note here that while the moment of contribution of the mother’s blood is subject to differing interpretations (either still in the “intestine,” or “outside” with the mother’s milk), no one questioned the inceptive primacy of the father’s contribution. The mother’s contribution, when acknowledged, comes at a later point. Indeed, when I went back to Don Benigno, he admitted that a child contains the father’s blood, and that of the mother comes “behind” as “second” (atrás, segundo). Therefore, whether the father’s blood is exclusive or not, in the temporal hierarchy it ends up earlier, “in front,” and therefore, is primary (adelante, primero).¹⁵⁵ Moreover, symmetrically, it should be mentioned that men also come to “contain” in the sense of “raising” (feeding and sheltering) the child, but to a lesser extent. This role could also be attributed to stepfathers, adoptive fathers, godfathers and possibly fathers-in-law as “secondary” recipients. I will discuss this point later.

1.2. The results

The villagers use some social and kinship categories that can be understood in relation to the above formulations of procreation. First, I present some parallels of the language of parenting with the language of belonging, and then overview several categories based on this basic imagery of procreative relations more broadly, construed as traces left by the procreative processes in persons.

1.2.1. “Belonging”

In other spheres, the representations of relations establishing parenthood could be formulated as ownership. This is most explicit when these relations are

¹⁵⁵ Note that bebú in Capanahua stands for both “male” and “in front” or “first” (Loos & Loos 2003: 71). The connection is not purely linguistic. On our way to the field, Doña Ashuca once told me: “you go ahead, because you are a male.” Gender relations were often formulated as “in front” for men – “behind” for women, either by the Capanahua descendants themselves, or visiting strangers, such as the Shipibo missionaries.
spoken of in terms of the “right” (derecho) of the parent to the children, or having them “in (their) power” (en su poder) (cf. Ch. 2), and when the genitive language uses the generative idioms, where “mother” or “father” are synonyms for “owners.” Yet, the very formulation of a position of containing other’s innermost substance or having others contain one’s own – is where the villagers’ generative language meets genitive language. Firstly, as pointed out several times in this thesis, there are the convergences between owning and containing. Such “motherly,” patterns of owning postulate containing elements of others. Here, I add that the idiom of “nacido crecido” [born and raised] as mentioned in reference to children’s outside (Ch. 1), could expresses the notion of “belonging to a land.” This is perhaps similar to mananyura [lit. “the body” of the ridge or highland] which is the idiom used for the original land where a group of antiguos lived (see Sect. 2). Secondly, owning of the “fatherly” kind may be identified in relations where an entity is merely marked, rather than contained. One could, for example take a note of the fact that a hunter who shoots an animal without killing it may speak of it as belonging to him or as “owing”. The Capanahua descendants use a further popular idiom of belonging to a place, “having one’s intestine buried” [tripa enterrado] which refers to the practice of burying the placenta after birth. This might be read as owning the land by virtue of having a part of oneself in it. In such imagery, implanted in another body/form is one’s “element” – blood, semen, pellet or placenta. In either case, parenthood seems to be about such permanent, primary markers.

---

156 It is worth noting that the Cashinahua term for parents is ibu (D’Ans 1983), although the Capanahua descendants do not explicitly refer to parents as dueños, or ibu, owners.

157 Notice that neither is this modality strictly gendered. Women who opposed the purely “containing” vision of the mother’s contribution claim implementation of the internal element, even if at a later stage.

158 These considerations parallel the formulations of killer-victim (i.e. master-pet) relations in other Lowland contexts (e.g. Viveiros de Castro 1992; Fausto 1999; Villar 2004) and especially its relation to reproduction among Jivaros (Taylor 1993b). Particularly striking in this context is the imagery of parasitic insemination found in the explanations of human procreation and the killing of enemies discussed by Dmitri Karadimas for the Miraña, Witoto and Andoke. Here, the foeetus, originally implanted as a “soul” or “worm/larvae,” is conceived of as a cannibal being, hungry for the mother’s blood. Killing was explained in terms similar to insemination, and indeed leading to reproduction. These dynamics were formulated in terms of the “game of genders” (le jeu des genres) (Karadimas 2003: 510), which translate to the language used in this thesis as positions of containing.

159 I have not been able to discuss the representations of masters of natural resources (cf. Ch. 5) and devote much space for explicit discussion of “owning,” although they can come to be seen as an underlying idea in this work. I hope to elucidate the theme on another occasion. Here, I will merely note that I have observed two ways of conceiving such ownership, either as madre, “mother” or as dueño, “owner.” In the usages I noted, one pattern describes a little insect, for example, controlling a larger entity, as the woodworm madre, of the tree trunk. In the other, the owner is a container, as the bee’s nest is an owner, madre, of the multitude of insects inside. It was not entirely gendered however, and as will be argued below, men can also “contain” that is, have under their care. Once, we watched an action movie, which portrayed a prison rebellion when Balán, Doña Germe’s son, referred to the ultra-masculine leader of the prisoners as the “mother” (madre). Further, it is never quite possible to tell if the contained element, the sorcerer’s helpers, for example, is owned by the sorcerer, or if the sorcerer is owned by them (cf. Fausto 1999). These eversible patterns or perspectives, as shown, can be used to think about the position of the children (or parents) as either an “inside” or “outside” (Ch. 1 and 2, 3 and 5).
One can notice connections between the language of “owning” and “knowing” from other dimensions that also apply to parenting. In Ch. 3, I suggested the closeness of the formulations of “knowledge” with “substance/qualities” (and by extension, stories or names) and their interpenetrations or transferences. In Capanahua, ʾunan can be translated as “getting to know.” The fact that it also describes the act of making markings or cuttings on a tree to mark one’s ownership of the tree (in logging) (ʾunantiakin) (Loos & Loos 2003: 324), or that it can be used in describing an adopted child as ʾunan bake, points to a correspondence with the LUS verb reconocer, “recognise as one’s own,” used especially with reference to adopted children (who, by the way, are bestowed with the step-father’s surname, cf. also Sect. 3). Conocer could also refer to having had sex or having visited (the inside of) some domain etc. (see Ch. 1). Conocer familia refers to recognising and respecting one’s own kin (thus avoiding incest), which is connected to recognising one’s origins through the mother and father, as opposed to “ignoring” (ignorar, see Ch. 5). From here, it is possible to recall N.’s expression of “ownerlessness” ʾiʾbumbabu (Prologue) as being ignorant of one’s origins. The overarching idea in these parallels could, it seems, usefully be thought of in terms of the above patterns of containing, that is, parenting/owning.

1.2.2. The descending remnants

This presentation now approaches a vantage point from which the significance of surnames and (group) names as such “markers” of kinship and belonging can be appreciated.\footnote{The connection between mushin, blood and knowledge is most salient in brujería. It could be compared to the transmission of “names” as “souls” among the other Panoans, e.g. Yaminalhua (Townsley 1988), and therefore, to the kinds of apparently “symbolic” descent recognised in the Lowlands (cf. Introduction). In the previous chapter, I noted the connection between knowledge, names, stories and the heart that breathes and pumps the blood, the substance passed on with procreation.} Links with parents, which I have been presenting thus far through “blood” – as an internal element transmitted across bodies – are also associated with onomastics. There is a notable overlap between the above ways of presenting generative relations and the Peruvian onomastics.\footnote{There are some tentative indications that the antiguos Capanahua might have been identifying themselves through similar combinations of surname-like, coupled markers corresponding to the kikir or the identities of breeds (cf. Prologue, Ch. 5).} Firstly, the use of both the paternal and maternal surname reflects the acknowledgment of bilateral contribution, and the women, especially, were dismayed by the fact that Polish (or other Euro-American) onomastics exclude the mother’s contribution. Secondly, having – or “signing” (firmar, in the local idiom) with two surnames is also
remarkably compatible with the temporal hierarchy of these contributions. Therefore, the villagers explain that the father’s surname is “at front/ahead” while the mother’s “stays behind” as the second. Notice, for example, how N. (above and in the Prologue) uses that order to make hierarchical claims in reference to his cross cousins.

Thus, “blood” (as a mark of parental contribution), and surnames are intrinsically linked and seem to be understood or explained through each other. Indeed, often, when asking about “blood,” I would hear responses that dealt with surnames, and vice versa.

This connection is explicit in what is possibly, the most important category attributed to procreative relations: “having” or “being” a raza [lit. “race”]. It is defined either in terms of blood (sangre), or the surname (apellido, eg. Ríos) and the name of the antiguos’ “breeds” (generación, tribu, cf. Prologue, Ch. 5). Although used alternatively with sangre [blood], raza is not quite literally associated with blood as the bodily fluid (and in this context, this holds true for the above, exclusive himi or sangre [blood] category). Such literal connection, it was negated whenever I asked about it. People would either tell me that we all have the same red human blood – or contrarily, that it is never quite the same, because, for example, it changes from person to person or from generation to generation (cf. explanation of en himi discontinuity between alternating generations and persons). Furthermore, as we will see below, raza seems to be broader and more transcending than the narrow category of immediate, intergenerational blood transference (kin) in himi or sangre, even though the idiom of blood can sometimes be used interchangeably.

Only when it is passed on directly, through the procreative relations, do villagers recognize raza as “legitimate.” Not incidentally, perhaps, it relies on the imagery of breeding: raza is said to nacer [be born], salir [emerge from], aparecer [appear], levantar [raise from], aumentar [multiply/augment]. Similarly, the interchangeable expression, generación, corresponds not to a “generation” as a single horizontal step in descent from the ancestors, but refers to the consequence of the generative act of producing offspring, which vertically transcends these descent steps. In the words of Don Guillermo, generación is:

\[\text{Cf. Marubo} \text{ wrenía, rising or emerging of peoples (Werlang 2001, Cesarino 2008, Welper 2009).}\]
Living with all those that have multiplied, you could say, from one father. One father that has multiplied right there, his children too. Our... the children of our children: a complete generación already [laughs]. (GHR02)

(LK: is it a body, a soul or...?) It’s not a body... It’s from the body: those that form, the children that keep on being born. And they grow up and they get their wives, husbands: and so one’s generación multiplies. (GHR03)

Generación is what is born from a child’s child. (...) Child of a child that is born: those are generaciones already. They go on, getting bigger. As it says in the Bible: descendants††ii (GHR06)

In Capanahua, a similar idiom used to categorise people into “breeds,” designated through the tribu names (see Prologue and Ch. 5), such as ‘atu(bake)bu, which were formed with the literally defining people as the “progeny/descendants of.” For themselves, the products of this “generation” were hauen/nuken/en kaibu [their/our/my breed], and indicated shared origin or birth (“emergence,” cf. Ch. 1).163 In LUS, kaibu is equivalent to the term paisanos [lit. countrymen]. Both kaibu and paisano might refer to particular generación, a particular -bakebu category or a surname on more exclusive levels.164 More broadly, the people of various formative “breeds,” that came to be subsumed by foreigners as the “Capanahua,” according to the SIL sources, preferred to refer to this set of “generations” collectively as nuken kaibu. Similarly, the villagers use the category nuestros paisanos/pais to refer to an extended set of people with the same origin, the Tapiche-Buncuya area, and parents speaking the “same” language.165 Today, when the Capanahua descendants (or local mestizo) say that a person is a “paisano,” it points to the generative ties to people who have been known to outsiders as the Capanahua. In other words, it overlaps with what can also be referred to as generación/raza/sangre capanahua in people, just as other people can be of raza remoauca, campa, cocama, brasileria, polaca, etc. In this

---

163 A series of cognates sharing the root kai- kaibu, kaibuj, kaibukin, kaichi, kaiakin, kaipa i’una’i – refers to being abundant, to multiplying population or to spreading; kaimi – to emerge from, to be born; and suffix -bu denotes generic/plural.

164 It is important to note that sharing the surname with no actual known procreative connection is not sufficient to classify people as paisano. In such cases, they refer to each other as “parientes” and the nominal description of this relation is “parentesco.” As Don Benigno (BRSzo) said of his remote cousin: “not so legitimate [a family]. Almost like just a pariente [sharing surname/remote family]. Parentesco [lit. kinship].” (“no tan legítimo -- casi como pariente nomás -- Pariente, parentesco. -- Si fuera Rios – ahí: mi legítma mi familia -- Pero somos raza -- este -sangre capanahua”). In Spanish, these terms denote “relatives,” but on the Tapiche they tend to mean precisely the reverse. A non-related person is also said to be an particular or gente particular, with the meaning of individual(s) apart (also an idiom of aparte).

165 Yet, based on a similar idea of remains of a more remote common origin/language, the isolated Remoauca can also be called nuestros paisanos, and are assumed to share origins and language with people who have been “civilized as the Capanahua,” (civilizado en Capanahua), despite the fact that these people of the inaccessible headwaters are said to refuse to be “tamed/civilized.” Similarly, the more remote groups who are found to speak related, Panoan languages – like the Isconahua or Sharanahua, whose recordings I played to several people – are also said to be of a misma raza, paisanos or even “Capanahua,” speaking “the same” language. This corresponds with how other Panoans seem to be building an idea of a global origin. For example, two Marubo men who visited the Tapiche River with Father Mariano Gagnon in 1903 identified Capanahua as their own people (Isidro Salvador 1986; Welper 2009; Ruedas pers. comm.). It is worth adding that raza, kaibu or su paisano can refer to a species or subspecies of animals.
case, it does not usually imply that these people are, e.g., Cocama. In fact, I had the impression that it might sometimes be considered rather rude to explicitly talk of someone as being, e.g. “Cocama,” and it is most often offensive to call someone else “a Capanahua.” Rather, raza marks the persons’ specific connections to their progenitors and ancestors, through some knowledge of a particular language (idioma), “custom” (costumbre), but it is also encoded in the surname. Therefore, I understand raza to refer to originating from specific persons and places, and connecting people as “kin” by virtue of sharing the same trajectory of emerging or producing offspring. This idea would overarch categories such as raza, generación, apellido, and kaibu or paisano. Sangre, as with the other categories, refers to different levels of origins, from the immediate transference relations of parenthood or siblinghood (as in Don Benigno’s first definition) to larger groups. In every case, it is based on the specific idiom of procreation and origins, and is closest to what might be understood as “descent,” yet, embedded in particular kinds of trajectories, which I draw out in the next section.

1.3. The trajectories of dilution

With this wider perspective on the consequences of procreation, I can return to reflect on the implicit nature of the generative relations and their results for the villagers. This, by extension, allows for approaching an idea of what kinship relations are in such context, and how they, along with other features of the world, are expected to exist in time.

1.3.1 Procreation as sickness

First, let me return to the “making” mechanism itself. The imagery of a parasitic implanting is profoundly significant. It construes procreation as a distortion of essentially the same kind that in other contexts was diagnosed as sickness. The parallel with the processes of cutipar, shinguriar, embrujar, and the generative-frustrative dynamics of ejemplar from the previous chapter should be obvious. By opposition, “health” would consist of the self-contained state, lack of internal voids or compositeness. Curing, or curar (Ch.3) consists of the extraction of the contained element or strengthening the body or its surface against penetrations, by internalizing a harder, more durable or resistant, purer content. This leads the discussion again past the idea of clarity and durability conducive to indivisibility that is opposed to containment, as illustrated in Ch. 1 and 2. In parallel, that state is also
reminiscent of the mythic owners’ original, pure and suffering-free domains (Ch. 3). The process of procreation is therefore conditioned by the harm done to a person, who assumes in relation to the product, a status of formerly original self-contained purity (abstracted from her/his previous dilution, or minor containment, such as natural human hunger etc.). Procreation reproduces the eternal void, the sickness or vengeance of the original owners, which consists of repeating their fate (Ch. 3).

1.3.2. The descent: offshoots

This means two things for the villagers’ approach to the “generative process.” Firstly, procreation is a process which is essentially destructive to the parents. It diminishes them by extracting their elements or consuming them (if “only” by making them suffer or “sin,” see Ch. 2). Secondly, this means that the product is, in essence, the difference between their health before and after procreation, a broken off “piece,” the worm, or blood of the parent. Like the “gifts” cut off from the original owners’ presence, the remnants are merely a memento, meagre replacements of the parents. These are diagnoses that I have mentioned in this thesis, and are explicit to the villagers. They are firmly rooted in the same reasoning that devolutionary explanations in Ch. 3. In fact, these two implications are powerfully illustrated in the image introduced in the previous chapter, which is explicitly used in reference to the progression of descent, or intergenerational relations: *tronco* (tree trunk) and *ramas* (branches).166

Recall the thief in the manioc story breaking off a little piece of the stalk, only as much as he could hold in his fist. Now that stolen piece of the original is implanted in an old and rotten, fallen tree trunk. It still grows to become an

---

166 The imagery of a tree trunk and the branches seems to be quite widely spread in the South American Lowlands. It first caught my attention in Delvair Montagner’s report (2007) from the Moa River. The headwaters of the Moa River adjoin the Tapiche River and have a history closely connected with the Tapiche, both through the Panoan inhabitants living between these rivers, and through later Peruvian-Brazilian interconnections. People on the Moa river, descendants of the Panoan Nukini and “Nawa” spoke of descent as referring to the *troncos velhos*, old tree trunks, the “real Nawa” who were gone, and the descendants who were only their *sementes*, the seeds. José Maurício Arruti analysed similar imagery for the remote Brazilian Pankararu (Arruti 1995). Peter Rivière (1969: 64) in turn mentions the idiom of branches or tributaries in the Trio ways of referring to offspring. Much closer, Luiz Antonio Costa (2007) describes similar imagery of the tree trunks or main rivers and leaders, opposed to tributaries and followers for the Kanamari. For the villagers, the main river is also a “mother” (*madre*) of the tributaries.
enormous tree, but gives out separate, smaller branches. It is these branches that the people will be breaking off and planting. They will not grow miraculously as the original had. The branches are also qualified with particular names, unlike the unmarked original, the “real” stem of the Creator. This branching out from the stem can be seen as a metarepresentation of the generative-frustrative process depicted in the previous chapter: division of the individual, original and pure trunk (tronco) into pieces or offshoots (ramas) which are its mortal and weaker copies, bound to further reproduce the original’s division.

Every such “insemination” by extraction diminishes the trunk, and similarly, every copy extracted becomes more diminished (Fig. 9). The previously signalled, temporal hierarchy of authenticity or purity evoked in the villagers’ explanations values the past as, real (kuin, legitimo), first (los primeros, fundadores), in front (adelantar), at the head (encabezar, matian [ma- head; tian period]) or at the source (cabeceras). That which comes afterwards is always lesser, weaker, smaller such as the chini bake (“the last (behind) children”) the very last ones (los últimos or huinshos), from the other day (del otro día nomás). In general, therefore, authenticity is attributed by the villagers to whichever was older, and thus experientially closer to an “original,” and it is expected to diminish in the extracted elements – not only between the original and its splits, but also between these. That is why older people are expected to “know” more about the origins (Ch. 3), why parents are originals in relation to children, and why older siblings are assumed to be more knowledgeable or “real,” having extracted more from the original. In the common expressions, descendants living today are what the villagers call “merely children” (hijos nomás), lo que crece [what grows]. They are the “branches” (ramas), “seeds” (semillas), “offshoots” (mallqui) of the original troncos, the genitors. Celso described his relation to his grandfather, the “original” Baquinahua, as “roots” (raíces), which would signal that the quintessence of this image is the opposition of original singularity to a multitude of lesser and weaker extractions or protrusions. They are opposed to the “real” ones, the parents and ancestors (tronco, sepa [core]). Consequently, if the ancestors were “Capanahua,” then those who live today are merely their differentiated, lesser descendants. Recalling the problem of the vanishing group in the Introduction, and how those ancestors themselves talked

---

167 In a related image, the more children she bears, the weaker and more destroyed (“old”) the mother is considered.
about their ancestors as “strong”, against their own weaker condition, the past tronco authenticity becomes elusive and relative for all generations.

Additionally, the opposition to Don Benigno’s first definition can perhaps be treated as both an indication of the problem with reproduction, and as the problem itself. It is the additional contribution that further contributes to the alteration of the extracted piece. Therefore, the problem with a child is that – as Doña Germe noted soberly – it is always the product of two (either through contribution or containment) and is neither one completely.

1.3.3. The kinship: counting losses

The most significant implication therefore is that the process articulates the devolutionary logic presented as organizing villagers’ explanations of causality, origins and what we could understand as the flow time in general. The process of procreation therefore has very little to do with the “re-production” of parents, because they are at best diminished copies, and at worst their nemesis. A perfect copy or clone is an asymptote, simply impossible to achieve in procreation (which can be for good or for bad, depending on which way they are headed – see below and Ch. 5). The process is also uneasily generative, because it is basically ambivalent – destructive or frustrative as much as generative.

In the context of increasing devolution, competing interpretations and discussions of the degree and timing of the parents’ contribution mentioned above point to a profoundly significant concern: who split (contributed) into whom and in what order. If the idiom here is that of “blood,” which stands for kinship for many people in the world, and in different ways, what matters on the Tapiche and Buncuya Rivers are the sequences in which that finite substance, standing for primal, universal unity and associated with “knowledge” or capacity, has been passed on. They indicate the resulting degrees of its dilution or soiling – or, in reverse, measure proximity to a pre-procreative original, which exists in varying levels across living people. I believe that these sequences or trajectories are what lines of raza indicate, as the specific “marks” of “emergence” in different order and thus, differentiated degrees of “purity” or “originality” remaining from the formative, generative splits (generación).

---

168 E.g. Carsten 2013.
In other words, with the uncontrolled flow of time or procreation, the “real” kinship (familia legítima) here is traced through the trajectories of dilution from postulated original purity existing before these relations have been established by procreative, ineliminably diminishing acts. At the relative level, “authenticity” of relations between kin is established by sequences of adjacent procreative positions, that is, diminishing, experiential proximities to (or containments of) the original before procreation. If measured in relation to the parent as the original or tronco (with the differentiation between sequence and levels of contribution between the parents themselves, where the father is “anatomically” split first), the first child is the closest and has the most experiential “knowledge/quality” of the original. Thus, in subsequent children these are increasingly diminished, and adjacent siblings have similar degrees of dilution (or originality).

The dynamic of the trunk and the branches, and the inherently perverted, differentiating and devolutionary flow of time permeate the villagers’ representations at different spheres. It is important that they articulate the pathogenic-generative character of procreation as the germ of mortality, and help to understand the specific formulations of kinship and descent. If uncontrolled, procreation leads to more differentiation, dilution and ultimately to perishing. The villagers explicitly imagine certain social strategies as directed at controlling such frustrating-generative dynamics of kinship (paque no pierda). I will now proceed to propose how they, and the ways of explaining participation in sociality presented so far could be understood as responding to these preoccupations. I start with those attributed to the antiguos, and then move on to signal another alternative, which will lead toward Ch. 5.

2. How not to waste away?

This deadly result of procreation through others is, I think, what the villages had in mind when they told me a particular story of the antiguos. It poses a locally important question embedded in what has been said here so far. The young man who became the moon is said to sneak into his sister’s (or parallel cousin, sometimes identified as niece) hammock at night and have sex with her while she slept. She became pregnant and decided to find out who did this to her. One night when he approached her, she smeared non-washable jagua or huito paint onto his face. In the daylight she discovered that it was her close relative. The boy was so humiliated, ashamed or angered by the revealed difference (of interests) that he was unable to
continue living at home. Various versions of his monologue,\textsuperscript{cliv} articulate this predicament particularly well. Consider what follows by the elderly Don Jorge, and another by Victor:

[She] says: “It was him!” \textit{Hen!} He no longer wanted to show up [at home]. Shucks, he says... \textit{Put’ carajo!} [swearing], he thought of all kinds of crap. He wanted to become... the bole (shungo)... what you use to make a house [post], see. “[But then] that can be made into a house! \textit{Ha!} It perishes too!” So now, he was thinking of all kinds of boles, I guess. But no. So now... “The... stone? - but it’s used to sharpen blades [i.e. wears down]! Mm... Shucks!” He thought of everything! Finally, he thought: “Ok, here it is: I’ll become the moon. There is no moon yet,” he says. “That’s how I’ll mess them [women] up”\textsuperscript{clv} (JRR03)

“It’s you, brother, isn’t it?” – she told him – “It’s you!” He didn’t say a word, they say. Ashamed, he was already thinking/worrying, they say, \textit{amigo Lucas}: “What can I turn myself into? I’ll make myself an electric eel!” Thinking, thinking: “[But] someone might kill me... What else – they say he was saying – can I become? I’ll become a boa... [but] someone might kill me then as well! What can I become?” – they say he says. “Let’s see, what’s not [here or] there?” he says, thinking he says, the man/does. “What can I become?” – and then he remembers, they say – “Aaaan! There is no moon, he says. I’ll become the moon! Done, dammit! I’m going to become the moon”\textsuperscript{clvi} (VPB03)

In this section, I present some solutions generally attributed to the \textit{antiguos} as a strategy of “\textit{paque no pierda su raza}” [so that their breed does not perish],\textsuperscript{169} by keeping the \textit{troncos} as “pure” as humanly possible, thus “reproducing” in the sense of actually issuing copies. In one idealized image, the breeds are perfectly impermeable, and thus imperishable. In the other, the dynamic itself is contained by literally taming its products, and thus transcending the procreative problem in the kinship and marital systems. I outline some of its guiding moves according to the dynamics presented so far on the example of the forgotten ideal kinship system.

\textbf{2.1. The impregnation of \textit{troncos}}

Although what Eugene Loos called the “patrilineal clans” were not in his times “identified with a particular locality” (1960: 1), the idea of the original separateness of breeds, \textit{tribus/razas} (cf. Prologue, Ch. 5), indeed seems to belong to the historical representations of the Capanahua people that he worked with. In a recorded conversation (1973) with Loos, Celso’s grandfather Ernesto spontaneously pointed to the lands (\textit{mai}) of his own \textit{kaibu}, the \textit{Neabakebu}, and “other” named groups in the

\textsuperscript{169} Perishability can be formulated as \textit{terminar} [terminate], \textit{dañar} [deteriorate], \textit{manchar} [blemish] \textit{raza} – or in Capanahua, \textit{hawen kaibu keuyama} [their breed does not exhaust itself]. I heard the mestizo talking about “staining their raza” by marrying people with lower surnames, and of the \textit{antiguos} Capanahua as guarding their \textit{raza} in a similar way to the Capanahua descendants.
area of the Buncuya and the Tapiche.\textsuperscript{clvii} Similarly, in a historical narrative from 1972 (Schoolland 1975: 256–301), Don Guillermo’s father, Manuel Huaninche referred to part of the Buncuya land as belonging to his \textit{kaibu}, the \textit{Na‘inbakebu}, and others to their neighbours, \textit{Neabakebu}, as well as \textit{Xanebu} (ibid.: 292), using the expression I mentioned before (Sect. 1.2.), \textit{nuken mananyura} [lit. our legitimate highland\textsuperscript{170}] (ibid.: 257). The episode from the earthworm’s son’s story, in which the boy establishes names-breeds at separate locations is consistent with this imagery. In 2007, Doña Germe’s father-in-law, the elderly Manuel Vásquez patiently responded to my questions, indicating past locations of some \textit{kaibu} he knew or speculated about, possibly echoing the similar mappings of his older relatives (MVP01) (Krokoszyński 2008: 38–39). She later added a future, post-mortem perspective to this image recalling:\textsuperscript{171}

You know how it sounds before the rain... (...) When someone died, and it sounded over here, my, dad would tell me: “That’s where the Neabu live! - he’d say – [motioning towards a part of the sky]. [So] thaat’s where the Neabu live!” [Then] someone else died: “Binabu!” – he’d tell me [motioning to] where the sound came from. “They live there!” (...) “They live there, and the Neabu live here.” (LK: So everyone goes to a different place in the sky [after death]? Different, perhaps... Whatever it was that my dad was thinking!... I’d say so...\textsuperscript{clviii} (GSR07)

Today, people invoke this trope by referring to historical or contemporary small groups, living in isolated locations as \textit{puro ellos} [only them], \textit{entre ellos nomás} [among themselves]. Different levels of exclusiveness can be invoked here, from a generic name (e.g. “\textit{puro Capanahuas}”), through specific breeds (e.g. “\textit{puro Neabus}”), to surnames (e.g. “\textit{puro Chumos}”) (cf. Ch.1). In each case, it points to a physical division into social spaces associated with singular, named breeds. Consider Américo’s explanation:

[they were] other nations (\textit{países}), they would not mix! (...) Only [e.g.] \textit{pisabakebu}\textsuperscript{172} lived here. From another \textit{generación}. Over there: \textit{pa‘ebakebu}. Another \textit{generación} over there. They would not mix! \textit{Neabu} [lived] apart. (...) They have different names. But they did not mix: like Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia: these do not mix.\textsuperscript{clix} (AR01)

\textsuperscript{170} -\textit{yura} as suffix generally marking emphasis. It is glossed as “positive” (Loos nd.c) or “a lot” (Loos & Loos 2003: 401). It should be added, perhaps, that \textit{yura} as a noun means “body,” and the intransitive verb \textit{yura} is glossed as “to coagulate.” Cf. \textit{manaa} claim in the Prologue. Note also that in Amahuaca, \textit{manaa} refers to a “village” (Woodside 1980: 45).

\textsuperscript{171} I expect the sound may refer to rolling thunder before the rain.

\textsuperscript{172} In the past, \textit{Pisobu} was a name with which Américo’s family from the Punga or Frontera Yarina called the people to the east of the Tapiche – probably the Matses.
Such separation between breeds coexists, not accidentally, with other qualities commonly attributed to the *antiguos* across many conversations. Most importantly, the *antiguos* are said to have been physically stronger and more resistant (*kushi, fuerte*) than their descendants. It is often noted that ancestors in remote times worked much harder, “suffering” without the use of modern metal tools, and yet, they left behind large fields that were cleared better than those of today. The older generations are remembered as working alone, in contrast to the group work on a *minga* by the descendants. The ancient people are said to have lived long and healthy lives, and they did not eat salt or cooked food (roasting it instead), unlike contemporary people (Don Benigno, for example, associated the contemporary weakness of people with eating too much salt – which the *antiguos* did not use). The ancient ones did not let anyone in or let anyone take anything from them. They are described as *bravos*, fierce, warlike – and most agile and resistant when fighting. A common motif concerns the club fights with terrible blows to the head or slashes inflicted with the *wushati* blades (cf. fighting in the Prologue), which contemporary people cannot imagine withstanding and they laugh at the idea in awe. The *antiguos* would fall down but not perish. Rather, they would get up with blood flowing down their faces. Thanks to their knowledge of healing plants, these horrendous wounds would heal within a week. They fought for women or to try (*probar*) their valour and endurance. Similar representations were passed on in the times of Loos’ and indeed seem to have influenced his presentation of the Capanahua past. As he notes explicitly, the Capanahua used to speak about how strong and brave their ancestors were (EL01), and the elderly would complain about the degradation of the young, mid-20th century generations (Loos 1960). As noted in the Introduction, similar discourses describe the past and younger generations. The villagers repeatedly told me how their fathers and uncles were fierce and hardworking, because, as Don Benigno would say, *antiguo era incansable*, [the old ones were tiresome].

There is a meaningful parallel of such imagery of separation and strength. Recall that an aspiring *brujo* produces a state of internal purity by cleansing himself of all influences and excludes all potentially harmful elements or situations from his “diet” (Ch. 2). I suggest further that this is also the quintessence of the *antiguos*’ state as the result of their absolute isolation, and they are indeed sometimes thought to have known sorcery because of their way of life. In both cases, toughening of the body by purifying and insulating it from the introduction of foreign elements through
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relations (interpenetrations) – is the condition for imperviability from unwanted influences, blows or penetrations, and thus, invincibility. This is necessary for survival as a brujo, and also explains representations of the ancestors. A trope that connects these two spheres further is, in fact, the “tree trunk” as the ideal, impenetrable “body” – both are called yura, cuerpo, with its himi, sangre, as “blood/resin” (cf. Ch.2 on anthropomorphic character of trees). An important insight into this explicit connection is provided by Don Baudilio’s interpretation of a certain expression, or an identity claim, attributed to his paternal uncles and ancestors (cf. drunken claims in the Prologue):

Binun’ibu are the… (...) sepa de aguaje [bole of moriche palm]! They used to be really strong/resistant (fuerte) in the past. (...) They used to fight – and there was nothing [others] could do to him, that’s why he often said: (...) “Pa ta binun’ibu ki! Hawentiabi Neabu ‘a’ka’, keyu’paunishki.” Haska’a’ ki nuen… [“I am the owner of aguaje! The Neabu have never been killed, finished” That’s what our...] (...) fathers used to say in the past”clxii (BSR01)

That portrayal of the “owner/bole of the moriche” is important for the imagery of descent in terms of tronco and ramas, as I argued earlier. Villagers say that the ancestors themselves were the sepa, or tronco, conveying the idea of the tree trunk as original, self-contained, separated purity and strength, connected with impregnability.

One more, important way in which the antiguos are said to have guarded their originality and guaranteed the imperishability of their raza, is the prevention of foreign introductions or inseminations. By invoking the expression of “living only among themselves” the villagers often point to another important constatation about the separateness of breeds: the postulated extreme endogamy of the antiguos. Don Romer gave me a hypothetical example, using the common Capanahua surnames:

They did not want the Chumos to penetrate, and neither were they going [near the Chumos], because they in turn did not want the Huaninches to penetrate. Like this. So [they would agree]: “You are from the Tapiche, we are from the Buncuya. And so I will be here, and you, go away!” [laughing] They wouldn’t allow!clxiii (RPR01)

In a popular explanation, the ancestors were stingy with their daughters or sisters [mezquinando hijas/hermanas]. Continuing Don Romer’s explanation:

They didn’t want people from far away coming in. They didn’t want their daughters to go far away! (...) The man [son-in-law] will always be homesick, it’s not his land. He wants to leave, with his wife. So that’s why they did it in the past [multiplied here]. That is how Manuel Huaninche explained it to me,clxiv (RPR01)
In other words, fearing for the continuity of their raza multiplications, the antiguos decided to marry only their own breed (raza). Many people today are not sure what the actual marriage prescriptions were, and describe the antiguos with some amusement as generally marrying kin:

That’s how they used to live, my dad said. They lived with their family, even their sisters! (...) They didn’t know anything, not even who their family was (...) With their fathers, sisters.¹⁷⁵ (GSR11)

The reason why Don Romer laughed in the quote above is that such isolation almost invariably implies incestuous relations. In the local idiom, it is compared to the behaviour of monkeys, especially the violently territorial and noisy red howlers (coto mono, ru’u).¹⁷³ It is sometimes attributed, with contempt, not only to the antiguos, but also to some mestizo families from downriver, wherever the paternal and maternal surnames are the same, or to other cases of known incest in the area. Most of all, it is connected with the savage, untamed, xenophobic, stingy and sometimes fiercely protective or predatory pole of sociality: the indios, both historical (as one’s ancestors) and contemporary (as other groups or the people said to be avoiding contact and hiding in the headwaters).

I would note that such a strategy of absolute closing off corresponds to the behaviour of the man who became the moon. The strong link presented so far between procreation through others and mortality or perishability suggests that what is represented as the Moon’s search for imperishability is connected with his visits to the female relative in the first place. Such a union would accomplish a complete self-contained reproduction without frustrating the mediation of difference. What became impossible for him on earth, he accomplished in the sky, where he took all his other female relatives apart from the one who resisted him and blemished the potential purity, thus causing the later generations to procreate in pain and loose the precious blood. He, in turn, went to live apart in an imperishable space (we might say, similar to the pure city dwellers, as discussed in Sect. 3).

2.2. Taming the infliction

Back on earth, the Moon’s extreme is not an accepted option in the attempt to save raza from perishing. Another solution imagined for reproduction approaches a

¹⁷³ I learned that one of the most secure ways of eliciting bawdy laughter are jokes involving monkeys, especially the red howler. Monkeys are said to “ignore” kinship relations and have sex with the closest members of the family.
more nuanced and recent view of the ancestors’ strategies against procreation. I propose that it is delimited by the pole of the Moon’s incest on the one hand, and on the other, by stories of radically foreign animal inseminations (Ch. 3). The strategy tricks the infliction by literally containing, or taming, its products. First, let me outline some imagery of this solution drawn by the villagers today. Later, I will reach for historical information recorded by the SIL.

Américo recalled what his father, “Lower Capanahua,” used to tell him:

There [in Frontera] they were all family, pure family (...). That’s what my father used to tell me. (...) “Well, son, [you’re] wanting to make out with pure family, right? That’s no good. Now, son: all of those here are your family. (...) Let’s see, we have to take your sister, and we’re going to make an exchange there.” They would (...) arrive at the house of his friend. Talk between fathers, and women with women. (AR01)

Likewise, on another occasion Don Romer qualified his previous image of radical separation between the hypothetical Huaninches and Chumos:

[so that the daughter would not be taken far away] the uncle hands his child over to a nephew or niece. (...) It’s his nephew too, but has a different surname. It’s the same raza, the same generación though (...). [Yet,] with the same surname, Huaninche Huaninche: no. It’s got to be mixed a little (mezcladito). Chumo Huaninche or Huaninche Chumo, that’s where the generación multiplies, and multiplies the village/group (pueblo). (RPR01)

He drew another hypothetical situation for the recent antiguos, which makes an important point:

They didn’t want to change the raza (...) didn’t want to mix the generación, to have others come from afar, so instead [they’d] make themselves unite. So (...) I hand over my daughter to my nephew. The other hands over his son to his niece. That’s how it used to be before. In the past, you could say they were marrying between cousins. There it multiplied, the same raza. It would not change. And it kept on multiplying. Like this. (...) Another daughter, and another son, so [he would say]: “Dang, cha’im! Give me your... min bake ñatawe, cha’in [give me your child, brother-in-law]!” “Ok, en p’iashan [my nephew]!” And he handed her over to him. (RPR01)

The “exchange” or “handing over” in these representations takes place between neighbouring “lands” or “villages.” In Manuel Huaninche’s story in Schooland’s 1975 collection, the Na’inbakebu arrive at the village of the neighbouring Neabakebu, whom they mutually address as their kukabu, cha’ibu, pi’ashabu (see below). I assume that the term henabu, or henayurabu with which he defines their relation
points to these kinds of allies, who have exchanged sons or daughters.\textsuperscript{174} The two meanings glossed for \textit{henabu} in the dictionary, “neighbour” and “family member,” were confirmed by the villagers. They point to the relations which do not annul simultaneous separation, and indicates a co-habitation (containment) within a shared space. Conserving the separate containment of their breeds or names, these affines are thus “joined, but separate” (Ch. 2).

\textbf{2.2.1. The Capanahua kinship}

Now, it will be useful to reach to the marital practices and kinship terms used by the coexisting \textit{kaibu} during the initial decades of the SIL missionary work (1950-70s). The ideal solution to perishability among the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century Capanahua is very similar to the one imagined for them by their descendants. The main source for this presentation can only be a term paper authored by Eugene Loos, entitled “Capanahua Patrilineality and Matrilocality” (Loos 1960), and some additional short presentations.

First of all, based on his experience between 1955-58, Eugene Loos listed names of only four patrilineal and exogamous “clans,” translating their -\textit{bakebu} suffix as “sons of” (see Sect. 1). According to Loos, these had a “unifying function within the tribe but beyond that seem[ed] no longer to have much importance” (ibid.: 1). Between 2009 and 2013, he also informed me that the only situations where he heard these affiliations mentioned were negotiations of marriage arrangements. For example, a man might discuss marrying the sister of the other one, arguing that “he was a \textit{binabakebu} – but the girl was not. So his logic was that the two clans are not incompatible – they are compatible. And so, they should be allowed to marry”\textsuperscript{clxix} (EL03). In another text, Loos wrote: “(...) in cases where persons were strangers and it was difficult to trace kinship relations, they used patrilineal lineage – the “clan” – to arrive at marital arrangements”\textsuperscript{clxx} (1972: 2–3).\textsuperscript{175} It should be taken into consideration here is that most of such patrilineal and exogamous affiliations with Panoan names by the 1950s had been overlaid with Peruvian surnames. Yet, these ways of marking descent seem to have been quite congruous, as I noted for

\textsuperscript{174} Probably related to the Cashinahua \textit{nabu}, where it refers to people addressed with the Cashinahua kinship/relatedness terms. It is translated as \textit{parientes}, relatives, by Marcel D’Ans (1985) and \textit{nabu kuin} as “actual relations” by Cecilia McCallum (2001). \textit{Enabu} in the latter’s explanation translates to “my relatives” and describes “a group of persons with whom one should live” (ibid.: 32).

\textsuperscript{175} Translations of the texts written in Spanish are mine.
contemporary surnames. Indeed, many of these modern surnames can be traced back to older *kaibu* names even today. Sometimes the villagers refer to them as the “real/original” (*legítimos, verdaderos*) surnames. As we saw above, for Capanahua descendants, these (sur)names correspond to patrilineal, exogamous *generaciones* or *razas*, i.e. “breeds,” just like they might have for their ancestors. It might therefore be said that their relevance for exogamous marriage arrangements, like with the contemporary surnames, is what would actually make them rather significant, although it might also be imagined that kinship terminology itself would be helpful in arranging the usual marriages.

Furthermore, in this and other manuscripts, Eugene Loos presented patrilineality as coexisting with matrilocality. In such an ideal or preferred arrangement, the newly married couple reside with or near the wife’s parents (1960: 4). This relation between “the patriarch” and his “helpers” is here one of the most explicit axes for social organization. Ideally the Capanahua settlements would be composed of extended family groups living under the influence of the patriarch who gathered, most of all, his sons-in-law through his daughters, and also sometimes kept his sons with their wives (Loos nd.a: 2). The lower generations in his place were “subject to the patriarch’s call” (1960: 8). This meant that a young man, after marrying his cross-cousin:

need[ed] to live with his wife in the house of his father-in-law, and he [was] obliged to serve his father-in-law until death took one or other. After many years, the son-in-law could build his own house, but generally a short distance from that of his father-in-law (Loos nd.a: 2)

[He] always served his father-in-law in the production of fields, canoes, signal drums, or houses, and satisfied his needs of meat and fish. (...) The relation between father-in-law and son-in-law was therefore important for the family because acquisition of skilful sons-in-law signified an economic help valuable for the head of the family (Loos 1972: 2–3)

It should be noted that existence of such a settlement would therefore be attributed to the father(s)-in-law and his helpers (sons-in-law and sons), who have opened the clearing, built a large house and invited other people (cf. founding in Ch.

---

176 For example, many middle aged villagers are aware that the Huaninches were *Naṕnhabeqe*hu, that the Ríos, Pizarros or Vásquez’ trace from *Añabu*, that the Chumos, Baquinahuas, Freires or Panaruas are descendants of possibly different “branches” of *Neabu*, Romainas of *Muebu*, some Ríos of *Pinabu*, Solisbancos from *Kapabu*, etc.

177 Cf. “political economy of persons” (Rivière 1983; Ruedas 2001; cf also Turner 2003).
1). Sons-in-law and lower generations would be subject to such founders-owner(s), and would quite literally be contained within their house or the cleared space.\textsuperscript{178}

In representations of the past, men might also gain prestige by capturing boys or girls in raids, and incorporating them into life on par with other adults\textsuperscript{clxxiv} (Loos 1972: 2–3). The captives just mentioned, as well as someone’s “helpers” or “workers,” adopted children or pets, all share a similar position towards a controlling, sheltering figure. In LUS, these positions would be referred to by Capanahua descendants as cría [pet], cholo [peon] or even esclavo [slave], most literally pointing to the functional aspect of this position: an obligation to work for (and therefore be dependent on) someone else (cf. M’s speech in the Prologue). In Capanahua, these wards are referred to as \textit{ñabu}. The same word – \textit{ña(bu)} – also refers to DH or marriageable (i.e. “deliverable”) ZS of a woman (see below).

### 2.2.2. The positions of containing

Here son-in-law embodies a crucial relational position, triggering the dangerous process of procreation between two entities. He plays the role of the pathogenic-generative transitory element at the level of social arrangement. Taming him means taming the very process and achieving the aim: \textit{paque no pierda la raza}. Here, patrilinearity marks the \textit{ñabu} son-in-law as belonging (having originated) “elsewhere,” and only “emerged/entered” in another space. Matrilocality establishes secondary containment, or “owning” over him by the process explicitly described as taming. This allows for an experiment in positioning the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century Capanahua kinship terminology between what I tentatively suggested might have been called “neighbours” (\textit{henabu} or \textit{henayura}), or in the terms of this chapter, the \textit{troncos} (Appendix 3. 1). Several of the comments that follow below accompany those charts, and are a continuation of this experiment, proposing a reading of these constellations in terms used by the villagers.

1. “Extracted inside.” Patrilineality, for example, might be understood through the idea of separate internal contributions. In fact, the idea of the internal containment of the male progenitor’s element, “blood” or surname (or \textit{kaibu}

---

\textsuperscript{178} Until early 20\textsuperscript{th} century settlements were composed of large houses with roofs reaching the ground, supposedly separated in quarters. Don Guillermo recalled that in the 1950-60s, his father’s 25-metre long house on the Buncuya, although of a contemporary construction (with elevated roof and with a floor platform), contained quarters for various nuclear families of his sons-in-law and sons.
affiliation) as more authentic, becomes useful in making sense of a basic distinction in this terminology: the relatedness of marriageable cousins. We might wonder if in an ideal arrangement – where FB (who shares internal content, “blood,” with F) inseminates MZ – it would be this male, dominant contribution (proximity to an original split) that establishes descended sameness of internal content in FB and MZ’s children, making them parallel cousins. Rather, that is, than the relation of closeness between the secondary contributions of M and her Z. And, reversely, MB (not sharing the content of F), who ideally inseminates FZ, would produce a batch of cross-cousins containing the alter’s contribution. The “bloods” of male originators, even though coexisting, remain contained in separate series, or using the imagery introduced earlier, in “troncos.” Siblings could be understood as a set composed of a number of mutual, yet diminishing replicas defined by their position and content. Qualifier wetsa [lit. another] implies “the other in a series,” so “my wetsa” is my same sex sibling or parallel cousin, literally “the other in ego series” and, e.g. my father’s wetsa is “the other in F series.”

2. “Hosting outside.” We might understand matrilocality as hosting “other content.” Matrilineal relatives could generally, be conceived in this context as assuming containing positions in relation to ego and his/her patrilineal relatives. Firstly, the mothers provide containment for the fathers’ inseminations, and children. Secondly, for the WM, their DH are ˓ina(bu), perhaps “the received ones,”179 and for the WF, they are ˓ikunin(bu), possibly “the embraced ones.”180 Indeed, from a larger perspective, the products of the WF’s work; such as cleared space, built house and engendered daughters, could be understood as their “inside,” which for the introduced, substantially other Fs constitutes a surrounding, an “outside” which hosts and “embraces” them. WM and WF could then be understood as becoming secondary owners, the recipients of the “blood” from the original tronco, subject to their call to work. These henabu are co-habitants, neighbours, a specific kind of matrilineal “family” – the containing, uniting “others.”

179 Additional linguistic expertise could determine whether it is actually conceivable that it is related to the verb ˓inankin [to give, hand over], which Don Romer used in a quote above describing a conversation between future in-laws (“min bake ˓inawe”), and which would make the noun convey the meaning of “the given one” or “a gift-person.”

180 Possibly a cognate of the verb ˓ikokin, “to embrace,” as in taming a newly captured pet (Loos & Loos 2003: 154), or tentatively, ˓fkut “to enter” (ibid.: 155).
3. “Returning insides.” **Alternating generations** could be understood as the actual reproduction. An act of introducing the S/F as *inabu* into the domain of the MF/MM can be conceived as penetration. The FF/FM could be understood as “inseminating” the MF/MM space in a familiar parasitic imagery. The F/S are bound to the MF/MM and not expected to return to their own parents. It is the SS who return, like a debt, to the “original” domains. FF/FM receive their SS as “the other in ego series,” with the same levels of internal contributions. The mutual terms by which they address each other are either “younger/older sibling” or *xu’ta*, “namesakes” or replacements (*xu’ta’ti*, “to replace” (Loos & Loos 2003: 391)). Such exchange would create a localized “ego series,” or a group of “siblings,” the tronco. Between these generations, the “F/S series” is only a transitional, mediating, “larvae” form meant to be implanted in another “body/place.”

4. Folding back of generations. At the same time, another kind of replacement takes place on the other side. Because of the different destinies of the F/S in respect to FF/ego/SS, their own reproduction of a localized “ego series,” would take place in a different place-time than that of their parents. Simply put, Ss would be external to their parents, and parasitically internal to their WF/WMs. The F/Ss fold back on the WFs and take over their domain, yet carrying its “larvae,” WBSs. All these ‘series’ would exist alternated by the results of similar reproduction of their alternating in-laws, and the containment of *inabu*, for whom they are the “outside.” This means the alternating outsiders are created at the cost of, or in the hollowed trunks of the previous domains, while at the same time, they are bound to contain the “seeds” of their renewal.

It should be added that these strategies are sometimes said to have focused on managing the children, which allowed the parents to establish alliances with chosen neighbours through exchanges of the *inabu* positions. The conjunction of genitive and generative language in parenthood (Sect. 1) thus appears even less accidental. In the Capanahua descendants’ descriptions (as well as those recorded by Loos, eg. 1972: 2), children would be handed over or “promised” even before birth to the chosen neighbours in order to establish or seal alliances early enough so that the progeny would have little say. In the strategy described above, this would take the

---

**notes**

181 The “replacements” or “namesakes” in other Panoan kinship systems actually receive the names from alternating generations (D’Ans 1983, Townsley 1988). Compare this transmission with that of the “knowledge/stories/names” mentioned in Ch. 3.
form of marriage arrangements, when the children were delivered to their in-laws, or to an adult husband for rearing. Overall, such exchange of implantations would lead to four combinations of positions of containing or of reproduction of identity: the batch of the parents intersected by that of the siblings-in-law, opposed to the batch of the parents-in-law intersected with that of the siblings, who might further be differentiated by sex.\textsuperscript{182} It would continue by replacing the same positions and contents (Appendix 3.2). The arrangement would guarantee that the raza would not perish by diluting or adding new contributions of blood.\textsuperscript{183}

\section*{3. The second parents}

Here, I propose to briefly look at another, for some – as indicated in N.’s introduction – somewhat controversial proposition of reproduction, which skips the procreative process entirely and contributes to “curing” the breed with stronger implementations: the co-parenting, or compadrazgo.

To introduce that “strength,” however, I first return to the ways of conceiving authenticity of kinship and descent. Apart from the relative level mentioned earlier, and to which the above strategies of the antiguos could be said to conserve, the logic seems to exist at an absolute, or cosmic level. Similarly, \textit{kuin/legítimo} “authenticity” would in this case be measured in people or social places by the sequences of diminishing, experiential proximities to an ideal, undiluted original. That is, before or apart from the process of differentiation of breeds. The least accumulation of distorting splits in relation to that remote original, the more “real,” “noble,” or strong a given offshoot is. Therefore, the “real” father (\textit{epa/papa kuin}) in the above terminology is FFF. As identified in the Bible or stories of antiguos (cf. Ch. 3), the term refers to the original/first “generation” – the “real,” original parents, from whom all living descendants are merely diminished branches.

This means that the breeds themselves could also be differentiated by the levels of dilution (or remains) from an imagined original. Therefore, it is possible to imagine the pockets of greater original, pure authenticity or clarity. Their lesser

\textsuperscript{182} Among other Panoans, most notably the Cashinahua or the Marubo, these categories are reified as named sections.

\textsuperscript{183} The villagers and their ancestors share, with a significant difference, a similar predicament as the Iqwaye of Papua New Guinea as understood by Jadran Mimica, for whom the “cosmogonic self-creation was the process whereby the original totality, the oneness, begot a multiplicity of differentiae. The counting system, like human procreation, is the reverse process (…) [-] unification of the multiplicities as ones and twos into oneness” (1988: 95). Here, in turn, the procreation reproduces the original split, rather than reversing it, and it is the social process of reproducing identities or “acculturating” attempts to reverse it.
dilution is associated, I propose, with the knowledge or capacity to live socially in large, united groups. This view would explain some intriguing features mentioned so far. Thus, cities, with their “material noble,” are more resistant to the perishing process (Ch. 1) and – handled by the organizing “good thoughts” (Ch. 2) – are resistible to the splits and differentiation which dilute an original unity and “health.” This may be why the city dwellers are often assumed to be huni kuin (cf. Ch. 2), or people who are “real,” “authentic,” “noble,” “good,” or “more” (mestizos legítimos, gente noble/buena/más). They embody the purer, less perishable spaces. Level of “descent” purity is marked by surnames – non-local, that is, “truly” Peruvian and universal. They are called “noble,” “good” (buenos), “elevated” (elevados), etc. These last names are multiplied, and thus, I understand, ubiquitous or famous (famoso, reconocido, de renombre)\(^{184}\) on the valued regional, national, and especially “international” scale – therefore, imperishable. They are opposed to local, low (bajos) or humble (humildes) surnames of indigenous origin, which mark the histories of differentiations into separate breeds of the rural “generations” (splits). These may be assumed to result from “sinful” (Ch. 2), antisocial isolation, or conflicts-procreations and heightened dilution, with the wild people, the indios – guarding their own, weaker pockets of purity in the way described in Sect. 2 – at the extreme. City dwellers, in turn, are represented as being better at being separate (aparte) from these sins and diluting social dynamics of differentiation thanks to the organized, lawful, well-thought-out spaces.\(^{185}\) They are más adelante [more ahead] or desarrollados [developped].\(^{186}\)

\(^{184}\) Similar to the way that mythical by now, ancient, strong, hard working men would be “famous” (famosos) men/leaders – kakamika or kakái bu (BRS17) (Loos 2009:14). Some of the surnames inherited from the antiguos were in fact explained to me as coming from such “strong” men, whose names became imperishable by multiplying, likewise with the “tribal” names associated with “strong” and “invincible” animals or plants (cf. Prologue).

\(^{185}\) Peter Gow (1993) has described the medial position that the Urubamba people see for themselves between the “gringos” or the cities and the wild people (indios) of the forest. Cecilia McCallum observed similar imagery among the Cashinahua (2001: 70–75), noticing also the temporal dimension of such axis (cf. Ch. 5). Similar positioning could also be identified among the Bolivian Ese Eja, leading to the somewhat surprising affirmations: “we are not the real people” (Lepri 2003), as opposed to city dwellers. The hierarchies of nobleness and beauty are quite strikingly similar to the revolving hierarchies identified for the Kayapo by Terrence Turner (2003). These distinctions are based on the distribution of the social values of beauty and order, associated, among other things, with the “beautiful” names (I have noted the local connections between good and beautiful in Ch. 1) and completeness of the process of social reproduction. Gow (2003) has written about the value and hierarchies of elevated or noble surnames between the Lower Ucayali and the Marañón rivers, among the descendants of the Cocama. Taken together, the social hierarchies on the Lower Ucayali (or perhaps eastern Peru) might be seen as resulting from recycling of a finite quality that I have been referring to here as “originality” or “authenticity,” defined by closeness to social self-containment and purity or harmony. As such, it would find a surprising reflection in the cycles of violent exchanges of the finite social (identity) resources driving the head-hunting vendettas among the Jivaros (e.g. Taylor 1994) or in the Northwest Amazon (e.g. Karadimas 2003). Indeed, there are some traces of this imagery of similar exchanges, head or trophy (teeth) hunting on the Tapiche (VPBo6) and the Moa (Montagner-Melatti 1977; cf. Erikson 1986).

\(^{186}\) What I came to understand as “pockets of authenticity” apparently echoes the theme of the mythical discourse of the Kanamari in Luiz Costa’s description (2005). There, original mythical Jaguars are fragmented by the ancient people (cf. splitting of the troncos), and their diluting remains exists dispersed across humanity in bolsas, or “sacks” of Jaguaricity. Furthermore, we
There is one important consequence of these differences. Mixing the “good” content with humilde results in elevation of the latter, as arreglar [to repair], enderezar [straighten out] amejarar [improve] la raza or surname – as much as it is to the detriment of the former: e.g. basurear [to trash] raza. Such a strategy has also been attributed to the antiguos as an attempt to add “better,” purer content, in the form of blood/names/knowledge.

Here, I present a strategy which, according to the villagers and their neighbours, has in the past been used to achieve this result. Apart from the actual marriages, it provided a slanted contribution to descent, which adds to the inextinguishable disputes on the “originality” of contributions to descent and surnames. This strategy also involves using children in establishing relations between co-owners (donors and receivers). The Capanahua term of address used mutually by the recipient and the affected child in such a relation was panun. In LUS, this relationship is referred to as compadrazgo.

In Daniel’s words, at the moment of birth: “taah, here comes the placenta... and one has to go and look for a compadre (…) And you bring an izanita. With this you pinch it like that and trah! – cut it with scissors: the umbiliego. Now, you tie it up and done!” (DHR06). This procedure of cutting the umbilical cord establishes a relation which in LUS connects the godchild (ahijado, ahijada) to the godparents (padrino, madrina), and equally, if not more importantly, the two sets of parents as “co-parents” (compadre, comadre). Resulting from this procedure are firstly, demonstrations of mutual respect (respeto): in mutual address (tratamiento) the above terms (often in shortened or diminutive form cumpa, comadrita, compadrito) replace personal names (or previous terms of address, denoting courtesy forms or more remote kinship connections). Secondly, compadres are expected to treat each other as family, by supporting each other and by sharing food or goods.

Importantly, one general consequence of this relation is an expectation or a
possibility that the child would be handed over in order to be raised, maintained, or supported by its godparent. It is, for example, common to hear that padrinos living in remote towns maintain their ahijados during their education. Such a containing role places padrinos next to padrastra/madrastra (adoptive or step-parents), to an employer (patrón) or to the father-in-law.

Yet, there is an important difference between the position of parents-in-law in the previous strategy and that of the padrinos. Because of the difference in conditions, scale and timing of the introduction and containing, it might be seen as the reverse of that of the father-in-law. It establishes a link of proximity, that is, “family,” between the godparents and godchildren. This precludes marriageability between the close relatives of the transference. Doña Elsa was indignant in pointing out that certain marriage was not only between an aunt and her nephew, but also between a man and his padrino’s daughter: “doubly family!” When I asked if this is a “real” family, Don Guillermo told me: “you could say that this is a second family. For example, your godson is like your son, because you have touched his blood. So he can address you as the godfather – as his second father” (GHR05). And Daniel added: “this compadre touches your blood, of your child: he is your real compadre, you cannot ignore him” (DHR10). The legitimacy of this first compadrazgo is thus attributed to the act of critical penetration, wherein by opening the surface (cutting of the cord), the godparent touches the blood of the child/father (cf. Ch. 3). Therefore, compadrazgo could be likened to curar, which employs the penetration to the benefit or strengthening of the future person. Indeed, as with the cutting of fingernails, this act transmits qualities between padrino and his ahijado. This connection with blood may indeed be accompanied by an act of naming the child by the parents-in-law. Even more illustratively, in some historical cases, the child might have received the full name and surname of its padrino. Today, when, as the Capanahua descendants note, the process of registering the surnames is stricter, this is more likely to result in passing the first name of the godparent. That is, for example, how Don Benigno received his name, and why my ahijado living in Limón is named Lucas. Significantly, therefore, the assumed identity of blood and name might contribute to the godfather being called “the tree trunk,” tronco, of his godson, as was

---

189 The latter is in fact similarly understood as a secondary recipient, a caretaker, because in the Ucayali conditions, he maintains his workers while taking them to remote places in order to work in extraction of whatever is currently being negotiated (logs, furs, meat or rubber in more distant past) (cf. also Ch. 5).
said of little Lucas when we went out to visit the neighbouring village: “va (a) seguir su tronco” [(he, little Lucas) is going to follow his tree trunk (the original Lucas)].

From this perspective, the positions of introducing and containing are not only fundamentally different from those with the parents-in-law, but could also be understood as everting the positions established by parenthood. Taking into account the padrino’s internal contribution might place the original parents in the position of mere containers or caretakers of the child who is internally marked as belonging to someone else. That such reversal is both conceivable and highly problematic for the Capanahua descendants is indicated by the inextinguishable controversies in competing interpretations of descent or “belonging,” as exemplified by N.’s introduction involving padrino. I will return to this “slanted” contribution in Ch. 5, as it plays a significant part in stories of origins to the Capanahua descendants current positions.

Here, I would note that it requires loosening the original “theories” of owning/parenthood presented in the first section, which may lead to what villagers call “ignoring” (ignorar) one’s primary, that is, legitimate, family links encoded in parental surnames and blood. From the perspective of the above formulations of relatedness, I would propose that while the procedure places compadrazgo alongside the acts of insemination and feeding by the mother, what differentiates these relations and their “legitimacy” is their temporal sequence. The father remains the most “legitimate” because of his firstness, and is followed by the mother, and then the padrinos cutting the umbiego, or padrinos created by other situations, such as baptism (ritual of naming, called agua de socorro as well as an official Catholic or Evangelic baptism), or even as a witness at an official marriage ceremony. Indeed, compadrazgo is spoken about as an added, widened family, “paque haga doble... familia ya” [to double the family already doubled] (DHR10). Therefore, the motive for the procedure, according to the Capanahua descendants, is to add connections to the “family”: “they look for someone to cut, like you have, and that one becomes my compadre. And thus we have (...) broadened the family, gathered in a group (agrupado), and broadened the friendship (amistad)” (GHR05). It is therefore preferable that the person chosen for a compadre is not closely related to the child. This preference is reflected in Don Benigno’s wondering about a family living apart from others: “how... among themselves, perhaps, they cut the umbilical cord?”

(BRS15), which sounds like the isolationist tendencies attributed to *indios*. The preferred godparent is therefore from at least a more distant family, or unrelated, as migrants to the village. Visiting strangers such as traders, missionaries or in fact, the irregular *gringos polacos* such as ourselves, are also favoured.

**Conclusion**

The overarching thought in this chapter has been to culminate, in the discussion of the process of procreation and categories resulting from it, the topological categories of containing and the generative-frustrative dynamics. After outlining the explanations of the process of procreation, its consequences and the broader implications for understanding specific formulations of kinship, I turned to a broader, social expression. I suggested that these formulations have significant implications for the villagers’ ways of conceiving participation in social spaces and substantial consequences for the way their societies exist. I proposed that the transferred and contained element, which constitutes a specific, pathogenic and formative relation between the entities – such as the *ínabu* thirdness between two “tree trunks” or bodies – articulates the generative-frustrative process itself, and therefore taming this is tantamount to taming the curse of procreation/perishing. The examples of social strategies conceived by the villagers might effectively be seen as reflecting the concern with the diluting character of procreation and with differing levels of originality or purity in people and breeds. From this perspective, the Capanahua descendants’ sociality could be understood as taming “time,” which means, following their explanations, the loss, mortality, procreation, and descent.

An example of the Capanahua kinship terminology and arrangement of exchanges and replacements seems to be aimed at precisely harnessing the pathogenic consequences of direct procreation, so that the actual reproduction might take place across generations, in grandchildren. This would contain the circuit against loss or the introduction of the foreign content. By recovering the missing, extracted content, the arrangement conserves the level of originality of the *tronco* content. Against the Moon’s curse, the blood is not, in the end, spilled and wasted, but instead contained and returned by the tamed, befriended others. I point out here that the explanation attributed to the ancient people eating the corpses of the deceased, “por no desperdiciar” [so they wouldn’t go to waste] (Ch. 5) assumes an additional dimension in this context and returns explicitly the relevance of the
predatory (here, containing) logic known in other Amazonians’ ways of making sense. By containing the very process, or sickness and by taming the potentially pathogenic ʻinabu like pets, the solution transcends the procreative problem. Outside and inside fold back symmetrically and impregnate their precious levels of originality by vendettas of “insemination-killings.” It should be remembered however, that, subject to the temporal processes themselves, this strategy, marked as “ancient,” has also a failed confrontation with the frustrating-generative force of the stronger procreative infliction.

The latter is hinted at in the next strategy. While in the previous strategy, the extracted child is a mediatory phase for reproduction which transcends procreative relations, and conserved the received level of strength, originality and beauty of the social spaces, in the second presented strategy, a godchild is already the result. Here, reproduction is postulated by skipping the procreation altogether, ideally yielding a perfect xu’ta replacement. At the same time, one’s own children, no longer passed on to separate affines, are implanted with the status of a befriended stranger. Because the new contribution is often deliberately chosen to be “stronger” or “noble,” here it is the “humble” parents who become the ʻinabu in their own spaces, pregnant with a stronger, even more original and beautiful future. Here, it could be understood that it is they who become “secondary” parents in relation to the “stronger” ones. While similar folding back, which has reappeared throughout this thesis, also takes place in the previous strategy, here the transitory moves of marriage and procreation are shifted and rescaled. Again, thinking about these strategies, the ʻinabu position and the folding back of outsides will guide Ch. 5 through a wider socio-historical context of “acculturation” from the vantage point of the villagers’ representations towards the end of this contribution.

---

190 Don Benigno, importantly in this perspective if somewhat jokingly, calls his little daughter Lurdes — ahijada of Doña Lurdes — by the nickname of a wealthy trader: “Brashica” (note the connection to Brazil which is generally considered “stronger” than Peru). I will return to this when gathering some notes on the ʻinabu in the Conclusion.
Chapter 5. Whose inside is this outside?: Acculturation

By way of closure, here I propose an additional perspective. I suggested in the last chapter that the specific, frustrative-generative formulations of kinship and descent shape explanations and ways of participating in sociality, and therefore, diagnoses of history and ways of creating it. I have explicitly not addressed this so far, because the examples provided by the villagers were themselves both illustrating as explaining it best by talking about other subjects. This chapter brings this theme into relief by explicitly addressing the origins of modern social spaces and the Capanahua descendants’ position within them. This seems significant, because it enables us to look for their vision of the history which for outside observers spells “acculturation.”

What follows is a handful of historical images presented by the Capanahua descendants, sampling some of the frustrations delimiting polarized (and yet surprisingly close) ideals of past (Sect. 1) and future (Sect. 2) purity. In my view, it is these ideals, or rather their very thwarting, that serve the paisanos to position themselves historically. As in the formulations of kinship and sociality, the position of the transferred, potentially thwarting element as the third, transitory agent plays a significant, discussed and wrestled role. It focuses on the problem of authenticity and originality: who emerged from where, and in what order?

1. The dying breed: frustrations of the original purity

Frustrations of the originating singularity/non-differentiation ideal by inseminations or killing (death) serve the Capanahua descendants as one reference point for identifying their contemporary situation. Humans are bound to reproduce in a dangerous way through containing and having oneself contained in others (Ch. 4). Therefore, while the identity associated with an origin, or raza, cannot change during most of the person’s life, and is an indelible remainder of progenitors in their offspring, it is possible, even unavoidable, across the temporal and physical limits between generations thus, conception and death. It dilutes, by mixing, in offspring,
while the originating original perishes away. This, in fact, provides a general guidance to the villagers’ readings of history.

Guarding the *raza*, either by impregnating the “containers” and staying away, or by establishing a perpetual vendetta of inseminations between allies or neighbours (*henabu* “family”) or *troncos*, is presented as aimed at preserving the specific, finite originality (Ch. 4). Yet, such equilibrium is both fraught with the “sin” of closing off and opposing to other people (Ch. 2), and ultimately fragile, because in the end, as the Moon speeches point out, everything perishes by the force of the frustrative-generative process (Ch. 3, 4). It is no wonder that in historical narratives, older people are usually cast in the roles of the staunchest opposers of novelties. They are represented not only as guarding against foreign inseminations, but also, the introductions of any tools or foods from “outside” their dominions. Américo told me about an absolute, ancient leader, who in his father’s stories, was ordered to kill a *sabio* [a knowledgeable/skillful man] who learned — by “talk[ing] to God perhaps” (fT1208) — how to procure metal tools. Similarly, in stories about conquest of the *indios* which are widely told in the area, one of the most common motifs concerns the opposition of the stingy “*viejos bravos*” [savage old ones] to contact with strangers, and their eagerness to kill anyone who approached. According to the attributed phrase which is re-utilized across similar stories: “I am not an old macaw that can be tamed!” This approach is in fact most often contrasted with the less radical, more curious and open attitudes attributed to the younger generations. 99

When asking about “the Capanahua,” during the initial conversations with the inhabitants of Berea, Víctor Raúl or Limón, I heard recurring diagnoses: the authentic “tree trunks” or “boles” that were the *antiguos* Capanahua are gone (*ya no hay ya*); the living people are merely their “branches,” “new breeds” (*nuevas generaciones*), while the old *razas* perish (*pierden*) — despite there being plenty of children in the villages. This is where this thesis was germinated (cf. Introduction). Explanations attributed to these diagnoses revolved around two or three main causes of the authentic ideal’s frustration: foreign inseminations, the perishing of the

99 It is also reminiscent of representations of other Panoan and Amazonian people (Marubo, Yaminahua, Piro etc.). Isolation is connected with strength, purity and a divided, warrior past. It is not necessarily associated with the idea of civilization as “acculturation” to the “the Whites.” The Marubo (Ruedas 2001, Welper 2009) speak similarly of their ancestors as originally isolated and warlike, and “civilized” or “tamed” by an influential Panoan leader in the headwaters. The time-place where they have united (cf. Monte Alegre image in Ch. 1) is now the example of ideal union, authenticity and knowledge, and is connected to the divide (in mythical terms, crossing the river) between the wild old ones and the new generations (Cesarino 2008).
knowledgeable, more original people, and the insubordination of the new “generations.”

1.1. The inseminations

Most of all, foreign inseminations or introduced foreign elements diversify or blemish the original raza, as in the stories of mythic owners. While they can be the beginning of new alliances, they frustrate the ideal, original separateness. Historical processes which led to the formation of the set of kaibu known to outsiders as the “Capanahua” in the 20th century is sometimes explained by the Capanahua descendants as the result of overcoming such previous isolations. It is the effect of a process described with the synonymous verbs of “taming,” “civilizing,” or “conquering,” just as acquiring sons-in-law or allies. It could be imagined that previously isolated diverse “tribes” (tribus) have tamed each other or “civilized in Capanahua” (BHR01). Further it is often said that the process was made possible by unifying, foreign employers (at the beginning of the 20th century):

There was no more fighting, they already lived peacefully (tranquilo). The Huaninches (...) Pizarros and Freires. All addressed each other as primo, [that is] chaqi [brother-in-law/cross cousin]. Already they were handing over their daughters, to the Freires, to Pizarros. For example, to me they gave the granddaughter of Manuel [Huaninche].clxxxii (RPR01)

This is important, because it shows the relations between kaibus/families could be understood as their mutual “emerging” process, similar to that which leads to “civilizing” alongside new others. For example, whatever the original raza Capanahua may have been in the past (being the result of such “civilizing” between previous strangers), its loss can be associated with the “others,” like the mestizo, who came from “various places” to “hacer raza” [make raza – i.e. sire children]. In Blanca’s words:

Just like they come to live here [now]. Like you can live here, but you’re a mestizo, not our paisano. There: mixing! You can have a woman here. (...) The surname can mix, if you have a child (...). With the boy: the surname does not die. If you have a girl: the man’s surname dies. (...) There’s a lot of that here. That’s why some are Jimenez, Velas, Rengifos, Hidalgos... those are other peoples, from outside. He has a wife, that’s where he multiplies.clxxxiii (BHR01)

It was sometimes claimed (by both the Capanahua descendants and related mestizos themselves) that, throughout history, newcomers had “conquered” (conquistar) the local families (“Capanahua”) by producing children with their women, or sacando la vuelta [lit. stealing the turn] from the husbands, thus
parasitically placing their own offspring under the roofs or mosquito nets of the rightful husbands. Again, the same representations of insemination or sex are made to play the decisive function in stories about taming or “conquering” wild indios, often against the opposition of the old people. In fact, Eugene Loos seems to have accepted such local diagnosis when he maintained that the Capanahua were “strong” (that is, separate?) as a socio-cultural group... until the mestizo or “Spanish-speaking Cocama” workers started to marry the Capanahua daughters in the 1970s (EL01).

Continuing the purity of raza in this broadening context is especially difficult, as suggested by Don Benigno’s layering of problems:

(I.K: Why does it say, (e.g. ˁAyū)-bakebu?) That’s already children of this generación, of ˁAyubakebu. Of this raza indígena, the ˁAyubakebu. It’s this kind (clase) of people. (...) So, like I’m telling you, generación continues on, does not perish (...). If you don’t multiply (aumentas), it terminates there, dies, ends, it does not continue. But, if you have multiplied children [sons? (hijos)], they keep on emerging... Yet, they differentiate as well... But, like I’m telling you: if I reunite with my cousin, engender children (hijos): then it does not terminate, it continues. Now, if I grab another, already from a different generación – then it will not advance, does not continue. Instead, it’s perishing. For example, I crossbreed (me cruzo) with a mestizo – it does not multiply there anymore. It dies there.\textsuperscript{clxxxiv} (BRS04)

1.2. The perishing

Let us now move on to the second most common explanation for the disappearing raza Capanahua. It is that the old, “real” representatives have passed away, often without having multiplied enough. The sentence “los viejos ya no hay ya” [there are no old ones anymore] was repeated frequently to me over my stay.\textsuperscript{clxxxv} It is they who are assumed to have known the “authentic” stories, language and the old ways:

(I.K: Who might these Capanahua [i.e. Kapabu breed] be?) These Capanahuas no longer exist. There are... but only their children. They are no more... (...) Those who used to know the histories, they don’t exist anymore.\textsuperscript{clxxxvi} (LCO01);

Now we are the new ones, as they say. From the other day that is all. And we don’t know the histories. (...) My uncles and my father have died. Like they say, we are the new ones, newly created... (BSR01)

An implicit common idea that often accompanies such statements is that contemporary children are but diluted, lesser versions of their parents. Therefore, there are “merely” descendants who are left. In fact, this seems to be the significance of a popular figurative expression, that I introduced in Ch. 4, which compares the descendants to the branches (ramas), roots (raices) or offshoots (retoños) – or
indeed, generación, razas – against the “tree trunks” or “boles” of the antiguos. For example: “(LK: Does it mean there is no real Neabu?) No any more, [those living] are just the branches (LCO01).”\textsuperscript{clxxxvii} This attitude in practice is revealed by Don Jorge’s answers to my questions about the surnames and ancestors of Limón’s inhabitants:

These Sachivo are others [than Chumo]. But they... Well, they are not the antiguos, [they are] just like us here. (…) There were (...) three Sachivo [brothers]. They are the ones who have their children here, all of these. (LK: Where was their father from?) Where from indeed!... From there, nowhere else. [They were those] who grew there. On their land, here, upriver on the Capanahua [stream], at the source. There, just like indios! But they... came here to the river. There they, too, got used. There they had their women, and a whole lot of children. And here, in turn, they make [are] their children. They make [are] all of these, all of them. These kids [offspring] here, they are all kids [offspring]. (…) Their father(s) have died, but there was only the children [offspring] living here. (…) The Pizarros, they too have grown here, like these kids now. But their father(s), the one(s) who raised them: all of them have died! There is no one. Only the children are left. (…) It’s not like it used to be. Everyone is... over there, gone to the cities (...), some live like this [here]\textsuperscript{clxxxviii} (JRR02)

1.3. Those that grow: the tender spot of history

Finally, there is a third possible and frequent explanation as to why there seems to be no more “Capanahua.” I often heard that in reality, “everyone” in these villages is of Capanahua descent, only they are ashamed to admit it (“tienen vergüenza” or “no quieren ser ya” [don’t want to be anymore – e.g. Capanahua], or “son ignorantes” [they ignore – their parents, origins].

This final explanation requires an explicit introduction of those agents who keep appearing or who have been implicitly present throughout the previous chapters. In the perspective drawn by the Capanahua descendants, the fate of raza is ultimately dependent on the adjacent generations. It boils down to that unpredictable, loose cannon, inherently wilful and instinctively disobedient partial stranger. It is an altered copy meant to ascertain the fuller circle of reproduction, a continuity of generación (Ch. 4): the muchachos [the kids/offspring]. As I suggested, the production and control of offspring is the central, and at the same time, highly vulnerable, point of sociality. They could be understood as the “third element” used for exchanges in the dynamics of inseminations or introductions between troncos, and thus, a guarantee of a preconceived future for the parents or grandparents: a mediating, transitory phase also between the past and future originalities. They are the tender spot of history. For one, their production has been one explanation for the loss of “original” raza of the progenitors, as they may be
kidnapped or impregnated by strangers. That is why sheltering and controlling the offspring was important for the old ones.

But the offspring or the younger generations themselves also constitute, unfortunately for the old ones, the decisive agents of the Capanahua descendants’ histories. As inherently traviesos, heady and wilful, the young people may slip out of the control of the older generations, and become disobedient or run away, “ignoring” that they belong to their original “owners,” the progenitors. This leads to the demise of the old ones’ dominions. This is perhaps the most important infliction of reproduction and descent. Below I have gathered some vignettes that illustrate this problem in paisanos’ histories. The first few illustrate the young ones’ search for new sources of strength or purity, and then, their outright rejection of the old dominions, often based in just such new affiliations.

Recall how in the Prologue, the origin of the Kapabu name, through an act of a naughty child was explained, and how “breed” or tribu names can also be seen as “surnames” that the “fighting men” of the past have claimed for themselves, invoking the strength, valour or agility of animals or plants, in order to ascertain their own invincibility, and thus imperishability and impregnability (cf. also Ch. 4, and the explanation of the “owner of moriche palm” claim). Similar identities could be attributed to the ruinous, diversifying activity of the earthworm’s child in the stories of the antiguos (Ch. 3). These identities, the tribus, can therefore also be referred to as “ramas” (OPH01; LCO01), thus implying another, remote original non-differentiation, which can refer to different levels of encompassment. Indeed, the Capanahua descendants often mention that it is merely such names that set people apart, yet they belong to essentially the same raza and speak the same language (cf. Ch. 4):

That’s how they gave themselves names. ‘I’m going to be this!’ – they said. So that’s why they are Xanebu, Binabu, Xawanbu... all of these. These were their names. But not because they really were different groups, the same – all have the same language. It’s only how they took on their names. Their tribadas (...) That’s how they took up names in their lands, in the forest.\textsuperscript{clxxxix} (RPR01)

What is important here is that the origins of the separate identities are associated with violence or conflict (cf. Prologue). I would note that they also result from discontinuity, and perhaps disobedience towards their originators, because the
wilful self-naming, that is, introduction of difference as personal identity of its founders, frustrates previous non-differentiation.

Now, in a leap towards a different source and remote times, consider the following note from an unpublished diary of Father López192 after a meeting with a group of Capanahua near today’s San Antonio de Fortaleza in 1907 (where the Sachivo and Ríos eventually “emerged from” to form Limón Cocha in the 1970-80s – see Fig. 3):

On the 15th [of December] all of them [local Capanahua] came to visit me, bringing five children to baptise. On the 16th the curaca [chief] came with his family, bringing four more. On the 17th he came back with another three children to baptize. (...) Finally, one Capanahua, aged about 20, came up to me and asked for a baptism. Recognising the extraordinary grace that God wanted to bestow on him, I administered the sacrament. Immediately, in front of all of his paisanos, and especially his grandfather the curaca, who all tried to dissuade him. He asked to come with with me downriver. He talked to the patrón to whom he owed around 200 soles, and who yielded to his wish, so it was no inconvenience for me to receive him. He prepared his things (...) and around 2 pm, filled with joy, we went downriver (...). (López 1903-09: 108–9)

As I hinted in Ch. 4, it is common to hear, both from the villagers as well as from other inhabitants of the area, that the surnames used by the Capanahua descendants over the last few generations originate from their godfathers (padrinos), employers (patrones) or adoptive fathers (padrastras). For example, according to Don Baudilio’s version of the origin of names of Limón:

These surnames... they were pulled from... the patrones who worked with them. (...) In the past they were truly... how would you say it... analphabets! They didn’t know what surname they had (...) They lived only to live! (...) The patrón would gather all of them (...), a Brazilian (...) – he pulled them together: “Ok, what’s your name?” “No, I don’t know what my surname might be.” “Oh, and you?” “I don’t know either.” (...) “Ok, then: You’re going to be Rodríguez. You are going to be Peso... You: Sachivo.” He got hold of my father: “You’re Sachivo, all right?” “Yes, ok.” (...) And so, they were left the surnames. The patrón gave the surname to everyone, to his workers. (BSR01)

In many cases, such changes are attributed to actions of the heady youngsters claiming foreign, “noble” (noble) or “elevated” (elevado) surnames (cf. Ch. 4) – and (therefore) “slanted” stories of foreign descent – while “ignoring” their parents. For some, the discontinuity and new affiliation is traced to having spent time (andar) with the mestizo/viracucha strangers, working away from their home villages. The

192 Father Agustín López Pardo is considered the founder of Requena, and his monument stands in the middle of the city square (Salvador 1972; Río Sadornil 1991).
readiness to engage in such a relation (and to abandon “the old ones”) has been captured in the diary entry above. During the several decades that followed, López recorded in passing some young Capanahua men who accompanied mestizo employers in other parts of the Tapiche or the Ucayali. For those who came back, having learned new languages and consequently visited new places, this experience is sometimes given as the reason for “forgetting” their language or stories. This is true of some elderly villagers in Limón in the recent past or nowadays. Don Jorge himself admitted to me that he had forgotten the language after living for so many years in “the cities.” Today, too, many people claim to have been raised in towns and cities, or with foreign employers, as an explanation of their lesser “knowledge” (thus, belonging) of the *antiguos*.

On the other hand, such changes can also be attributed to the voluntary actions of the parents themselves, perhaps with similar motivations. In any case, this would illustrate the associative potential of *compadrazgo* discussed in the previous chapter. One remote example may be found in the story of the *curaca* bringing children to be baptized as told by Father López. Don Romer described further how such a decision to change may arise:

(LK: How was it done, when they were small?) Small, when they are very young – then it stays. This is my surname now. They themselves give the name: “Leandro Torres.” (...) One called Torres baptised him. He wanted it himself: the belly of the pregnant woman, the mother. He asked for it as his ahijado. No matter if it be a boy or a girl. And Leandro was born, so then they named him Leandro. (...) [The padrino] would lay claim on him as the real father [after the real father died], that’s why lots of people wanted a padrino. So the padrino gave this surname (...), the whole name and surname. And that’s why he’s not Pizarro any more, but Leandro Torres. (...) (LK: And it didn’t bother the parents that the child will not carry their surname?) No, to the contrary. They wanted him even more, because he would give them clothes, and all they needed. Because of the ahijado. (...) [The child grows up] with the mother and father, not so much with the padrino. And his other brothers. But he is already left with that surname, he grows up with it. They are brothers and recognize each other as such, but the surname is different. As if from a different father. (RPR08)

As I mentioned, seeking new, stronger affiliations could be connected with the attitudes directly rejecting the *antiguos*. Some examples of why and how the younger generations reject the past could make this clearer. In the past generations of the “Capanahua,” some people are remembered as recommending to “throw away the

---

193 For example, I was told that N.’s father had *criado* [grown up] or had been *andando* [wandering] with mestizos, and learned Quechua.
antiguo.” Often, this would concern the violence or differentiation linked with isolationism attributed to their own xenibu [ancestors]. For example, Doña Joba told me that her grandmother said of herself that she was “no longer indio,” and she did not want to pass on stories from the past: “It’s good that you were not Capanahua, child. (...) Campa descendants (hijo de Campa) would go for them, finishing off the Capanahua”cxciii (AC02).194 According to Don Albino, Joba’s husband: “Even back then [1960s-70s, when he came from north-eastern Peru], the Capanahuas did not want to speak their language. It already seemed ugly to them: ‘We are no longer indios, we too, are now mestizos’ – they would say [laughs]”cxciv (AC01). In fact, Doña Joba’s father is remembered by him as saying: “It’s enough that the old ones know [the language, but cf. Ch. 3] – he would say. The children don’t have to be like this. Because they should have a higher education, (...) so they could be taught”cxcv (AC02). For this reason parents, or the old ones, did not want their children to learn the language, as is sometimes claimed across today’s generations.

Furthermore, it is worth comparing this approach with the way in which Victor related how the “old ones” insisted on consuming the corpses of their deceased relatives,195 while the younger generation, represented by his grandfather, refused to comply:

My grandfather said that his grandfathers wanted to eat people! People that died. So [they] wouldn’t go to waste, they wanted to eat them – (...) the old ones wanted to eat (...). My grandfather would say: ‘Why should we? Have we come here to eat people? No. We have to bury!’ And he would bury the dead: done! My grandfather was young! (...) The antiguos wanted to eat.”cxcvi (VPB01)

In a similar, more recent image which addresses another element of the antiguos’ conservatism and their insistence on “not perishing/wasting” (Ch. 4) was related to me by Doña Germe and Don Benigno from their own experience. They both admitted to opposing their parents or uncles in their refusal to marry their closest cousins in the context of a broadened sociality:196

Our cousin is beneati [marriageable for a woman], they say. [Is] our... “husband.” “You can marry your cousin” – my dad would tell me. “Ha! Watch me!” – I would tell him [laughs]. I was just a kid but I knew how to think. How am I going to

194 Cf. Similar images of violence are common in today’s representations of that remote past, and similarly in Manuel’s Huaninche’s account (Schooland 1975).
195 Some historical sources (e.g. Oppenheim 1936a) suggest the practice of funerary anthropophagy for the ancestors of the Capanahua.
196 It should also be mentioned that they both married other, less closely related Capanahua descendants. Both originated from the Tapiche, and they both married people from the Buncuya River.
marry my family, I would say. How would I address my kin? (…) “Min beneyura” [your real/trunk/body husband], he would say. (…) I remember how X would say to my dad: “You’re going to give me your daughter, uncle.” I raged and cried when they spoke like that [laughs]. I didn’t like my kin to be speaking like that. And I opposed them to the end! I didn’t want to hear about it! And until today I address him as ñño [brother], not even primo [cousin]! I treat them as my brothers. (GSR08)

“The raza is already perishing – my dad said. – You want to make the nawa [mestizos] multiply! (…) You want to make the Cocama multiply!” – he’d say [laughs]. (GSR11)

So my uncle wanted me to marry his daughter. And I didn’t want to! Uuuh, the uncle was mischievous, he’d grab you – [laughing] (…) I would [take off] [laughs]. (…) “A’ki... min ‘aibu betan ‘uxawe, ihu!” [In her… Sleep with your woman, there she is, son!] (…) They would do this to me at every drinking occasion! (…) Damn, in the morning I would be ashamed, sleeping with my cousin! (…) I did not want that: “That would be bad, dammit! But my uncle wants to give me his daughter. Like they say, so that the raza would not perish. To multiply there.” I did not want that. My mom didn’t know, I would be mischievous somewhere else. Young, 14 years old. (…) And the aunt was the same (…): “Tkunin, ra’e hutanwe! Min ‘aibu!”[Come tame yourself (cf. Ch. 2 on civilizing), son-in-law, it’s your wife!] “No, aunt – I’d say – I don’t know how to work, how will I provide (servir) for her?” (BRS04)

Because she was my cousin, I didn’t want to. I told [my uncle]: “Nnoo, I’m afraid.” “Why would you be? Huh? Is she other people? But that’s your ‘aibu[wife] (…) He would grab my hand like this: “Come! Sleep with my daughter!” (BRS08)

I didn’t even think about… that… my raza is going to waste away, right? Being with them, my children would have multiplied [i.e. producing grandchildren] (…) and my blood would not perish. (BRS11)

Similarly, Doña Germe recalled how, even more recently, her brother-in-law – who worked with the SIL on the Capanahua dictionary – would advise her against making pottery as the thing “of the antiguos”: “‘Having the opportunity to buy pots, you’re going to be making them out of dirt? That’s what the antiguos used to do (…). When they couldn’t buy any!’ (GSR04).

Finally, consider these two vignettes on the offspring’s radical attitude towards their living ancestors. First, according to Don Rogelio’s observation about the attitudes towards those who preferred to speak the Capanahua language:

All of them have perished. Even worse now. When someone speaks – they are ashamed! When the old women spoke it, their children, grandchildren said: “No-no-no-no! Don’t speak, grandma, they are listening, the mozos (mestizos)! (…) They are going to treat us like we’re cholos!” [laughs hard]. So [the language] is ending. They never want to speak now. (RBS01)
The second, more extreme example was presented by Don Jorge. It concerned Doña Shabi, who was one of the last women remembered (by people 50 and older) to have tattoos on her face, similar to those inherited by the monkeys in the earthworm’s son’s story in Ch. 3. According to Don Jorge, these tattoos made them “like a jaguar! Ugly!” (JRR04). Shabi is commonly mentioned as one of the “authentic” antiguos, and as the ancestress of many contemporary people of Capanahua descent. Don Jorge told me a grisly version of her death:

She was grandmother of X [from a breed left on the Tapiche by the Brazilian traders – and she lived in his house] (...). [He would say to her:] “Because of you, some viracuchas tell us: ‘Look, you are indio! Why do you live like this?’ [That’s what] they tell us! Because of you!” [There was] a ladder, the house was up high, elevated. And there, when the old one was [going to?] wash herself, he pushed her off there: “Carajo! [swearing], you old one, what are you doing here!? – and he pushed her. She fell... boom! Dead. That’s how she ended. (...) There’s no more Shabi today. ci (JRR02)

I would add that such attitudes could be seen as illustrating again (cf. Ch. 1 and 2 on position of children, Ch. 3 on the shift in the earthworm’s son’s story, and the replacing in the kinship system in Ch. 4), the folding back of generations, a switch of perspectives, whereby the offspring becomes more “ahead” in relation to the social “outside” than their living ancestors (cf. also Ch. 4 on the contribution of stronger, “ahead” element to the children). The positions of containing reverse, as the old ones find themselves living in spaces belonging to, and determined by, the younger generations. In other words, the position of the last old ones becomes comparable to that of other ʔinabu, as the bearers – or worse still, visible markers – of difference within a social space which aspires to clarity and harmony.

INTERLUDE

Carnaval

One day in February, when the coming celebrations enter conversations, Daniel tells me that carnaval is not a holy day (día rojo). It is just a feast of the demons (demonios), he explains with slight derision. But the demons are happy when carnaval approaches. They are there in their forest, sleeping in the cold, or in their holes. Drinking their manioc beer, whatever it may be made from... (fΓ1302). On another occasions, he explained:

197 I heard the verb criar, to rear/feed, used by a mestizo woman in reference to her old mother, who had to be cared for and carried when she was very old.
They live in the forest, same as us here. That’s where their village is. Children, girls, dogs, all of these. Their animals, peccaries, all. (LK: Do they have their house and clothes?) They do... No, in hole in a tree. They live there. There they are inside of that darkness. (…) they are from there. (DHR03)

[in] hole in the ground. (…) Like you find in the forest sometimes. A huge one, see. Well – cleaned – the darkest inside! But nice (lindo), cleared! Perhaps [they] sleep inside there. (DHR24)

Because they live deep in the forest, in darkness and isolation, these beings occupy a place in Capanahua descendants’ representations that is closely related, or even synonymous with that of the yashingos, who kidnap people in the forest or make them lose their way. These, in turn, might be associated by the villagers with the stories of figure(s) who control(s) the animals and may keep them contained in pens (cercos) – the “owner of animals” (dueño de animales) or “king of the forest” (rey del monte). (cciv)

The carnival is initiated each year by the demons, and they are happy in anticipation for the infectious feasts which mark the carnival. This is the only time each year that they have a chance to “come out” (salir) socially. Or at least it is their spirit/quality/knowledge that “comes out.” It is the centripetal party sociality which captures people along the way, and is referred to as the “mother of carnival” (madre de carnaval). Indeed, according to the stories told by the antiguos, it was rather dangerous in the past to venture out into the forest at the time of carnival. Lonely travellers would find the parties moving through the land, and if they were unlucky, they would be pulled in:

One man went to the forest on the day of the carnival. (…) The day they put up the húmisha [central palm, see below]. (…) He kills a collared peccary (...). Coming home (...), he hears the sound of a drum ahead of him. He hears it behind him. So he (...) makes a little cross from sticks (...). [But the devils] heed nothing, and keep on coming, coming... tran! [they arrive]. [Because he hid in a hole:] “Hey, friend, what are you doing in there? – Let’s go and celebrate the carnaval feast!” So he comes out. He comes out and goes with them. And he looks around: there was no forest anymore! A beautiful road! Well cleared! Then – they say he was a flute player – so they gave him a flute. There was a bombo drum, bruuto [swear] the people kept coming. All kinds: youngsters and adults, drinking. Some drunk. They kept on coming, and he went along with his flute. They were going to drink masato, trago. (RPH01)

In other stories, feasting parties would move through settlements in the forest, bringing with them the cleared social space. Yet, still today, when carnival time comes around, that space spreads to all the communities on this side of clarity, in the human world. The old people said that in the past spirits would actually come out
(salir) alongside the villagers, who pay a fee and register to get dressed up and emerge with the demons. On that February day, when I bring up what others told me, Daniel said that it is true; they used to come, but they do not come as much these days. They have become more timid, and more and more of the forest.

On that same occasion, Ronal stops by our place when I talk with Daniel. They check with each other about whether there was any news of demons coming out this year. One asks the other if their obligations have been fulfilled (cumplido su año). Naada [Nope!] — they both answer — they agree they don’t feel like it anymore (fT1302).

Although participation is admittedly “entertainment,” once a person comes out into the carnaval demon sociality, he (less frequently she) is obliged to participate 12 times (i.e., years) before being freed from this obligation. This is reminiscent of handing oneself over to the containing, employing figures such as kuka or patrones. If one does not fulfil this obligation, the mother of carnival will “accompany” (companion) the noncompliant, and pester him, in an effort to claim his soul (alma)ccvii (DHR28). Sickness befalls as a result of the infliction of debt to another sociality. Daniel explained this several times before:

The carnaval is approaching, so they make you dream. Bruto [swear], hearing the dancing. Beautiful girls. Their faces well painted up/made up. Come! — they pull me to dance. They paint me, playing! Ta! I wake up: “Dang, it was a dream...” I look in the mirror: nothing. Clean (lindo). But in your dream they paint you! (DHR03); Bruuto, how it made me dream. (...) The devil of the forest comes to take you in your dream. (...) the girls, beautiful girls, their faces all red [painted with wild achiote]: They pull you in your dream, to dance. That’s because you didn't get dressed up and come out. (...) If you don’t come out, you become sick. It accompanies you. ccvii (DHR02)

Therefore,

you come out dressed up (...). Uuuh, it’s the same all over the world, right? In your country, do they do this as well? (...) Here, they do this every year. (...) The [village] authorities ask what the villagers say: “Are we going to erect the palm or not?” (...) So they chip in: masato, one lata [c. 19 liters] each. (BRS22)

Then,

[At the] time of the carnaval they put up the palm. They arrive with the flute and the bombo drum. They erect [the palm] with the drum, the music. And they decorate the palm with scarves until it is heavy, lots of things to dress it up. (BRS17)

As to the central palm, the húmisha/úmisha:
[They make it] out of the walking palm (cashapona). They cut it down (…) Bring it to the communal building (…) There they plait its leaves (…) tie it up [in a loop]. There [horizontally] they place a stick and it’s ready: things are tied to it. Everything, well dressed up! Well loaded! Everything. And at the very top, the flag. Red and white, Peruvian. (…) That’s because we are Peruvians.\textsuperscript{ccix} (DHR22)

I “collaborated” [contributed] bleach, dishwashing paste (ace) and soap (…) Some offered up turtles (motelo), some wrapped meat (…) manioc or plantains (inguirí), cookies, bread, zapote fruits, (…) sweets, the soda (gaseosa) – that doesn’t break.\textsuperscript{ccx} (DHR02)

“They will have to celebrate the feast all night, all day. At 5 pm they are going to drink by the palm. (…) Aja, painting [each other] with mud or paint\textsuperscript{ccxi} (BRS17). And the next afternoon:

Around that time they cut the húmisha/úmisha [i.e. the palm] down: po, po: blon! There they defeat that húmisha: Uuuh. Then they carry it to the water. The feast ends there. (…) [When it falls,] everybody piles up on it, grabbing. A fight!\textsuperscript{ccxii} (DHR02)

The participants swarm around while the palm is still standing at the centre, dancing in the pandilla style to the sound of the bombo drum and flute music (baile bombo). Twice during the night and then again at noon the following day, they intermingle with the visible “children” of the mother of carnival. For people, these are the demonios [demons], diablos [devils], tunchi [spirits], i.e. yushin (Ch. 2), and:

And [all] that devil has is his foreman (capataz), that is, their boss. One more devil who is the ooldest! (Julia: They say he’s the apu [indigenous leader]. He commands them all. He enters first. He comes limping, with his cane\textsuperscript{ccxiii} (RPH01). [It is] the owner of the yushin (demons), of all of them (…). The foreman emerges ahead, and his crias fall behind. (…) He leads in front, like a matero\textsuperscript{ccxiv} (…). An old one, white beard.\textsuperscript{ccxv} (…) [The foreman, their] father. And we [the other dressed-up], [his] children.\textsuperscript{ccxv} (DHR22)

To explain simply, demons are the difference between what is seen around the palm and who the participants actually are. Firstly, they are the difference in number between villagers who declared to “come out” (salir) to the dancing space dressed-up, and the number of visible demons. That difference is created by the authentic members of the demon domain: “those are devils already (…). That’s how it used to be before: they have more [dancers] than [people] coming out. (…) [That’s what] my dad told tell me”\textsuperscript{ccxvi} (GSR07).

\textsuperscript{198} In logging, matero is a worker who enters the forest searching and marking trees for felling by the teams who come afterwards.
Secondly, demons are the difference between the outer appearance of the participants and their actual selves, because they are mostly made up of villagers serving under the mother of the carnival’s command. They imitate (imitan) or copy (comparar) the devils. Demons are the masks, clothes, greenery and the personas (youngsters, girls or old men) of the forest sociality seen by the other people. They tightly cover the villagers, so that their own ―body doesn’t show up‖ (DHR22). While the dressed-up people are said to remain human, they are “con demonio” [with a demon]. Back on this side, the clothes and masks they wore in service of the carnaval are “puro demonio” and after the party, should either be thrown away, or washed off with bleach (removing the smell/air/spirit – cf. Ch. 2). Dancers only wear them for short periods during the feast, and prolonged contact with the divergent quality in clothes or masks causes sickness – a weakening paleness resulting from “being accompanied” by the demon for too long.

The insistence of the mother of carnaval partying on the external surface is illustrated further by the practice of jugar carnaval [playing carnival] in which everyone can be painted or soiled (ensuciar) by anyone else with whatever is at hand: mud, paint, oil, even faeces, without the possibility of complaint. In a popular expression: Carnaval manda nadies no demanda [There’s no complaining when the carnival ordains]. That general hold over its participants, especially those who serve the mother of carnaval, was expressed by Ronal: “You have to obey [and come out], by force – don’t you know it’s the devil’s feast?” (RPH01).

It is worthwhile noting how several elements of the party rely on the language of owning/parenting. For example, the invisible, non-personified madre de carnaval is a multitude, or an organizing, centripetal principle of an “outside,” holding (i.e., containing) the aggregate of participants together. Also, the capataz who comes first is the oldest and is followed by his younger fellows, who are less or lower in hierarchy or his “crias.” And finally, the image of the centripetal palm tree loaded with goods, which is cut down and “defeated” in the culmination of the feast, and its possessions are distributed amongst the participants – strikes me as illustrating the quintessence of the relation between wards and a domain owner such as the mythical owners or, more metaphorically, as the father-in-law (Ch. 3, 4).

Importantly, this constellation also provides an imagery of the positions available to the participants. In relation to the centripetal (containing) force or “the
mother,” these demonios are defined as its crías, that is, ɨnabu. Villagers do not become entirely true children of the carnaval’s owner. Underneath the masquerade – that is, in an inside created by this altered surface in relation to the partying outside – dancers continue to be dressed-up humans. We could actually consider that while they represent or wear the appearances of the carnaval’s offspring, their inner humanity gives them the status of composite, internally divergent, demons for this sociality. Yet villagers’ obligations, the debt to carnaval’s owner, also penetrate them as an element of that otherworldly sociality. This element can potentially affect their health and “accompany” villagers.

The image of a moving clearing, as a sociality on which participants come out, are covered with an external surface of either clothes or paint, and thus become subject to the rules and the command of its sponsor or owner – has come to help me make sense of the way Capanahua descendants spoke about participation in social spaces. I came to understand the social spaces or domains in which people live, wear their clothes, their appearance, submit to their rules or habits (costumbre) as their instruments of perceptibility (Ch. 1). This imagery inspired me to look more closely into the paisanos’ ways of positing the difference between this side (outside), the other side (inside) and at the mediating, third position of ɨnabu, are the themes that “owned” this thesis. I see it as an illustration of Capanahua descendants’ theory of sociality. What is important in the context of this particular interlude is that although the imagery refers to a forest sociality, it might be relevant to the Capanahua descendants’ particular position in relation to the social spaces they inhabit, in this case, Eastern Peru or the Selva. I return to this below.

2. The remains: frustrations of the present purity

Meanwhile, let me return to the frustrations of ideals, this time with a focus on the other side of the descent trajectory. Note that the ways in which the Capanahua descendants explain their identity changes, such as those described as thwarting the older razas, revolve around the individuals’ yearning to establish themselves in improved, clearer or less differentiated positions. This would be expressed in an abbreviated way as “quieren ser más” [they want to be more] or “no quieren ser…” [they do not want to be (what they have been)]. It holds equally true for the self-naming of the “fighting men of the past,” which originates in the proliferation of kaibu kinds. Here, it is explained as claiming improved strength or endurance for a
new breed, a purity of the *tronco*. The Capanahua descendants similarly explain other people’s affiliations with the *nawa* strangers and the appropriation of their “noble” surnames and status, as mentioned in Ch. 4. Yet many people have significant objections to such moves, either of a technical (or “ontological”), or moral kind.

2.1. Technical objections

Most importantly, starting off in an imperfect, rigid world, such transitions are ultimately doomed to be frustrated. That is a solid boundary of the other, future ideal of clarity (apart from the purity of the originating *tronco* in Sect. 1). The one fact which most effectively frustrates attempts to “be more” in the Capanahua descendants representations is that the *raza* is imperishable and ineradicable. This confused me at first, considering the fragility of *raza* and the efforts attributed to the *antiguos* who tried to save it. However, in this context, *raza* might be understood as referring to that fraction of the original that is passed on, like the gift-curse of the original owners. Consider the different reflections on this ineradicability by Doña Germe and Doña Elsa:

(LK: I thought that maybe the Capanahua wanted to become mestizos.) Noo. What we are... we can never be more. We cannot change what we are. (LK: And doesn’t it matter that people here speak Spanish, wear their clothes and live in their way?) No. Well, yes, but, the *raza* does not perish. It does not perish, not ever. One can speak Spanish, but the people know who we are. They know what *raza* we have. (LK: So despite everything being the same as with mestizos, people here are a different *raza*) Mhm (LK: So what accounts for this?) (...) Because they are *raza*... *indígena* [indigenous]. That’s the kind of *raza* we have. From way back. We have the *raza* Capanahua. That does not perish – not ever! (LK: So where is it? In your body?) In... well, it’s nowhere, it’s just one’s *raza*. (LK: So it’s not blood?) No, we all have the same blood. (LK: So it’s just that descent (*descendencia*)?) Mhm, we are the descendants of the Capanahua, those that existed before. (GSR02)

By ignoring [my surname/*raza*] – what do I become? I am not going to make myself more... better. Because my face (caracter) does not do (...). It doesn’t allow for being *viracucha*, to equal myself to them. They are *viracucha*, and not *cholos* like us. It would not do, brother. Nor does my surname allow for it. What would it be for if I were to become a *viracucha* (LK: But you could change your surname) ...But my face won’t do. And my colour, seeing I’m so dark (*negrusha*) (Celina [Doña Elsa’s daughter]: Not like the brother – his skin is all white like the *cunchi*’s [small catfish] belly) [all laugh]. (EFN03)

We can now see the affirmations that *raza* cannot be “denied” (*negar*) and should not be “ignored” (*ignorar*) appear precisely in the context of such attempted changes. With the dry sarcastic humour typical of the villagers, which often characterises these revelations, Doña Olga summed up someone’s claim of descending from the San Martín Region (indicating a remote, noble mestizo identity):
“San Martín of Buncuya? [chuckles] They want to be \textit{viracucha}, \textit{gringos} like you! They are from the Buncuya river!” (fT1210). Similarly, Don Romer summarized the surname changes in past generations: “They have changed their surnames hoping to grow/become more. In the end: the \textit{generación} remains the same!” (RPR06). Providing an important indication of what such an elevated ideal might be, someone once told me of similar contemporary claims to foreign descent: “[Even if they had] the surname Ollanta [President of Peru], they are [still] from here.”\textsuperscript{ccxxi} In such a context, Doña Elsa expressed a rather common attitude to such changes:

That’s why I’m saying: those from the past were... ignorant! The ancient folks, ignorants (\textit{ignorantes})! Like I sometimes say of my father, laughing, about what you said\textsuperscript{199} – that he doesn’t want to be a \textit{Capacho} [extremely derogatory version of Capanahua] see! [laughs],\textsuperscript{ccxxii} (EFN03)

These changes are often traced back to the “true” (\textit{verdadero}) surname that was “negated” (\textit{negar}), or parents that were “ignored” (\textit{ignorar}). In Ch. 4, I mentioned that those “original” surnames can be identified as \textit{kaibu} names. However, these are ultimately also said to be “made up” to differentiate from previous origins (see above). In either case, there is often only a shadow marking the status of their contemporary identity as “not true” and secondary:

His godfather gave him his surname. (...) And his mother was the same! They were not X. The godfather of her father was X. (...) (LK: What was their surname before that?) What might it have been!? I don’t know (...) but this wasn’t their true surname.,\textsuperscript{ccxxiii} (GSR10)

Such assumptions result in a proliferation of suspicions affecting a large part of historical and contemporary identities. The surnames (of others) are hushedly revealed to be “presented” (\textit{regalados}), “bought” (\textit{comprados}), “stolen” (\textit{robados}), “changed” (\textit{cambiados}), or “straightened up” (\textit{enderazados}),\textsuperscript{200} etc. This is a result of \textit{compadrazgo}, employment, adoption, individual claims, or intentional concealment. For this reason, affirmations of authenticity are sometimes put forth before any actual accusations, as in the case of N.’s introductory speech in defence of the legitimacy of his surname.

\textsuperscript{199} When I met Doña Elsa’s father in 2007, he told me that he was not Capanahua and his parents were from other parts of Peru.
\textsuperscript{200} The practice of “straightening up” surnames, e.g. from Solisbanco to Solisban or Solis; or from Chumo, a surname associated with the Upper Tapiche Capanahua, to surnames that are more likely to be found downriver, such as Chumbe or even to the “Chinese” surname Chung. Cf. Ch. 4.
It is the ultimate intransformatibility of “true” origins that Daniel (DHR27) seems to have meant when he told me I could not become a (real) Capanahua. Although I could be a “Capanahua” while being in Limón, or when speaking the language – I would still be a white man when going to other places, while Daniel and others would be “Capanahua” wherever they went. This is a praised attitude to one’s raza, in the expression “not being ashamed and being the same (or speaking the same language) wherever one goes” (“En donde me voy, soy igual nomás,” “En cualquier parte que me voy, yo estoy hablannndo mi castellano... mi idioma,” or simply “Por donde también!”). I understand that I was a white/Polish raza in a “Capanahua” outside. On the other hand, the villagers occasionally speak of themselves to others as sepa “Capanahua,” but that is a synecdochic formulation to which I return in the Conclusion. Recognizing their remoteness from the original ideal, villagers usually treat such claims to pure identity amongst themselves sceptically (cf. the case of a “Capanahua” and “Capanahuillo” in the Prologue).

As recalled from N.’s speech, in the social dimension, ſinabu, from pet or son-in-law, becomes rescaled to mean cholos, or peons, workers, and sometimes is an equivalent of indios. It relies on judging the hierarchical level of containing undesirable difference traced to more diluted, lower descent. Or, conversely, on the marking by contrast the degree of claimants’ absorption and belonging to a more prestigious, “pure” outside or descent. The former marks “backwardness” (atrás), and may suggest a position of submission to the latter, which is “ahead” (adelante). Consider this part of a drunken speech by a man who will be left anonymous:

Those Y. – they are more cholo than us, brother. (…) Their surname is good. (…) Me, yes, I am X, it’s my legitimate surname, I have not changed it, I am of the X. But those? They changed their surname! How does he sound to you when he speaks? (LK: well, he does have some…) Some remainder (dejo) [i.e. accent!] And me, how do I sound to you, brother? (…) No, they have a lot of remainder! A lot! (…) they can speak the [Capanahua] language well, but they don’t want to speak it! They are not Capanahua, wannabe viracucha! Just imagine! [laughs hard]. (…) They are from here, truly (legítimo) – more than us! “What is a cholo worth, an X!” – they insult us like that. Being more, see! [laughs] (…) They think themselves more. Their surname is good, but… (…) (LK: And are you not ashamed of being Capanahua?) What the fuck would I be ashamed of!? This is how God created me. Going any place I speak my castellano – my… [Capanahua]. (…) Look at me, brother. How would I make a mestizo? Nor does my manner say I’m a mestizo: I don’t have the mestizo way of walking, of laughing. Of speaking. No, right? (…)

---

201 Working on a different project some years before, I found out that the Shipibo use the word ſinabu to refer to uncontacted people.
That’s why I’m saying – how the fuck would I become a mestizo? They know who I am!

2.2. Moral objections

I was told on numerous occasions that the antiguos made similar distinctions between families, and considered other kaibus more cholo, their inabu. The actual context of these historical hierarchies lies beyond the limitations of this thesis, but such examples as above, or in N.’s speech in the Prologue, show that similar hierarchies echo today among the villagers, as seen above. Here, we touch on the delicate, moral obstacles to such claims. Don Benigno’s reflections on such differentiating is illustrative of its moral impropriety in an outside that values unity and equality:

Like I said, we shouldn’t talk in terms of cholo. Because here, none of us is cholo of a patrón. And, like I said, cholo is a servant of another person. (...) An obedient cholo. Taking commands. Like an adopted child/servant. (...) Aha, nuken [our] ina (...) We can’t think that I have a better surname, or [surname that is] less (...) (LK: But cholo can say indio?) Yes, like I hear them talking – when people are drunk – “He is less than me, I have a better surname” ...and that makes him more... But what is his surname worth, right? (...) Some say this surname won’t do. What matters is our education, our demeanour (presencia)... But in the end, like I say: we are all the same. Having education or not, in our hearts: we are all good, or some have a good, some have a bad heart, right? You ask a favour, he doesn’t do it...

3. Rescaling descent

This position of inabu brings me to an important aspect of the representations of history. Its meaning ranges from the “adopted child,” or “pet,” to that of the “son-in-law,” and from there, in one more move, to the “slave” or “indio/cholo” as wider social positions. My suggestion is that this rescaling is not limited to the particular term, but also refers to the relational dynamics in which it serves as a central catalyst, which can similarly be rescaled. Indeed, the process of “taming” (ra’e’i, amanzar), which describes the process of acquiring inabu sons-in-law or pets, also describes “civilizing,” (civilizar) (see Ch. 1). Similar to its other instantiations, the process results from the movements of “emerging from/onto” (pikuti, salir afuera) or “letting oneself be seen” (dejarse ver). It would not be unreasonable to assume that with such rescaling, problems of one level parallel those of others. And indeed, issues similar to those discussed for formulations of such an introduced element at the levels of body or in marriage arrangements (Ch. 2, 3, 4) can be identified on representations of the social and historical level. Here, too, the introduction of such “third element” –
inflicted by the compulsiveness of reproduction (also social, through alterity) – disrupts the self-contained state of the two separate, original social purities. This differentiates the receiving “internal” space into a containing “externality” for their wards. These, as the offspring, or “branches” of an originally undifferentiated space (“tree trunk”), become the tamed servants: cholos or “slaves” in the receiving space. At the level of adopted child, pet, or son-in-law, inabu conserve their status and can never become an unquestionable “true” descendant. Similarly, the cholos as “branches” of other domains or troncos, have trouble becoming entirely “true” citizens of their hosting “outside” (cf. problems of “inside content” for the clarity of the “outside” in Ch. 1, 2). The recognition of “true” and “secondary” surnames evidences that.

I would suggest that such breaking of the original purity and frustration in achieving the absolute new purity constitute the most important problem for the villagers in human sociality in general. In their particular case – as I suggested in the above collection of reference points through which they define their current position – such frustration frames their presentations of themselves between the ideal domains of past and future self-contained clarity, and proper belonging, non-differentiated into inside and outside by the “guests.” From one of these domains they, or rather their razas, are said to have emerged (or have been extracted). The other is that into which they have been received, and wherein they understand their own participation as starting from ignorance and acquiring competence (Ch. 1). From this perspective, it would be possible to think about their way of referencing and describing social and historical relations as a rescaling of the familiar exchange dynamic with the “guest” or inabu position as crucial.

Here it is also worth considering that for living people, both domains are “ahead” – one as the “first generations” and the other as the “real people,” whose legitimacy, I argued in Ch. 4, also comes from the “original” purity. How, then are we to understand desarrollo, development, that describes the move to the “outside”? I would suggest that it must involve a sort of circularity or complementarity (ultimately similar to the exchanges between original troncos as elicited by Capanahua kinship terminology). The move to know the outside would mean shedding the ignorance and difference acquired throughout the generations of “generations” living on earth, suffering and differentiating away from the original. It would mean to recover from a
“sickness” of descent. This positioning would place the present people in the middle between spatial extremes, and simultaneously, at a “vertical” temporal scale between past and present extremes of connected originality and purity, as in the alternating generations of the *antiguos’* arrangement.

Transplanting these historical representations into a sort of middle ground, I would suggest that the processes formulated as “emerging” or “coming out” to clarity correspond to the processes called “acculturation” in the Lowlands. However, because of its contexts, which I have been tracing in this dissertation, the middle ground quickly turns out to be a working misunderstanding (Sahlins 1985), because there is a significant difference in what Capanahua descendants and outsiders, including anthropologists, might see as problematic in such histories. I suppose that in general, the latter might tend to formulate the problem as the loss of a particular identity and uniqueness of tradition, assuming that it leads to becoming identical with all the other mestizo in the Peruvian selva, either in a process of intermixing or of assimilation into the “Western culture.” Yet the villagers speak of difference as, in essence, pestiferous in its indispensability. It is actually the quintessence of problems which frustrate purity and tranquillity between people, and as such it is shameful. The Capanahua descendants’ problem with “acculturation” might therefore be twofold. On the one hand, it is a loss of the original, mythical purity by the *antiguos*. On the other hand, the ultimate incompleteness of the process of re-unification, precisely because of the internally reproduced difference carried by descent.

It is possible to view such rescaling of categories as correlated, for example, with the historical process of widening the consanguine categories, such as “brothers,” onto former affines, or cross-cousins. In the examples above such process is well demonstrated.202 At the same time, widening of the “inside/origin” category might imply that the affines “outside/destiny” category is also shifted elsewhere, as we saw with the new kinds of inseminations, consensual or not.203 Let me therefore finish by glimpsing at the neighbours of the Capanahua descendants, or other “villagers” in eastern Peru.

---

202 Paul Henley speaks of hawaiinization of kinship terminology (Henley 1996).
203 Graham Townsley (1988) proposed that the moiety marked as “outsiders” has been projected on the mestizo society by the Yaminahua.
4. *Perú*: The co-emerged

4.1. Who have the Capanahua acculturated into?

When speaking of “acculturation,” anthropologists tend to focus on groups which are in the process of becoming “acculturated” and the continuities or transformations. Significantly less attention is paid to those to who they actually acculturate into (Gow 2009), as if there was only one final option, a vaguely hinted “national” or “Euro-American” milieu. Ethnographers tend to pass by those people “in between” on the way to do fieldwork with the “named” groups, just as before when they passed by the “invisible Indians” (Stocks 1978). However, confronted with the problem of distinguishing “Capanahua” from “mestizo” elements, I would like to learn in the future, who the Capanahua have acculturated into.

Everyone in the villages, as elsewhere, occasionally gives in to the temptation of positioning themselves hierarchically, either as of more authentic descendant, possessing more knowledge, education, or even as an older sibling. Yet, as Don Benigno noted in a quote above, speaking of others in terms of such inherent differences, especially as ñabu or cholos, placing oneself in a hierarchically higher position, is not proper in outside sociality. It is so particularly because the villagers consider all people to eventually share essentially the same condition. Firstly, blood is the same in all humans, and the Capanahua descendants might rhetorically challenge to find this out by cutting oneself and comparing the colour of the blood. Secondly, there is an important, and perhaps related, assumption about the human condition in general, which might be deduced from their representations. It is that participation in society – an outside – wherever it may be, which requires taming of one’s difference, the dimming of one’s *raza*. And it also means that all people share a similar frustration in the attempt to become “purer” and taming such internal difference. As I heard often from some villagers, the inability to live harmoniously (Ch. 1, 2) does not only inflict Limón or Berea, but generally concerns the world on this side.

For people living in eastern Peru – whose situation the villagers know best – there is a specific instantiation of this larger problem. In some cases, as we saw, mestizos may be spoken of as the “pure ones” (*los puros*) (Ch. 4), which would signify their “authenticity” in the Peruvian domain. However, knowing the places and people downriver, many *paisanos* ultimately also realize that these, as any other, constitute
only claims to clarity. Recall how, at the beginning of Ch. 2, Julio spoke about the mestizo villages on the Ucayali. Or how Don Benigno poked fun at the claim to what he assumed was a pure mestizo identity (\textit{huni kuin}) of the Cashinahua. These opinions are in fact indicative of the way citizens of the Peruvian \textit{selva}, if not of Peru in general, are spoken of by many Capanahua descendants:

(ŁK: Does \textit{cholo} say the same as \textit{indio}?) Mhm yes. (ŁK: So what does \textit{indio} say?) \textit{Indio} are those that come [here sometimes], the \textit{primos}, the Mayorunas [i.e. Matses]. That’s what I understand by \textit{indio}. But, arriving at the truth: we are all \textit{indios}. We are all \textit{indígenas}.\textsuperscript{ccxxvii} (GSR05)

“We have all emerged from... We are all \textit{indios}, we have all emerged from \textit{indio}, formed ourselves” – that’s how I used to mess with mestizos (ŁK: That they are also...) Yes, from an \textit{indio} woman [and the Spaniards].\textsuperscript{ccxxviii} (GHR03)

“Look at the times of the Inca empire, who were the Incas: they were the \textit{indios} of Peru. That’s why we, Peruvians, are \textit{indios}. Every one of us is of the Peruvian \textit{raza}. You can’t say no to that! It may be that (...) you are Vásquez, I am Pizarro: but I will not deny! I am from the \textit{raza}, what I am, I know. I recognize: that I am from an \textit{indio} woman”\textsuperscript{ccxxix} (RPR05)

Therefore, despite the attitude of some downriver people, who might like to see villagers such as the “Capanahua,” that is, as strangers or backwards \textit{indígenas}, \textit{indios} or in the most pejorative designations, \textit{Capachos}, they do not consider themselves \textit{cholos} or \textit{inabu} of anyone, more than any other eastern Peruvians, and perhaps all other people. The Peruvian flag put on the \textit{húmisha} has been flying over their lands for many generations. Don Romer’s grandfather (and Ronal’s great-grandfather) is said to have flown the red and white colours over his settlement in the highest inhabited reaches of the Buncuya river even before the arrival of SIL missionaries in the 1950s. It was named República for this reason, and the grandfather, Tomás Pizarro, is said to have charged visitors for entering or passing through his land (GHR04). Similarly, Don Jorge recalls his grandfather’s stories about the time when Requena was still a small settlement, and therefore was one of those who “founded” it in the early 20th century. These ancestors were thus no less Peruvian than anyone else, and this is even more so in the case of contemporary generations. The \textit{paisanos’ raza} happens to stem from the so-called Capanahua or their “branches,” or, local families – that is, particular lines of descent.

A perspective on who, in turn, the downriver people actually are – especially inhabitants of the biggest local town Requena, at the mouth of Tapiche River, capital
of the Requena Province – is best be explained in the words of Ronal, Don Jorge and Don Mariano:

They [the former Capanahua breeds] have dispersed. Some live here, as well as those that have gone to the cities. Damn, they are already changed (diferentes): because in Requena there are… a myriad… the majority are Capanahua! That’s why some say that Requena is the land of the Capanahua. The Capanahua live everywhere [there]! (LK: But changed?) Changed surname… That is, their women have gotten in with the mestizos, so they already carry different surnames. So their children have different surnames, of the mestizos already. (LK: Are they still Capanahua?) Still Capanahua! For example, those X. that were here, working logs: damn, those who understand the Capanahua language (dialecto) well. Damn, they laugh: “Puucha carajo! [swearing] – that’s how my mum used to talk! – he says – And now we live in the city (ciudad) – we have already left [the language] behind.” I mean, the accent they have, the rhythm of talking, they have abandoned it. It’s not the same anymorecxxx (RPH04)

This one, too, is Chumo! His grandma was that Shabi: these are the Chumos. But… not anymore. It’s terminated. But… there are the offspring. Downriver, even… even in Lima there’s Chumo! Those who go there – girls, youngsters, all of that. Uuuuh! A whole city (pueblo)! In Requena: Chumo, Chumo, Chumo, Chumo. Qué bruto! In Iquitos, everyone: Chumo! That never ever perishes!ccxxxi (JRR02)

If you go to Requena: a multitude of Huaninche. But these are already great-grandchildren. Even I don’t know them. But they… don’t want to erase Huaninche (LK: Are they Capanahua?) Capanahua… but… they don’t want to speak it much. I mean, they are not fluent in their own language living among the mestizos. And that’s why they can’t speak: but they are razasccxxxi (MHR02)

That would mean, at least from the perspective of Limón and Berea, that eventually everyone – in the Peruvian selva at least, perhaps even in the whole of Peru, or the world– shares their own problem of containing divergent descent and layering of sociality, and any hierarchy might only refer to the seniority of emergence: from the isolated people who still refuse to emerge from the river sources, through those who conserve traces of their origins in language or remote locations, to those who have managed throughout generations to clear themselves of such remainders and live in urban areas. Consequently, all Peruvians, if not all people, have “emerged” into the outside just as the Capanahua descendants. If there can be some that are said to be “more” “pure” or “noble” – and so less divergent, with language and rural raza – then this can only be said merely by comparison to someone else in a different position. The absolute purity or authenticity is in this view ultimately impossible, because the combinatory, mixed, individuation condition of humans articulates the asymptote that prevents people from achieving either side of the formative clarity and originality, and is the essence of production and replication of human life.
In the above interlude, I meant to show how the imagery of *carnaval* — sociality worn by humans emerging to feast according to rules of the absorbing centripetal principle — is compatible with the Capanahua descendants representations of sociality. But there is one important fact that might indicate that *paisanos’* diagnoses of their own position are shared with other (eastern) Peruvians: the *húmisha* is erected, surrounded by the emerging dressed-up people, and it falls at their hands every year across “the whole world,” as Don Benigno said. Here, this means in all parts of the Peruvian selva. The *carnaval* celebrations might represent (eastern) Peruvians’ participation in their state.

The question is, does the compatibility of categories used by contemporary, “acculturated” villagers to speak about space, time and sociality in order to read their ancestors’ ideal terminology (shared with other “traditional” Panoans) indicate the ineradicable remainder of the *antiguos* in Capanahua descendants’ ways of formulating explanations? Or are contemporary ways of explaining into which *paisanos* have “acculturated” (and epitomized in the *húmisha*) so compatible with those of their “traditional” ancestors? In the end, I find myself unable to answer which of the contemporary representations discussed throughout this thesis come from the Panoan ancestors of Capanahua or their descendants, and which from eastern Peruvian mestizos. They show apparent continuities and mutual transformations with both, but what is important in the villages is that they ultimately work as a fairly consistent way of explaining the world for Capanahua descendants.

I definitely do not mean to say that this imagery of the *carnaval*, or this thesis shows the villagers as “wearing” “contemporariness” as “acculturation,” while being “original” Others underneath, the real Amazonians. Rather, I hope that, supported by the discussion in this thesis, it illustrates the formulation of the universal contemporariness of the human social condition in participating in sociality generally, with its ineliminable complexity embodied in the *ünabu* thirdness.

Yet, the villagers’ perspectives on their fellow eastern Peruvians from downriver, with whom they share the LUS language, the *húmisha* *carnaval*, and as far as I could learn, a broad range of other representations, might point to an important truth. It is their common descent, or a common position towards the outside they all participate in. This, I would guess, is not limited to “blood,” “raza,” or
other versions of obscured “descent,” but, importantly for anthropologists, refers to ideas about human participation in society. In accordance with this view, the double compatibility of their representations with those of their ancestors and with those of the contemporary eastern Peruvian “exterior” might also be conceived in a manner proposed by Anne-Christine Taylor for relations between the social categories of mansos and aucas in Ecuador. In these “mutually implicating cultures”:

in terms of what is usually defined as ‘culture,’ the two groups in fact share a great deal of common ground, a kind of ‘zero degree’ of habitus, the commonality of which goes largely unperceived: it is salient neither for the Indians nor for ethnographers. This invisible backdrop of similar body techniques, work habits, mythic narratives, diets, ways of using and understanding language, and manners of interacting is what allows Quechua and Jivaros to move in and out of each others’ societies with such facility. Conversely, the differences between auca and ‘domestic’ cultures are rooted in sharply contrasted ways of contextualizing and elaborating, in a few restricted domains, the same cultural stuff and the same sorts of knowledge. (...) The permeability between auca and manso identities clearly involves shared premises concerning the relational forms that underlie these kinds of personhood. (...) At issue in these distinct ways of framing identities is a hidden but decisive modulation in the relation to alterity constitutive of Self. (Taylor 2007: 158)

4.2. Is there an owner of this outside?

In any case, if such rescaling of “inside” and “outside” were actually an acceptable perspective on the Capanahua descendants position, there is still one question that I would hesitate to answer, as the villagers themselves seem to. While it is rather clear who fulfils the receiving role in kinship and marriage arrangement, that is, whose “inside” composes the containing space of the inabu (the host body, adoptive parent or father-in-law), it is unclear whose inside the villagers currently occupy as their outsides in the social and historical dimension. Although other Peruvians increasingly become affines, they largely turn out to be, at best, senior “co-emergents.” The villagers agree that there is no owner of Limón Cocha or Berea. However, there are a set of remote figures whose decisions affect the villages from afar. At the most direct level, it is the authorities who represent the state at the level of villages, and are largely responsible for regulating external aspects of village life (to the extent that inspection of houses became problematic when an order was sent from Santa Elena to search the houses after a larger robbery). Further away, there is the municipality (municipalidad), headed by the district mayor (alcalde), that

204 Here, we might perhaps consider that even in the most “traditional” Panoan kinship/relatedness terminology, and the groups organized by it, it would be hard to find Panoans who do not conceive of reproduction as the interweaving of distinct identities, including the endogamous Cashinahua, who postulate separateness of their constitutive sections.
occasionally provides material support the Tapiche villages expect (Ch. 1). Finally, in remote Lima, there is the president who is the highest imaginable Peruvian, as indicated in the sarcastic comment on the presidential surname. He is recognized as a source of regulations (*Ley de Presidente, Ley de Ollanta*) which govern the externality of the villages.

Yet, for the villagers, the ultimate, real owner is not reachable in this domain, just as the mother of *carnaval* is an aggregating but invisible presence. It is God (*Dios*), Our Father or Owner (*nuestro Papa, nuestro Dueño*), who created and then left the earth as the *Netecanika*. It is he who watches this domain from the sky and takes down notes and names in the “Book of Life” (*Libro de la Vida*). It is in his domain, villagers say, that when we die, we will achieve the state which is impossible in the corrupted (*corrupto*) state of the world with our composite bodies, when reproduction and hunger cease. That will be the ultimate clearing of the remains of original punishment that inflicted reproduction. It will happen not in particular villages associated with non-differentiated *kaibus*, which Doña Germe’s father pointed to in the sky, but rather the large, heavenly cities of God spoken of by the Shipibo missionaries, who learn from *gringos*. The Capanahua descendants would agree with them that we live in the “intermediate times” (*tiempos pasajeros*) between the original purity and the final rejection of the past differentiation and the sin producing our “fronts,” or bodies in the ultimate owner’s domain. I could only mention here that the phenomenon of religious fervour sweeping through the cities and villages of contemporary eastern Peruvian *selva* is, in the context of continuities theorized by the Capanahua descendants, truly deserving of our attention:

That’s how they are over there, Lucas, the [Evangelical] ‘brothers.’ They are true believers (*creyentes*). The things they did in the past, they have already abandoned. To follow the Lord. (...) Only them in their churches there. In the city [Pucallpa]: “Whatever [wrong] they may do to you: do not go there, leave them aside. (...) Then God is with you, looking at you. He’s in your heart, making you do the good work (...). He comes to your mind, to your desire, your *yushin* is… beautifully/purely (*lindo*) with the Lord! It’s not… thinking about doing bad.” There’s lots of people who practise this. We should... leave it all, they say... So many things to be... learned from that book... (BRS19)

In the end, we could see the villagers of Limón and Berea, like many other eastern Peruvians, as the “progeny” or “descendants” passed between their ancient ancestors and the receivers, such as the president of Peru or God. In historical terms, they are neither their pure ancestors nor the pure ultimate heavenly beings,
whomever that position might be projected onto. They are the new breeds with potentially equal rights to both troncos. Like in N.’s introductory speech, they are of the father and of the mother, of the Ayubu and viracucha. Capanahua and Peruvian. They are “of mixed blood” indeed.
Figure 10. Men erecting the húmisha palm in Limón, 2012 (photo by Ł. Krokoszyński).
Figure 11. *Baile bombo or música típica*: During a football match, Don Romer Pizarro Romaina (left) playing the bombo drum, and an unknown man plays the flute. Victor Raúl, Buncuya River, 2011 (photo by Ł. Krokoszyński).
Figure 12. Schoolchildren’s *carnaval* parade in Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 2012. The green-painted boy with crutches probably represents the forest demon, *yashingo* (photo by Ł. Krokoszyński).
Figure 13. “And [all] that devil has its foreman (capataz), that is, their boss. One more devil who is the oooldest! (Julia: They say he’s the apu [president]. He commands them all. He enters first. He comes limping, with his cane.” Schoolchildren’s carnaval parade in Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 2012 (photo by Ł. Krokoszyński).
Figure 14, 15. Schoolchildren’s *carnaval* parade in Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 2012. Above: The tourists. Below: *mingueros*, or the agricultural workers (photo by Ł. Krokoszyński).
Conclusion

The 'inabu, tamed descent, and acculturation

Z rodziną wychodzi się dobrze tylko na zdjęciu

["With the family one only looks good in a photo" – a Polish saying]

This thesis was intended to think through and follow the lead of the representations of the generative process and their contexts among the people I refer to here as the Capanahua descendants or the villagers, and who call themselves nuestros paisanos. As such, it was driven by the indispensible and causative position of the “third element” which in turn drives the dynamic of those representations. The narrative traced that dynamic in the reverse order to the temporal and causal direction of the generative process, so as to elucidate its articulation between the formative entities and through processes on different levels. My presentation moved from an understanding of space and its products as the “outside,” towards understandings of the spaces as contained, and then towards the process that produces such differentiation. In other words, it moved from that “third element” (children, contemporary social space) “owning” or containing the places, towards being “owned” or contained by the places (parents and their perspective on the social space). Further, the narrative followed from this “thirdness” to the processes that form it (procreation and interpenetrations of social spaces), and finally, to the entities existing separately before it was formed (parents and past, ideally separate social spaces).

The leading problem has been to grasp the dynamics that produce these distinctions. Between Ch. 1 and 2, I showed how, thinking through these representations, light and space can be seen as creating the “outside” of the social space, as much as they do the “inside” expected of them. The dynamic is in fact not unlike, to use the meaningful categories of the villagers themselves, of the light (associated with social space, as nete joining light, space and time), producing
shadow (associated with the imperceptible, and thus asocial, internal or back content, the yushin, demonios – or kinship). Here, the presence of the “inside” was presented as inherently problematic for the “outside,” existing at the cost of the bright space, as a void. This articulation can be seen as creating the “layers” of sociality that have been introduced in a cross-section of the Prologue. In Ch. 2 and 3, I examined the constellations and dynamics that result in the very opacity that casts such “shadows,” as insides or hungers, and their layering. I presented such opacity as the thirdness or separation/relation articulating between inside and outside in the form of the “bodily containers” and the contained “children.” I associated this with the movements conceived as penetrations of previously self-contained spaces, and the resulting extractions or implementations that create the voids, that is, the composite character of entities containing life. These movements, I suggested, construe the flow of time as passing on of debilitating, diluting curse or infection, which entails further, branching out complications or differentiations for the villagers.

Ch. 4 fully articulated both the topologies and the process of implanting and devolution. Here, the process of differentiation between inside and outside, initiating the diluting sickness, was identified as an encompassing function of the relation between two original entities that come to interpenetrate, introducing or extracting elements of each other in the process of insemination. This creates the third form, the child, which is thus the very articulation of processes and topologies discussed before. The process, I argued, is also embedded in an absolute perspective on the flow of time, which construes consistent dilution of previous original(s), and the temporal hierarchy of authenticity which governs the representations of kinship. I suggested that the process of procreation as a cosmic, mortal sickness can be seen as the negative motivation for social solutions and the very formulations of the role of sociality. I argued that in these formulations, descent is an always partial and potentially diverging trace in persons, rather than a unifying principle. In other words, it is a latent, dormant insemination of difference which needs to be tamed by the actions of outside sociality.

In Ch. 5, such dynamics of frustrative-generative processes of procreation and sociality aimed at containing it was indicated at the level of social-historical representations. Here, the process of socio-cultural change that could be called acculturation, was thought of in terms of the villagers’ formulations of descent,
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“originality” and the inherent devolutionary process creating hierarchy and encompassments. I suggested that for the people involved, the results of such acculturation could ultimately be seen as the reverse of expected devolution by introducing a more real, or authentic, orthodox clarity and purity, or light, which, in turn, casts the past as the shadow. This, in the above formulations, is the expected role of sociality. In this locally created perspective, acculturation (like children who literally embody it) might be seen as much the effect or cause for devolution and loss, as the potential solution to taming these “natural” and inherited processes of “descent.” The process is represented as clearing and strengthening the unifying or “containing” quality of social life rather than diluting it. In other words, containing previous differences (as Perú space), as much as containing seeds for their reproduction (as “Capanahua” descent).

1. The ĭnabu trouble

In this context, the “containee,” ĭnabu (cría) that I came to refer to as the “third,” mediatory position, can be seen as the key category. As Ch. 4 revealed most strongly, the ĭnabu-like positions not only participate in the relation between the contained and containee, but rather, articulate a relation between two original entities: between separate troncos, yura, as “bodies” or “domains,” and could be understood as the social relation itself. Throughout this thesis I have pointed to the spatial and temporal conjunctions implicit in the villagers’ categories. Among the most important consequences of that conjuncture is that the second generation, children, occupy a doubly mediating role in the larger procreative (i.e. temporal) perspective. One is contained between “spatio-temporal” entities, their parents and their “domains.” The other is contained between their parents or ancestors and their own children and descendants. ĭnabu is thus as much a spatial, as a temporal, and eversible position, that is, a social relation, between entities in (interconnected) temporal and spatial dimensions. This is where descent and alliance intersect and reproduce each other.

ičnabu thus articulate the generative-destructive dynamic in bodies and children, inside and outside. They are the literal “embodiment,” in the form of opaque

---

205 This formulation seems to echo with Victor Cova’s recent proposition (2014) of the “technologies of incorporation of the future” based on his ethnography of the Shuar and American evangelical missionaries.
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bodies or children, of the distortion to self-containment of pre-procreative original entities. Diminishing one side, they burden the other by conditioning its compositeness as the “outside.” This fate they later reproduce themselves as containers, in which the new and previous clearings or containers will become contained as diversifying differences conducive to further branching out. Their own inherently composite nature, doubly belonging and doubly (eversibly) contained spatially and temporally, contributes to ineliminable ambiguity. That is why taming and containing such positions – which I proposed were among the most important functions expected of the current outside sociality – was tantamount to controlling the very process of procreation and perishing, conducive to reproduction against procreation. The asymptotic quality of one’s offspring is enough to position them as mediatory strangers, subject to social relations, and this is where the folding back of generations, or switch in containment, everts the spatio-temporal perspective. ‘Inabu, containee (pet), is a potential ‘ibu, container (owner); its “other side” is ‘ibu.

To close, let me review and refine some features revealed when thinking about this position. Among its most salient examples were, in Ch. 1: the people and children emerging into and gathered in an “outside” of social spaces; the manioc plants in a field; wild people (indios) extracted from the forest and contained in open spaces. In Ch. 2: the hosted demon helpers; thoughts/feelings and hungers contained in persons; foetuses and tapeworm; the self-working (that is, containing “helpers”) instruments or secrets from the other worlds. In Ch. 3: the earthworm’s son and other wards of the mythic owners; the manioc cultigens; the parting gifts of the mythic owners or actions of ancient humans, as the very “examples” to follow, including procreation itself; the pathogenic implantations in sicknesses; omens and words in influencing the future; the stories and knowledge of the old people. In Ch. 4: the “blood,” “worm,” or foetus in procreation; raza markings in descent and surnames within people; the sons-in-law or captives in the social spaces of marriage arrangements; the godchild in compadrazgo. In Ch. 5: the old people in the new spaces; people as demons participating in the carnavalesque sociality; people in the God’s or State domain.

The cost of being contained

In these examples, one can notice first, the cost of being contained and the initial status of an ‘inabu “helper.” For the Capanahua descendants, the adopted or
stepchildren are assumed to have a status of “slaves” made to work by the adoptive parents, their containing, sheltering owners. This was the preoccupation of Rolando, a mestizo who was in the process of divorcing a local girl. He came to ask for our advice, and worried about the fate of his children at the hands of a future partner of his wife. He was preoccupied that they would become “slaves” (esclavos) of the other man. Don Romer spoke in a similar way about ill-treatment by adoptive fathers, and Don Benigno about inconsiderate employers and their cholos, workers. I have pointed out the position of sons-in-law as the helpers of the father-in-law and compared this relation to that between sorcerer and his crias.

**The cost of containing**

Secondly, containing incurs a cost to the container, and the role of the introduced element is always ambivalent, as is evident in the stories the Capanahua descendants tell of the antiguos, like the manioc thief in the Neteanika story. When the containing roles evert, taking a part of the original, singular trunk of manioc as its branches is atoned with the suffering-work of replanting at the hands of its new owners. Likewise, when the brujo transfers the tree blood into his body, the original owner tree dries out and dies. Yet, the containing sorcerer himself is now under threat of being either abandoned or killed and eaten by his guest demons. Similarly, the establishment of a “group of siblings” at the cost of the previous domain would be atoned by the reproduction of the situation and the return of descendants of the previous domain. Daughters’ foreign husbands and their children would overtake the domain. Similarly with the cost of containing opposition by the earthworm’s son.

In daily life, such internal content can also sometimes be formulated in terms of blood or instinto (e.g. del indio), which for the Capanahua descendants can serve as an explanation of wilful, violent or asocial behaviour or unwillingness to cooperate harmoniously. They often express helplessness towards the lack of cohesion or unanimity, “Así son ellos” [That’s the way they are], or “No sabemos vivir bien” [we don’t know how to live well] (Ch. 2), which may refer to this divergent, inherent element.

---

I am purposefully using this example, because Rolando is not a Capanahua descendant, and comes from Requena instead. This is an opportunity to point to the significant co-participation in utilizing representations I am discussing here between the Capanahua descendants and other local people.
**Diminished**

Extracted from the original, the transferred element is always merely a diminished part of the first owner. The image of the tree trunk and the branches illustrates this point eloquently. It is merely an extract from the original owner’s possession/body, contained in others, who have power over it. As such, a partial element of the owner is not equal to the original. That can also be exemplified by the gifts of the mythic owners, where the process of extraction or abandonment by its “soul” or owner, blemishes and lessens the original capacity while initiating degradation and dilution.

**Inextinguishable**

No matter how small or diminished it is to the “donor,” the extract conserves the origin trace, and is, like the wild manioc seed, potentially inseminating or dangerous. For the recipients, it stands synecdochically as the original, and preserves a link to the original. I like to think that the example of the “chicken named Dorca” captures this adequately. A woman from a neighbouring village (Fátima), presented one small black chicken to Daniel. Because Daniel did not have his own flock, the bird was fed and sheltered by Doña Ermisha, while being recognized as “Daniel’s black chicken.” Yet, I noticed that when Daniel inquired about his protégé, he and Doña Ermisha jokingly referred to the chicken as “Dorca,” which is the name of its original owner from Fátima (DHR12).

To me this image epitomizes the idea of ‘inabu as extracted from the original owner’s possession/body. In the Prologue, I presented some claims to originality based on such connections. Others with one or more “foreign” parent, grandparent and so on, have the status of children of foreigners, as “raza Campa” or “raza Cocama,” (also see A.’ response to N. in the Prologue). But similarly, some ancestors rumoured to have been “caught” among the Mayu (possibly Matses) indios some 3 generations ago, are said to have been mayubake, “children of the Mayu,” and this still casts a shadow on their contemporary descendants as those of Mayu origin.

Like the curses of the mythic owners, such inheritance is irreversible. Initially, I expected to find the formulations similar to these described for other Amazonians, relating to producing and altering of kinship or/as bodies, for example, through

---

208 Similarly, a chicken whose leg had been bitten off by a gold tegu (iguano) remained for Doña Ermisha the “Iguano” (fT1211).
commensality or cohabitation (cf. Introduction). Yet, people consistently denied that possibility whenever I approached the subject, as they did in other contexts (Ch.4, 5). A representative example comes from a conversation with Doña Germe:

(LK: Some say that if a person is not your family, but you live with them a lot of the time, then they turn into your kin (familia), their body or blood changes) hmmm... (LK: No?) No. That’s a lie. (LK: So another can’t become your real family?) Other people can address you as family because they have this respect (estimación), not because they really are your family. Mhm. (LK: And if you raise a child when it’s very little, you give it your milk (...) so that it can become your real kin?) your family, because you have raised it. Mhm. Not because it is your real family (...) (LK: So its body, blood can’t change?) No. Its blood is already made. (GSR10)

Here, therefore, the only possibility for such production of relatedness was consistently confirmed to be when a child is adopted at a very early age, before “knowing its family,” which I would connect with the permeability of an infant (cf. curar and cutipar in Ch. 3). Yet, even in this case, it remains legitimate only because of being raised (criado, de crianza), and the adoptive parent does not become as “legítimo” as the original progenitors. She or he remains a secondary recipient, parent of an adopted, “recognized” child born of others, a criado (in Capanahua, unan bake, recognized child, or ſinabu). For this reason, an adopted child cannot be transformed into a fully legitimate child more than a domesticated animal can. It continues to contain foreign origin, whether encoded in “blood,” people’s memory or elsewhere. It will grow as a criado [raised/adopted], a status maintained and transmitted over generations in a whisper. A publically held secret usually conserves the origin of any such “gift” within its domain.

Overall, in the villagers’ opinions, “real” kinship is associated with the temporally primal act of formation or extraction, and containing elements introduced by others in strategic moments of openness (conception, birth, very early infancy) and the levels of “authenticity” (Ch. 4). Relations established by early adoption can be written over these unchangeable primal, “legitimate” trajectories only as secondary. Later adoption, similar to other contributions, are in this context, hierarchically more distanced, and the process of “accustoming” (costumbrarse) through neighbourly cohabitation even more so. Bodies of ordinary, non-infant

---

209 Here, the “body” is not an idiom of relatedness or “kinship,” but an external container. “Kinship” concerns the continuities or proximities of internal content and positions of being contained. Apart from the attempts at reinforcing the container (Ch. 3), or compadrazgo (Ch. 4), there is no explicit process of producing the body or kinship as elsewhere in the Lowlands. Production and taming is rather concerned with the future inseminations by the children and larger reproduction cycles, or improvement of the breed, and thus, the external social space.
persons are said to be hardened and unchangeable (Ch. 2, 3), and so is the blood they contain. This means that in the person’s life, raza is expected to be unchangeable:

What we are: how can we change it? No way! (…) You can’t cheat it. For example, you are from… your generación is like this, the way… your father put you up, your mum…. How are we going to unmake you (disformarte)? (LCO01)

However hidden it may be, other people around remember about it. The fact of adoption is never forgotten, at least by others, who seem to see it in a somewhat ambiguous way, as Don Elías said with slight derision about a couple: “They were raising children of others (ajenos), they never had their own” (fT1203).

Attempts to alter the original affiliation are, as shown in the last chapter, contested. Contribution from other sources, at a later time, can also be used to affiliate a person with another domain, based on personal experience (“knowing,” cf. Ch. 1 and 3) or any drop of contribution, through blood (parents’ or godparents’ etc.), teaching or feeding. Yet, placing these affiliations or changing the surname before the original origin is questioned, and generally referred to as an act of ignorar, or “ignoring” one’s raza, as the experiential-existential “knowledge,” or ignoring one’s “owner,” as in the expression ḫbuma, “not knowing anything” (see N.’s speech and Ch. 5). People who deny their origins (negar) are called ignorantes.

**Shameful compositeness**

By now it should become apparent that an “outside” is the space owned, or contained (as their “inside”) by hosts similar to the fathers-in-law or brujos. They, as other forms/containers/bodies, strive for internal singularity as a condition for their strength and imperishability. Their thoughts or knowledge (pensamiento, shinan) organize and strengthen that internal-external space (Ch. 1, 2). Therefore, because the inherently foreign status of the “mışu” introduces an ambivalent divergence within the receiving space, it is an obstacle to the ideal of clarity and sameness which governs the aesthetics of the “outside” as a social space (Ch. 1).

In accordance with these aesthetics, the foreign connection tends to be hidden, sometimes quite explicitly, as with the secrecy that guarantees the efficacy of tools received from powerful owners in myths or brujería. Like the originators’ blood, the

---

The only imaginable exception is the sorcerer who absorbs the blood of the owner-tree or his victims (Ch. 2).
original differentiation tends to be kept “inside” or concealed from the *alegre* sociality, which manages harmonious coexistence (*kuin kuini*, Ch. 1, 2). Within this external space, one’s divergence is a source of *vergüenza*, shame, and on the other, is readily attributed to people who are said to refuse to admit their connection with their parents or speak their language “outside.” One elderly woman said that she would teach me her language for 500 soles, not here, in the mestizo village where we met, but in her own settlement. Similarly, one performer of a drunken speech maintained that he speaks to his brother in Capanahua whenever they go hunting “inside” (in the forest). There are also anecdotes told in Limón about people who were accidently heard speaking in Capanahua on their way to a field, and actually frightfully rebuked each other: “Shh, someone might hear us!” — while staunchly refusing any knowledge or connection with the *antiguos* Capanahua to others in the open. In the end, villagers of both Limón and Berea sometimes maintain that all the inhabitants know the language, but they are ashamed, that is, they wilfully “do not want to” speak it. The *ganas*, desire, to speak one’s language is said to come to people when they are inebriated and that is also, as the Prologue shows, the context where descent or *raza* is revealed in the “outside.”

2. *Raza* as an origin story

Thinking through these categories and explanations, it would appear that *raza*, as descent, has the status of *inabu* within the person, as an element, an experiential “knowledge” of other *troncos* or time-places contained within a person. It makes the person *inabu*, or *raza*, in relation to other containing spaces, etc., as a fractal imagined (by the analyst) in time. In either case, it marks a trajectory, provenience from an original owner, or a story of origin similar to those that Capanahua descendants tell about items or qualities in their possession. These range from manioc, corn or the capacity to give birth in the stories of the *antiguos* (Ch. 4), to much smaller stories of the origin of the gifts. Here, the idiom of the connection, the story, *raza*, *descendencia* [lit. descent] as “story of the origin,” or “a history” — is literally the irreversible internal containment of an element introduced from another being. The element may be blood, language, name, surname, knowledge, quality or

---

capacity (“instinct”), where the primary introduction, the origin, is normally attributed the highest place in a temporal hierarchy, and thus, authenticity.

3. The ʼinabu and anthropology

Those particular ideas of descent, difficult and everted as they are, help us to understand why N. is both viracucha and ʻÁyubu, why the “foreign” outside is “truly original” (kuin kuini), and why the mestizos are “original, real people.” All refer back to an always regressive, original unity or “owning,” before it has been split, diluted and spoiled by the destructive processes of untamed procreation. Without taking into account this destructive force, it is difficult to understand the strategies for conserving or improving the raza and attempts to become more “real” or “authentic” by affiliating with purer strangers. Let me make a few notes on how this vantage point offered by such hierarchic thirdness relates to the ways of explaining Amazonian ethnographies.

Firstly, the ʼinabu position corresponds with the other relations described widely for the indigenous Lowland South Americans between representations of “masters” and “pets,” as well as the relation of maintaining or feeding that to a large extent structures such relations. In this thesis, the formulations of this relation were located directly within the broader context of kinship. This allowed both to reveal some aspects of the analysed relations, as it contributed to a wider dimension to the very dyad master-pet. Firstly, I tried to demonstrate the applicability of the dynamics which led to the establishment of that position in explaining other areas of the villagers’ representations. Among these areas were, I argued, not only killings or sickness, but causality in general. Therefore, they were capable of explaining the representations of procreation. The master-pet model applied here helps to explain the relations between parents and children as established not only through the crucially important, yet temporally secondary acts of feeding, but also as the primal transference of vital elements between persons, as in the procreation itself. In this case, feeding could be situated alongside other similar contributions or activities aimed at placing one element inside of the other and containing/owning it. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, the “pet” position in such a context can be seen not only as a term of the relation between master and owner, or container and containee

212 Cf. Introduction.
– which I ultimately showed to be reversible or eversible (as it is ambivalent in other formulations across the Amazonia) – but the approach in this thesis allowed imagining the pet-master’s position as the relation between two entities as the third, containing-focusing quality.

Furthermore – to return briefly to speaking of descent in the Lowlands (cf. Introduction) – concentrated on the horizontal level as a consequence of the seminal rejection of descent as a unifying principle, current approaches to Amazonian kinship tend to minimize the role of the procreative process in establishing relations (as assumed non-difference) between generations. Yet the differences or discontinuities between adjacent generations seem to be essentially important for the villagers. These discontinuities might be read as providing the motor for their ancestors’ social strategies, meant to recover the balance distorted by procreation and extract back (individualize) the precious originality or purity, and thus to reproduce (continue) in alternating generations.

Let me note how the intergenerational difference might be traced to several factors. Most importantly, the difference/discontinuity exists across the terms in the generative-frustrative acts because the third, produced element is not reducible to either of the two poles. Their very conjunction makes the product something different, both one and the other, and neither one nor the other. Therefore, a child is never quite the same, and never quite different from both parents. That incomplete status plays a crucial role for the villagers and stands for the limit of convergence for the poles (cf. Introduction).

Furthermore, from the child’s perspective, consanguinity and affinity appear as equal, original purities: maternal and paternal relatives (to whom it has different relations of containing and authenticity, either being contained or containing, and ahead or behind). Both of these purities, in the cross-generational perspective, are opposed to the focusing, joining space which is produced by the third element, their “outside.” That outside or encompassment, either by adjacent higher generation (container, ṭibu) or lower generation (containe, ṭinabu), unites them in a way described for potential affinity. It thus encompasses both consanguinity and affinity as the child or as the common origin/parent/containment.
Many different instantiations of “thirdness” are sure to be found in these contexts such as the Amerindian representations, where dualisms are perpetrated by their own disequilibrium (Lévi-Strauss 1963, 1995). Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (1996, 2001, 2002) associated this third quality either with the third, encompassing kind of relationship, outside of consanguinity and affinity – for example, the formal friendships – or with the term mediating between brothers-in-law, or between the affines and the consanguines. The encompassing potential of the third quality is that it is neither one nor the other, while synthesizing them and enabling their coexistence (cf. Coelho de Souza 2001). In the present case, the idea of the ˀinabu thirdness seems to be close to the Mebengôkre “triadic terms” described by Vanessa Lea (2012), whereby two persons use the same relationship term in reference to a third person, thus transcending the two distinct terms they might use with reference to that third person independently. It is neither “my daughter/your niece” nor the reverse, but a third, shared term that is neither of the two. Identifying the thirdness in the progeny in this thesis might widen the range of possible mediating positions imagined for Amazonian kinship in the horizontal relations, embodied by the exchanged spouse/sibling-in-law, by a number of positions of thirdness on a temporal axis. And further, from the encompassing role of the formal friendship or leadership to the role of the parent and the initially focusing, eversible position of the child. The progeny is essentially different from its parents, who come to assume a similar, containing position towards it: it is first contained, and focuses their duality, and then contains the consanguinity and affinity that produced it, when the initial “ˀinabu” everts into an “ˀibu,” or the contained into the container. Widening of this perspective in the temporal dimension reveals the adjoining generations to be mediating between alternating generations, which again alternatively enclose and are enclosed by them.

The difference/discontinuity between generations grows if the processes of procreation are not tamed, and discontinuity becomes ever more pronounced. Associated with filiation and consanguinity, the difference is therefore not so much a value, but ultimately an indispensable problem for the villagers, who value nondifferentiation. Again, from their perspective, they not only “become others,” but also try hard to cease to be others (depending on the perspective of containment

213 Although the focus of this argument is seemingly contrary to Schneider’s (1984) negation of the universality of filiation/consanguinity/kinship, I believe it is in the spirit of this call to return to those relations when they are identified by people themselves and see them through the ethnographically specific lens.
determined by generational position). This means, to overcome the compositeness produced by combining their fathers and mothers, or parents and recipients – either parents-in-law, godparents, teachers or God. They try to “clean” themselves of this compositeness and approach original purity. Coveted future and lost past collide in purity and originality, expressed in unity and beautiful peace.

There is one more question related to kinship that I would like to pose in relation to this argument. In her Malinowski Lecture, Anne-Christine Taylor addressed the “angelic” perspective of “the English school of Americanism” (1996: 206) on sociality seen through morality. In the introduction, I described the anthropological approaches to descent and consanguinity, kinship or relatedness in Amazonia. It strikes me that in many cases they seem to be guided by the assumption of an inherently moral character of kinship or consanguinity. Thus, “blood,” “kinship” and “descent” are expected to be associated with sociality, unity, continuity and similarity. In the villagers’ expressions, as I portrayed them in this thesis, there is something inherently ominous, or explicitly predatory and parasitic to the relations established through sexual procreation. They can be shameful and destructive rather than positive, and they do not produce more similarities than differences. Still, these are the relations that the villagers speak of as “kinship.” Therefore, kinship here might be seen as the curse or sickness of procreation, which is cured by cleaning cleansing it or containing it in neighbourly relations. I proposed that this negative – or at least highly ambiguous – force may be imagined behind the attraction of coexistence with, or containment by, the non-kin. It is the relations that they recognize as kinship that do not allow them to live well, because of their predatory, parasitic demands. In other words, it is because they find that they do not know how to live with the “kin,” that they need someone to mediate and contain those relations in a neighbourly, uniting and harmonious “outside,” counteracting such “kinship” or “consanguinity,” and taming the original difference of blood by enveloping it with the external knowledge, respect, relatedness terms, care, etc. (cf. Gow 1997). Because unity and organization were not easily identified with procreation and its consequences in descent, which elsewhere (in Europe and America) are associated with “kinship” or “consanguinity,” would it be possible to imagine that the notion of “kinship” was delegated in these approaches to those spheres that do posses such qualities, such as sociality of neighbours and affines, which for the villagers are not “kinship”? 
That predicament at the level of kinship also characterizes, I suggested, the societies that the villagers produce – from the ones that try to contain the destructive process of procreation, through those that appear like they have succeeded at some point, and appear as “traditional,” to those that have not succeeded, or have embraced new ways of overcoming the process, a stronger originality. In this way, the ‘inabu’ dynamics echo with the ways of speaking about acculturation or interethnic contact as well. For example, ‘inabu’ is obviously comparable to the prey position assumed by the Paumari in relation to organizing foreigners (Bonilla 2007, 2005). As I argued in Ch. 5, the ‘inabu’ or cholo position structures the representations of history and negotiations of contemporary hierarchic relations on the Lower Ucayali River. As Harry Walker shows for the Urarina (Walker 2012, 2013), the dynamic echoes in other places in Peru.

In another way, the dynamics articulating the ‘inabu’, as I suggested, also correspond to the formulations of history in Ecuador, as portrayed by Anne-Christine Taylor (2007). Here, the ‘inabu’ position is the very pathogenic element that allows seeing history on the Tapiche as sickness or devolution (to which acculturation might be a cure). The dividuality of the ‘inabu’ between groups is also rather obviously related to the language of mixing and creating kinship described for the upper Urubamba by Peter Gow (1991, etc.).

In either case, central to all relations, or the relation, articulated as an overlap between future and past, front and back, father and mother, grandparents and parents, face and heart, inside and outside – or the original purities at other levels – is the figure of the destructive, difficult, ambiguous ‘inabu’. It refers to the position of a transferred element, living because of and at the cost of both, while being neither. It is embodied as adopted children, wild people, siblings-in-law, pets, or bodily containers themselves.

4. Cholos

In many places of Latin America, cholo, the equivalent of ‘inabu’ stands for the mixed-blood people. On the lower Ucayali, cholo can be used towards people deemed as someone “less pure or original.” Because the subtracting element here is the indio blood, cholo usually means indios in relation to someone else, who deem themselves or others “more pure or original.” This thesis shows that the basic condition of living
a human life for the villagers is being “mixed,” contained or cared for, ultimately wilful and “in between” light and shadow, or future and past. We might now appreciate firstly, the informal address denoting friendship between equals – “cho!” (e.g. vamos, cho!) – as a shortened version of either cholo, which in parts of Peru may in certain contexts denote friendship, or chochero, which expresses caring (and may elsewhere be used to mean “pet,” like 𝜅inabu). Cho! thus epitomizes the broader, existential meaning of the terms: a humble companion in the work/suffering that is life.

Secondly, if cholo, as 𝜅inabu, is synonymous with indio, the latter also basically expresses human compositeness as lack of the mythic originality and purity that causes this suffering. In the end, claiming to be “pure” in the world where everyone is inflicted with the same procreative condition, facing and depending on others, rather than being cloned or immortal, and where the world of the parents is always “on the wane,” is ridiculous for the villagers, as we saw in the Prologue and Ch. 5. Acculturation, as the articulation of the third quality (never of one only! – soberly warn the villagers – and always unlike the two) is the “natural” for this world, frustrative-generative product of meeting and interpenetrating between people, groups of people, or the “realities” vanquishing in the process of “travelling,” making oneself seen and/or establishing the relations of procreation or exchange: the sociality. The embodiment of acculturation/sociality are the children. From the Capanahua descendants’ point of view (if we may imagine it), the fact that we are all alive and born from two parents, means that we are all “acculturated,” and no one is pure and original. And, if indio means less “pure,” having a dual origin, and being humanly ambiguous or imperfect, this would add a more deeply universal truth to Doña Germe’s statement from the last chapter: “arriving at the truth, we are all indios.”

\[\text{\textsuperscript{214} Cf. Lévi-Strauss 1961: 45.}\]
Bibliography


DeBoer, W. R. 1986. Pillage and production in the Amazon a view through the Conibo of the Ucayali Basin, eastern Peru. World Archaeology 18, 231-246.


Fleck, D. W. & Krokoszyński, L. n.d. The Two Capanahuas.
Bibliography


Bibliography


Loos, E. E. nd.a. La tribu Capanahua, ms.

Loos, E. E. nd.b. Notes on Capanahua kinship terms, ms.


Loos, E. E. & Loos, B. H. Loos. nd.d. Textos Capanahua Tomo III.


Loos, E. E. nd.f. Textos Capanahua Tomo IV.

Loos, E. E. nd.g. Informe socioeconómico para la inserpcíon de las comunidades nativas, ms.

Loos, E. E. nd.h. Diccionario capanahua-castellano. (Série Linguística Peruana 45). Lima: Ministerio de Educación & ILV.


--------- 1936b. *Ethnographic notes on the indians of the alto Jurua (Acre) and the valley of the Ucayali (Peru) (Translated from Portuguese).* ms.


248 | Bibliography


------- 2012. Figure-ground reversal among the Barok. HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory 2, 535–542.


Walsh Perú S.A. 2010. Estudio de impacto ambiental prospección sísmica 2d y perforación exploratoria, lotes 134 y 158. Lima: Walsh Perú S.A.


Appendix 1. Interlocutors

The following presents the persons who have participated in recorded conversations. The order of presentation reflects the frequency of participation, and does not take into account the conversations that have not been recorded, or any other contributions. The location next to the name signifies where the conversations took place. Short notes cannot of course do justice to the people concerned, but I hope they allow the reader to familiarize with the contexts of the interlocutors’ life stories and connections of which they are products and producers. That, in the end, includes the author.
b. 1968, the son of Victor Huaninche Romaina and Hilda Romaina Guelle. Born on the Buncuya and raised in different places on that river, he went to school in Aipena. In the 1980s Daniel came to Limón after his father and siblings, who followed Doña Estefita, Don Benigno’s wife. He stayed there, and lived with his father and his second wife, Doña Hilda Chumo. He worked for some time in Iquitos and other places. His two sisters live in Limón. Since the death of his father a few years ago, Daniel has lived by himself.
b. 1951, the son of Santiago Ríos and Aurora Sachivo Ríos. Namesake of Benigno Puga, his godfather. Born in the vicinity of San Antonio, where he went to elementary school. Don Benigno worked and travelled on the Tapiche as a logger, and he was married on the Buncuya, to Daniel’s older sister, Doña Estefita Huaninche Romaina. They lived there until the mother-in-law passed away, when they moved to Limón, where Don Benigno’s siblings, cousins and uncles had previously moved from San Antonio to create the village. He visited and lived for months at a time in Pucallpa on several occasions. He has raised eight of his own children.

b. 1964, and daughter of Rozendo Sachivo Ríos and Olga Ríos Baquinahua. Doña Germe is originally from the vicinity of San Antonio (Proa) where she went to elementary school. She married Eugenio Vásquez Romaina on the Buncuya, and lived there until the death of her mother-in-law, when they moved to Limón. Doña Germe’s parents, siblings, uncles and cousins founded Limón and lived there. A few months ago, in 2015, she went to Iquitos for the first time. Germe gave birth to nine children.

b. 1954?, Don Romer is the son of Romaldo Pizarro and Florentina Romaina Baquinahua. Widely known as “Arbolito” [lit. the tree]. He was born in the vicinity of San Antonio. The family moved to Santa Elena when he was a boy, and he went to school there. He served in the army and then came to the Buncuya, where his paternal grandfather, Tomás Pizarro lived and died. Here, Romer lived with Luisa Huaninche, Manuel Huaninche’s granddaughter, and sired Ronal and Omer, among others. He has travelled widely, visited many places and worked many jobs. He has knowledge of several languages, including Cocama and the Lower Capanahua (Pa’enbakebu) dialect that he learned in Frontera Yarina, where he lived with his other wife. He now lives in the vicinity of Tamanco, with another woman. He has engendered at least 13 children. I talked to him in Berea, where he was trying to earn money by hunting and fishing. He then accompanied us and introduced us to Limón Cocha and the Tapiche.
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche b. 1974, the son of Romer Pizarro Romaina and Luisa Huaninche Solis. Born on the Buncuya, where he went to elementary school. Ronal travelled and worked on the Ucayali and the Amazon and came to Limón in the 1990s. He married a local woman, Julia Perez Sachivo and has five children and two step-children. His brother lives in Limón.
b. 1950?, the son of Manuel Huaninche Sachivo and Amelia Romaina. Don Guillermo was born, raised and lived on the Buncuya. Elected by the Buncuya community, he studied in Yarinachocha with the SIL and worked as the bilingual teacher, first in Aipena, then in Nuevo Aipena (Berea) school. He travelled widely because of his courses, teaching and work. He lived with a woman of Cocama descent from the vicinity of Tamanco, and he lived next to his father in Aipena. He raised six children. In 2012 he was elected the *apu* (president) of Berea.
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Jorge Rodríguez Ríos

b. 1930?, the son of Froylán Rodríguez Vásquez and Elena Ríos. Don Jorge is from the upper Tapiche, in the vicinity of San Antonio (Cashuera). He travelled widely, and lived most of his life with his parents and brothers close to San Antonio. Jorge came to live closer to Limón when it was founded (in a settlement called San Juan, upriver), and moved to the village several years ago. His four brothers live in Limón and Jorge lives with the family of one of his brothers.

Limón Cocha

Limón Cocha 2013. Photo by Ł. Krokoszyński
b. 1928 in Wisconsin, to a family of Bohemian and Norwegian descent. In 1945 Loos attended military training in Texas, where he later met Betty Hall, whom he married. In 1952 they joined the Wycliff Bible Translators, as he says, “to have a part in giving God’s word to those who had nothing.” In 1954 they arrived at the Buncuya river for the first time and returned repeatedly until 1984, learning the language and translating the New Testament. Eugene Loos served as the International Linguistics Coordinator and in 1967 received his Ph.D. in Linguistics from the University of Texas, Austin. Eugene and Betty Loos went on to have four children and numerous grandchildren and great-grandchildren. They live in Austin.

Manuel Huaninche and Eugene Loos. Aipena, 1960s?
Celso Baquinahua Ruíz

b. 1969?, the son of Juana Ruíz, and raised by Cesar Baquinahua. Celso grew up in Aipena, but his family moved to Frontera, where his mother was from, when Celso was still very young. He worked as a logger, reaching Yaquerana, and has lived in Limón for almost 20 years. Celso married local woman, Rosa Ríos Freire, who is Don Benigno’s niece. He has four children and one stepchild.
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Victor Panarua Baquinahua
Limón Cocha
b. 1971?, the son of Ricardo Panarua and Joba Baquinahua Panarua, and the namesake of Victor Panarua, his paternal grandfather. Originally from Frontera Yarina, he has lived in Limón for 20 years. Victor married local woman, Mercedes, who is a niece of Don Benigno. His mother lives close to Limón with Doña Germe’s older brother, and Victor’s two brothers and sister. He has six children.

Elena Solisbanco Huaninche
Limón Cocha
b. 1944?, daughter of Manuel Solisbanco and Adelia Huaninche. Originally from the vicinity of contemporary Nueva Esperanza on the upper Tapiche, Elena has lived in different parts of the Tapiche and Buncuya. Since her first husband was killed by the indios near Fatima, Elena has lived with Jorge Huaninche Salasar. They live in Requena and San Vicente on the lower Tapiche. Her brother Leoncio lived in Limón and passed away a few years ago, leaving a married daughter. She visited Limón for a few weeks. Doña Elena has at least 3 children that I know of.

Elias Huaninche Baquinahua
Limón Cocha
b. 1926? - April 2012. The son of Augusto Huaninche and Rafaelina Baquinahua. Originally from the area of the present Limón Cocha and the Maipuco River. Elías worked and travelled on the Tapiche. He sired several children with a local woman, all of whom have moved away. Later in his life he lived in Limón with Aurora Sachivo Ríos, Don Benigno’s mother, and raised several of her grandchildren.

Ermelinda Ríos Sachivo
Limón Cocha
b. 1945?, the daughter of Santiago Ríos and Aurora Sachivo Ríos and namesake of her maternal grandmother Ermelinda Ríos. She is Don Benigno’s older sister. Born in a settlement on the Capanahua River, she lived with a Buncuya man, Velisario Freire, Doña Elsa’s uncle, on the Tapiche, near San Antonio, and participated in the creation of Limón, where she has lived since he passed away. She gave birth to one child and raised several nephews, nieces and grandchildren. Last year she moved away to live with one of them on the Amazon river.
Elsa Freire Nahuatupe

b. 1959?, the daughter of Generoso Freire Romaina and Celina Nahuatupe Shapiama. Born and raised on the upper Buncuya, Elsa travelled a lot and lived in several places on the Ucayali. She gave birth to 12 children with partners from the Ucayali. Doña Elsa lives with her partner from the lower Ucayali, along with her married and unmarried daughters and sons.

Berea 2011. Photo by Ł. Krokoszyński
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Ahuanari Cachiqui</td>
<td>b. 1925?</td>
<td>The son of María Ahuanari Chota, a Cocama woman, and his father’s surname was Cachiqui. Originally from the lower Tapiche, near Iberia, Juan was orphaned by his father. After his mother and siblings were kidnapped by the <em>indios</em>, he participated in retaliatory raid to find them. He has travelled widely, and during the latter phase of his life he lived with Escolástica Shapiana, Doña Elsa’s grandmother, while travelling on the Tapiche. After her death he lived alone in Limón Cocha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Vela</td>
<td>b. 1940</td>
<td>The son of a man from San Martín and a woman from Lamas. Originally from San Martín, he worked rubber with his father from an early age and came to the Tapiche with his paternal uncle, Rogelio Vela, whose father and siblings lived and worked on the Tapiche, around Bellavista. He lived and had children with two Sachivo women, who are parallel cousins of Doña Germe. One of his daughters lives in Limón with Omer, Ronal’s brother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moises Inuma Ortiz</td>
<td>b. 1960?</td>
<td>In Monte Alegre. Moises has lived in Frontera Yarina with Alida, and now lives in Santa Elena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legonías Mosombite Huaninche</td>
<td>b. 1953?</td>
<td>The son of Adolfo Mozombite Lomas and Julia Huaninche Chumo, originally from Contaya, now lives in Santa Elena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albino Coachi</td>
<td>b. 1945?</td>
<td>The son of an Ecuadorian man who lived in Peru after the 1941 war between Peru and Ecuador. Originally from the Marañon River, at the mouth of the Chambira river. After travelling and living for some time in Ecuador, he came to the Tapiche to work in logging. After his first wife’s death Don Albino lived with Doña Germe’s older parallel cousin, Doña Joba Sachivo Ríos and raised her grandchildren in Limón. His own son Jorge lives in Berea with Don Guillermo’s daughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ríos Baquinahua</td>
<td>b. 1935?</td>
<td>The daughter of Benjamin Ríos and Isabela Baquinahua. Originally from the upper Tapiche. Orphaned by her mother, she was raised by her husband Rozendo Sachivo Ríos and his first wife, Miguelina (Huaninche?). She has lived on the Tapiche all her life, firstly near San Antonio and then in Limón, where almost all of her children, many grandchildren and great-grandchildren live, including her namesake Olguita.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geysen  

b. 1971, the son of Guillermo Huaninche Romaina and Ercelinda Fatama Ahuanari. Geysen was born and raised on the Buncuya. He lives with a woman from the Buncuya, Doña Saida who is Doña Germe’s sister-in-law. They have one daughter, who also lives in Berea along with his sisters, brother, and father.

Huaninche Fatama

Berea

Berea, 2011. Photo Ł. Krokoszyński
Mariano Huaninche Romaina Tamanco b. 1954, the youngest son of Manuel Huaninche Sachivo and Amelia Romaina Freire. Mariano lived with Isabela Chumo, a woman from the Tapiche – the namesake and granddaughter of Mama Shabi (Isabela Chumo). They raised 6 children. When we met, Don Mariano was a widower and lived with his daughter and her husband in Tamanco. Recently he came back to live in Berea with Doña Hilda Chumo, who is Daniel’s step-mother.

Pedro Tomás Freire Ruiz Limón Cocha b. 1982, the son of Adolfo Freire Sangama and Corina Ruiz Panarua [note the difference between his sister Alida Freire]. Born and raised in Frontera Yarina, where he was taught in elementary school by Jairo Tomás Zumba Tamani from Requena. He occasionally works in logging, and came to Limón some years ago where he lives alone.

Manuel Vásquez “Sandi” Pizarro/Sachivo Berea b. 1924? – 2009. Born in the area between the upper Buncuya and Tapiche. Manuel’s original surname was reportedly Pizarro Sachivo. He lived with Rosa Romaina Freire, Don Guillermo’s maternal aunt, a woman from Buncuya, which is where they lived. Don Manuel travelled and worked widely in the area and raised 5 children, including Doña Germe’s husband Eugenio.


Celina Nahuatupe Shapiama settlement at the mouth of Torres Causano stream on the Buncuya b. 1941?, the daughter of Pedro Nahuatupe and Escolástica Shapiama Muñoz and raised on the Tapiche, in Monte Alegre. Celina’s mother came from the San Martín region. Doña Celina was taken by a man from the Buncuya, Generoso Freire Romaina, and she lived with him on the Buncuya all of her life, and then for short periods on the Tapiche after they separated. She lives between Victor Raúl and Berea with her son and married daughters.

Eloisa Chumo Huaninche Berea b. 1947?, the daughter of José Chumo and Carolina Huaninche, is originally from Contaya, near present Bellavista. Eloisa lived with a Tapiche mestizo man, Fidel Pacaya, in Fatima before moving to Victor Raúl on the Buncuya. She lives there with her children and her brother’s daughter Wilma Chumo Oliveira.
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Baudilio
Sachivo Ríos
Limón Cocha

b. 1960, the son of Rozendo Sachivo Ríos and Olga Ríos Baquinahua. Like his siblings, Baudilio first lived in Proa and went to school in San Antonio, then travelled and worked on the Ucayali or the Amazon. Finally Don Baudilio came to live in Limón with a woman born on the Buncuya, Manuel Huaninche’s granddaughter Mariela Huaninche Sachivo/Romaina. They raised nine children. Don Baudilio has been the *apu* (president) of Limón Cocha since the 1990s to 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Américo Ruiz Panarua</strong></td>
<td>b. 1960?, the son of Esteban “Chai/Zangudo” Ruiz and Joséfa Panarua. Originally from Frontera Yarina, Américo lived and worked for 20 years in Acre, Brazil. His sister was Celso’s mother, and he came to visit Celso a couple of times during our stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limón Cocha</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myrna Blanca Huaninche Romaina</strong></td>
<td>b. 1970, the daughter of Victor Huaninche Romaina and Hilda Romaina Guelle. Blanca followed her father and sister Estefita, Don Benigno’s wife, to Limón, where she now lives. She is the younger sister of Daniel. She gave birth to at least 8 children with different men from the Tapiche or the Ucayali. She now lives with Doña Germe’s brother Armando and her children in Limón Cocha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limón Cocha</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edilbrando Sachivo Ríos</strong></td>
<td>b. 1960, the son of Rozendo Sachivo Ríos and Olga Ríos Baquinahua. As his other siblings, first near San Antonio. He now lives with Joba Baquinahua Panarua, Victor’s mother, near Limón.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limón Cocha</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antonia Flores Chumo</strong></td>
<td>b. 1970, among the last children of Manaces DaFlores, a Brazilian man who settled on the upper Tapiche, and Antonia Chumo Rocha. Originally from the vicinity of Contaya, Antuca now lives with a local man, Pedro Padilla Hidalgo. They moved to live in Limón in 2012, and still maintain their cattle ranch upriver (Fundo Padilla). They raised five children together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limón Cocha</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedro Padilla Hidalgo</strong></td>
<td>b. 1965, the son of Wildfredo Padilla, a mestizo man, and Olga Hidalgo Chumo, a daughter of Alberto Hidalgo Mafaldo and Margarita Chumo. Originally from the vicinity of Contaya (Junin), Pedro lives with Antuca Flores Chumo in Limón and ran for mayor of the Alto Tapiche district in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limón Cocha</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elena Rodríguez Sachivo</strong></td>
<td>b. 1980, the daughter of Pablo Rodríguez Ríos and Margola Sachivo Pizarro, Elena the namesake of her paternal grandmother, Elena Ríos Pacaya. Elena was raised in the vicinity of Limón, San Juan, with the Rodríguez family. She is married to Juan Bocanegra Freire, a local man (current apu of Limón), and grandson of Velisario Freire. They raise three children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agustín Flores Sachivo, b. 1970?, the son of a mestizo man, Miguel Flores Lavajos, and Lidia Sachivo Ríos, Doña Germe’s paternal uncle and Don Benigno’s maternal uncle. Originally from San Antonio, like the other Sachivos, Agustín’s family moved to Limón Cocha in the early 1980s. He lived with Eneida Sachivo Baquinahua, Victor Panarua’s half-sister. They had five children and separated in 2014.

Julia Pérez Sachivo, b. 1972, the daughter of Leiter Pérez, a mestizo man, and Joba Sachivo Ríos, Doña Germe’s parallel cousin. Julia is the namesake of her maternal grandmother Julia Ríos Baquinahua. Originally from Tapiche. She lived on the Buncuya with Doña Germe’s youngest brother-in-law, son of Manuel Vásquez, Victor, and had three children. Julia then moved back to her mother in Limón, and lived with Ronal, giving birth to five more children.

Leopoldo Rodríguez Ríos, b. 1940?, the son of Froylán Rodríguez Vásquez and Elena Ríos. Originally from the vicinity of San Antonio (Cashuera), Leopoldo then moved along with the whole Rodríguez family to San Juan near Limón. He spent years living in Santa Elena, and now lives in Limón with his other brothers.

Luzmila Chumo Oliveira, b. 1966?, the daughter of Fermín Chumo Rocha and Hilda Chumo Oliveira. Luzmila now lives with Máximo Ríos Sachivo, Don Benigno’s younger brother, with whom she has two children, and they have raised four more together.

Máximo Ríos Sachivo, b. 1956, the son of Santiago Ríos and Aurora Sachivo Ríos, Don Benigno’s younger brother. Máximo lives in Limón with Doña Luzmila.

Moises Hidalgo Chumo, b. 1965?, the son of Alberto Hidalgo Chumo and Ana Chumo Huaninche. Moises is the grandson of Juan Hidalgo Mafaldo who “conquered” the ancient Capanahua by establishing his descent line among them, by living with the Chumo women. Moises, or ‘Moico’ is originally from the present Nueva Esperanza, where he lives with his brother and their families.
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**Omer Pizarro Huaninche**

b. 1976, the son of Romer Pizarro Romaina and Luisa Huaninche Solis. Originally from Buncuya, Omer came to Limón after his brother Ronal, and lives with a local woman who is Don Miguel Vela’s daughter. He has finished a course as an evangelical preacher in Yarinacocha with the South American Mission. They have four children.

**Hilda Chumo Oliveira**

b. 1940?, the daughter of Antonio Chumo/Buenapico and an unknown mother. She was originally from Nueva York on the Tapiche, a settlement upriver from Contaya. Doña Hilda was orphaned and raised by her older brother, Julio Chumo. She came to the Buncuya after her other brother, who was briefly the first bilingual teacher in Aipena in late 1960s, with Doña Eloisa’s (step-?) brother from the vicinity of Contaya, Fermín Chumo. After they separated, she lived with Daniel’s father, Victor Huaninche Romaina near Limón Cocha. After he passed away, she moved to Berea, where she lives with her son Wilson and his partner from the Buncuya, Ashuca Navarro Huaninche. She has given birth to eight children and raised many more.

**Ester Saida Vásquez Romaina**

b. 1955, the daughter of Manuel Vásquez Pizarro and Rosa Romaina Freire. Saida had at least nine children, mostly with men from the Ucayali. She now lives with Geysen, Don Guillermo’s son and her two youngest, married daughters in Berea.

**Julio Hidalgo Freire**

b. 1979, the son of Bonergio Hidalgo from the Ucayali and Elsa Freire Nahuatupe. Julio was born on the Buncuya, and lived with his mother on the Ucayali and went to school in Requena. He lives with Doña Saida’s daughter Edela Guerra Vásquez and has five children.

**Rogelio Bachichi Solis**

b. 1951, the son of Héctor Bachichi Romaina and Diojana Solis Pacaya. Originally from the vicinity of Monte Alegre, Rogelio moved to the upper Tapiche in Nuevo Esperanza, and settled down in Fatima with Paca Bocanegra Ríos. He had five children.
Roman “Tigre” Manuhuari

b. 1965?, originally from the Ucayali, of Cocama descent. He lived with and had children with Daniel’s sister Blanca, but they separated. For a few years, he continued to live in Limón, and moved out in 2012.

Pablo Rodríguez Ríos

b. 1953?, the son of Froylán Rodríguez Vásquez and Elena Ríos Pacaya. Pablo moved from San Antonio to Limón Cocha along with his brothers. He lives with Margola Sachivo Pizarro, Doña Germe’s parallel cousin. They have eight children.

Hípolito Nahuatupe Chumo

b. 1946?, the son of Esteban Nahuatupe and Espírita Chumo. Originally from the vicinity of Monte Alegre, Hípolito came to live in Fátima.

Ana Chumo Huaninche

b. 1935?, the daughter of José Chumo and Carolina Huaninche, who is the sister of Doña Eloisa and the mother of Moises Hidalgo. Doña Ana lived with Alberto Hidalgo, the son of Juan Hidalgo Mafaldo and years ago she left the upper Tapiche and now lives with her daughters in Requena.

Aníbal Lazo Chumbe

b. 1948? the son of Antonio Lazo. From the upper Tapiche, near San Antonio (Miraflores). Aníbal lives in Requena.

Carlos Ruiz Hidalgo

b. 1939?, the son of Aldegundo Ruiz Sánchez and Viviana Hidalgo Chumo, one of Juan Hidalgo Mafaldo’s children.

Adán Hidalgo Chumo

b. 1959?, the son of Alberto Hidalgo Chumo and Ana Chumo Huaninche. Adán lives in Curinga on the Río Blanco.
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Sulforita Tafur

b. 1940?, born into a large family of San Martineses who lived and worked on the Tapiche from the beginning of 20th century. Sulforita founded Wicungo to avoid indio raids in the 1960s. She lives in Requena.

Requena

Abrán

Gordón Rengifo

b. 1947, the son of Álvaro Gordón Bocanegra. Abrán lives in Curinga on the Rio Blanco.

Nueva Esperanza del Río Blanco

Medardo

Ruíz Ahuanari

b. 1965, the son of Carlos Ruíz Hidalgo. Medardo lives in Curinga on the Rio Blanco.

Nueva Esperanza del Río Blanco

José

Agustín Lazo

b. 1975? grew up in Fatima, and lives in Santa Elena.

Santa Elena

Desiderio Potocarrero

b. 1932, the son of Desiderio Potocarrero and Mariela Pinieiro Robela of Brazilian descent. Don Dico was born on the upper Tapiche and lived there all his life. He now lives in Puesto Lima, between San Antonio and Nueva Esperanza.

Puesto Lima

Esteban Reyna Montilla


San Antonio
Ezequiel Jumachi Sachivo


Bellavista

Rosa Montilla Mafaldo

b. 1927? on the upper Tapiche, is of partially Brazilian descent, and lives in Bellavista.

Bellavista

Vidal Ahuanari

b. 1939? the son of Vidal Ahuanari from the Ucayali, has lived all his life on the upper Tapiche and a few years ago moved from Junin to Bellavista.

Bellavista

Łukasz Krokoszyński

b. 1979, the son of Grzegorz Krokoszyński and Grażyna Krokoszyńska (Nowakowska), and raised as an only child by his mother. Originally from Leszno, Łukasz has lived in Poznań, Poland since the 1990s. He studied anthropology in Poznań, travelled and worked as a carpenter, plumber, roofer, and bookstore salesman. Łukasz was hosted for several months by the Ho-Chunk and the Lakhota people in U.S.A., then went to eastern Peru to work on the Ucayali for a few months, and finally settled to work in an office of an auction portal company in Poznań. Then, after returning to work for another few months on the Ucayali, he requested the supervision of Prof. Peter Gow in the doctoral program at the University of St Andrews, so that he could go back to eastern Peru. Godfather of his namesake, Lucas López Vásquez from Limón Cocha, and Adam Gregorio, his father’s namesake, in Berea. Lives with a Polish woman, Kinga Kokot.
## Appendix 2. Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC01.</td>
<td>Albino Coachi – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>3 12 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC02.</td>
<td>Albino Coachi, Joba Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>9 12 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH01.</td>
<td>Ana Chumo Huaininche – Requena, Ucayali River</td>
<td>6 3 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC01.</td>
<td>Antonia Flores Chumo, Pedro Padilla Hidalgo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>3 10 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP01.</td>
<td>Alida Freyre Panarua – Requena, Ucayali River</td>
<td>8 7 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP02.</td>
<td>Alida Freyre Panarua, Moises Inuma Requena – Ucayali River</td>
<td>10 7 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS01.</td>
<td>Agustin Flores Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>28 10 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR01.</td>
<td>Abraham Gordón Rengifo, Adán Hidalgo Chumo, Medardo Ruiz – Nueva Esperanza (del río Blanco), Tapiche River</td>
<td>15 2 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC01.</td>
<td>Anibal Lazo Chumbe – Requena, Ucayali River</td>
<td>19 6 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR01.</td>
<td>Americo Ruiz – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>14 5 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR01.</td>
<td>Blanca Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>20 4 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS01.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>28 5 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS03.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>13 9 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS05.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>24 9 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS06.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>27 9 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS08.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>5 10 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS22.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>31 1 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS23.</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>7 2 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS01.</td>
<td>Baudilio Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>24 10 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB01.</td>
<td>Celso Baquinahua Ruíz – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>14 10 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB02.</td>
<td>Celso Baquinahua Ruíz – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>26 10 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB03.</td>
<td>Celso Baquinahua Ruíz – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>9 11 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS01.</td>
<td>Celina Nahuatupe Shapiama – Berea, Buncuya River</td>
<td>10 10 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR01.</td>
<td>Carlos Ruiz Hidalgo – Requena, Ucayali River</td>
<td>9 7 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHR01.</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>15 4 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHR02.</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina, Pablo Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>18 4 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHR03.</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River</td>
<td>22 4 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DHR06. Daniel Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 5 5 2012.
DHR07. Daniel Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 8 5 2012.
DHR08. Daniel Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 12 5 2012.
DHR22. Daniel Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 8 1 2013.
ECH01. Eloisa Chumo Huaninche – Berea, Buncuya River, 16 10 2011.
EFN01. Elsa Freyre Nahuatupe – Berea, Buncuya River, 15 1 2012.
EFN03. Elsa Freyre Nahuatupe – Berea, Buncuya River, 22 1 2012.
EL01. Eugene Loos – Dallas, Texas, 18 1 2010.
EL02. Eugene Loos – Dallas, Texas, 16 4 2013.
EL03. Eugene Loos – Dallas, Texas, 17 4 2013.
EL05. Eugene Loos – Dallas, Texas, 22 4 2013.
ERS01. Elena Rodríguez Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 22 12 2012.
ESH01. Elena Solisban Huaninche – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 23 8 2012.
ESH02. Elena Solisban Huaninche – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 24 8 2012.
ESH03. Elena Solisban Huaninche – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 26 8 2012.
ERS01. Edilberto Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 5 10 2012.
fD1001. “Notatki (field notes): Dallas I.” Dallas, TX (USA), 01 2010.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fD1304</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Dallas II.” Dallas, TX (USA), 04 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1202</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche II.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 02 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1203</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche II.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 03 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1204</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche II.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 04 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1205</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche II.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 05 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1206</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche II.” Limón Cocha, Santa Elena, Requena (Peru), 06 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1208</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 08 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1209</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha, San Antonio, Bellavista (Peru), 09 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1210</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 10 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1211</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 11 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1212</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1301</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 01 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fT1302</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tapiche III.” Limón Cocha (Peru), 02 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fU1109</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Iquitos, Tamanco.” Iquitos, Tamanco (Peru), 09 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fU1111</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Tamanco, Iquitos.” Tamanco, Iquitos (Peru), 11 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fU1202</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Iquitos, Requena.” Iquitos, Requena (Peru), 02 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fU1207</td>
<td>“Notatki (field notes): Requena, Tapiche III.” Requena, Frontera Yarina, Limón Cocha (Peru), 07 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHF01</td>
<td>Geysen Huaninche Fatama – Berea, Buncuya River, 10 11 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHR02</td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 14 10 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHR03</td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 12 1 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHR04</td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 22 1 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHR05</td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 24 1 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHR06</td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romaina – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 27 1 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR01</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 9 4 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR02</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 5 5 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR03</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 26 8 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR04</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 7 10 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR05</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 15 11 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR06</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 10 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR07</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 18 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR08</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 19 1 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR09</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 10 1 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSR10</td>
<td>Germé Sachivo Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 5 2 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO01</td>
<td>Hilda Chumo Oliveira – Berea, Buncuya River, 22 1 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAC01</td>
<td>Juan Ahuanari Cachiquí – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 15 10 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAC02</td>
<td>Juan Ahuanari Cachiquí – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 18 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAC03</td>
<td>Juan Ahuanari Cachiquí – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 20 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAL01</td>
<td>José Agustin Lazo – Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 12 6 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPS01</td>
<td>Julia Perez Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 13 4 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRO1</td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 15 10 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRO3</td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 1 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRO4</td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 13 12 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRO5</td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 25 1 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRO6</td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 12 2 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LCO01. Luzmila Chumo Oliveira, Máximo Ríos Sachivo – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 19 1 2013.
LMH01. Legonias Mozombite Huaninche – Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 14 6 2012.
LRR01. Lepoldo Rodríguez Ríos – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 9 10 2012.
MHR02. Mariano Huaninche Romaina – Tamanco, Ucayali River, 1 10 2011.
MI01. Moises Inuma – Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 12 6 2012.
MI02. Moises Inuma – Santa Elena, Tapiche River, 14 6 2012.
MV02. Miguel Vela – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 8 11 2012.
MV03. Miguel Vela – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 18 2 2013.
RPH05. Ronal Pizarro Huaninche – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 14 1 2013.
RPH06. Ronal Pizarro Huaninche – Limón Cocha, Tapiche River, 9 1 2013.
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1. Kinship terms imagined between two troncos

Capanahua language terms of: ‘address’ and reference (below). Reconstructed from data gathered among Capanahua of the Buncuya River between 1954-70s by Eugene and Betty Loos. None of the villagers has been able to produce a thorough terminology that would be consistent with SIL material. The terminology includes the Spanish or Shipibo borrowings “papan” or “maman,” at that time replacing the older Panoan term “epa” and “ewa,” but does not acknowledge the borrowings used by contemporary elderly Capanahua speakers, such as “ihun” for son/child (from Sp. ‘hijo’). Dashed lines indicate the domains of containment by ‘fathers-in-law’ through their daughters. Cloud shapes indicate concentrations of the ‘brothers’ category. Red colour marks ‘consanguineal,’ and blue, ‘affinal’ position in relation to ego. The distribution of positions corresponds to an ideal uxorilocal practice.

Fig. 15. FEMALE EGO: * Loos (1960: 4) gives the address term for Female ego’s BD as mamanchin, jointly with term for BS as papanchin. This seems to be an error, as the siblings are not marriageable. The term for papanchin’s sister is elsewhere recorded as ḟnin. The latter is marriageable in relation to kuka (S/ZS/HBS) and the former to mamanchin (D/ZD/HBD). Likewise, the wife of HZS is recorded in (Loos nd.b) as ḟnin, a term for HZS/BS sister, and not spouse. In accordance with the logic of other terms, it should be mamanchin/bake (D/ZD/HBD). This is confirmed by other Panoan terminologies, e.g. Cashinahua (D'Ans 1983), Yaminahua (Townsley 1988) or Marubo (Welper 2009). Alternatively, such use may indicate a specific, divergent marriage or a particular switch in terminology.

Fig. 16. MALE EGO: * marks an odd use in the only source for the term in this place. It may be an error in writing down, a divergent marriage which the informant referred to, or an unusual feature of the terminology. In accordance with the logic of remaining terms, it should be baken/papan.
2. Continuities, frustrations and replacements in the mid-20th century Capanahua kinship terminology.

Diagonal division marks marriageability or spouses. Shading allows tracing of “consanguineal” (dis-) continuities. Fields with the same shade and in the same triangle position mark corresponding positions (replacements treating each other as siblings) in alternate generations. All fields indicate a series of hierarchically ordered positions, “wetsa” (“another,” i.e. sibling).

Figure 17. Male ego
Figure 18. Female ego
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Fig. 15. Female ego’s terms
Fig. 16. Male ego's terms
3. LUS relationship terminology used by the Capanahua descendants during my fieldwork.

abuelo/a
REF: MM, MF / FF, FM; ADR: older persons
madre, mama
REF: M; ADR: (mama or mami) older female kin or postulated hierarchy figures
padre, papa
REF: F; ADR: (papa or papi) ego’s S or postulated hierarchy figures
tío/a
REF: MB, FB/MZ, FZ ADR: WF/WM, older relatives, adoptive parent, step parent
suegro/a
REF/ADR: WF/M, HF/M
padrastra/madrastra
REF: adoptive or step parent
padrino/madrina
REF/ADR: godparent
hermano/a
REF: B/Z; ADR: cross and parallel cousins, evangelical missionaries
ñño/a
REF: B/Z; ADR: B/Z, cross and parallel cousins
pedazo
REF: twin or adjoining sibling
primo/a hermano/a (primo/a)
REF/ADR: MZS/D, MBS/D, FZS/D, FBS/D
cuñado/a
REF/ADR: WB/Z, HB/Z
compadre/comadre
REF/ADR: child’s godparent
hijo/a
REF: S/D; ADR: SbCh, younger relatives
sobrino/a
REF/ADR: child of Z, B, or cross and parallel cousins
yerno/a:
REF: DH/SW
ahijado/ahijada
REF/ADR: godchild
nieto/a
REF/ADR: children of generation +2 +3, etc.

tratarse v. to address each other with specific terms
raza n. descent
familia n. family, either legitimia, real, or por respeto, courteous
menor/mayor adj. older/younger
winsho/a n. or adj. the ultimate child
masi adj. used occasionally in reference or address to a person in symmetrical relation to a third person: e.g. suegro masi as ChSpF/M or cuñado masi, WZH
legítimo adj. close, actual or original
lejano adj. remote, referring to remote relatives
pariente n. person sharing the surname, but not known kinship relation
particular n. unrelated person
## 4. Table of the Capanahua kinship terms in SIL materials

60 (Loos 1960); 1 lists in (Loos nd.b); 8 diagrams in (Loos nd.b); C (Loos nd.c); (Loos & Loos 2003); T (Loos & Loos 1976a, 1976b, nd.a, nd.b); N (Schoolland 1975).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generation +3</th>
<th>xohta xenibu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PtPtM</td>
<td>hehuacoin&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PtPtF</td>
<td>hepacoin&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt; hepa seni (xeni?)&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coca xeni&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?+4?)mihipa [min hipa?] xeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+4?) hepacoin xeni&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF</td>
<td>¿hepa/papa&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿hepa coin&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMM</td>
<td>¿hepa/mama&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿hepa coin&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFM</td>
<td>¿hepa/mama&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿hepa coin&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFF</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFM</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generation +2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generation +1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBW</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZ</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZH</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZH</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpF</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpM</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generation 0</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿coca&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>60</sup> (Loos 1960); ¹ lists in (Loos nd.b); 8 diagrams in (Loos nd.b); C (Loos nd.c); (Loos & Loos 2003); T (Loos & Loos 1976a, 1976b, nd.a, nd.b); N (Schoolland 1975).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Kinship Terms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BW   | o: adr/ref bocha<sub>60</sub>  
o: bocha<sup>DC</sup> | tsaben? |
| Z    | o: ho<sub>90</sub>hsh<sub>30</sub>  
y: shara<sub>DC</sub>  
huetsa<sub>60</sub> | ref poi<sup>DT</sup> |
| ZH   | o: bocha<sub>60</sub>  
chahi<sup>60</sup> | y: shara<sub>DC</sub>  
huetsa<sub>60</sub> |
| FBS  | (parallel cousins) |  
adr/ref huetsa<sub>60</sub>  
noo (sic) huetsa<sub>60</sub>  
y: adr/ref jochi<sub>60</sub>  
o: adr/ref bocha<sub>60</sub>  
chahi<sup>60</sup> |
| FBD  | | tsabe<sup>60</sup> |
| FZS  | chahi<sub>60</sub> | ref beneahti<sub>60</sub> |
| FZD  | chahi<sub>60</sub> | tsabe<sub>60</sub> |
| MBS  | (parallel cousins) |  
adr/ref huetsa<sub>60</sub>  
n accent huetsa<sub>60</sub>  
y: adr/ref jochi<sub>60</sub>  
o: adr/ref bocha<sub>60</sub>  
chahi<sup>60</sup> |
| MBD  | | tsabe<sub>60</sub> |
| MZS  | (parallel cousins) |  
adr/ref huetsa<sub>60</sub>  
n accent huetsa<sub>60</sub>  
y: adr/ref jochi<sub>60</sub>  
o: adr/ref bocha<sub>60</sub>  
chahi<sup>60</sup> |
| MZD  | | tsabe<sub>60</sub> |
| WB   | chahin<sup>60</sup> | hahuin huetsan<sup>60</sup> |
| WZ   | hahuin huetsan<sup>60</sup> | bene huetsan<sup>60</sup>  
beneahti<sub>60</sub> |
| HB   | | tsabe<sup>60</sup> |
| HZ   | | benen<sup>60</sup>  
bene<sup>60</sup> |
| Sp   | haibo<sup>60</sup>  
haibon<sup>15</sup>  
haibo<sup>60</sup>  
hahuin<sup>60</sup>  
honanma<sup>60</sup>  
yoxan<sup>60</sup>  
hihquin<sup>60</sup> (conviviente) | benen<sup>60</sup>  
bene<sup>60</sup> |
| CH   | chito<sup>60</sup> | chito<sup>60</sup>  
bihanen boque<sup>60</sup> (firstborn)  
beboquaha<sub>60</sub> (older)  
chini boque<sup>60</sup> (older)  
bebo quaha<sub>60</sub> (older)  
chini boque<sup>60</sup> (older) |
| S    | bebo baque<sup>60</sup>  
papanli<sup>60</sup>  
papanchin<sup>60</sup>  
jochi<sup>7N</sup>  
thuni<sup>60</sup> | bebo baque<sup>60</sup>  
papanli<sup>60</sup>  
papanchin<sup>60</sup>  
jochi<sup>7N</sup>  
thuni<sup>60</sup> |
| SW   | pihasha<sup>60</sup> | hihnin<sup>60</sup>  
hihn<sup>60</sup> (sic- hihn?)  
pihasha<sup>60</sup> |
| D    | baquen<sup>3</sup> haibo baque<sup>60</sup>  
haitan<sup>15</sup> | haibo baque<sup>60</sup>  
baquen mananchin<sup>60</sup>  
mananchin<sup>60</sup>  
y: shani<sup>60</sup> |
| DH   | pihasha<sup>60</sup>  
rayos<sup>60</sup>  
r rayos<sup>60</sup> | pihasha<sup>60</sup>  
r rayos<sup>60</sup>  
r rayos<sup>60</sup> ([?]) |
### Appendix 3. Kinship terms

#### Sibling’s children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st/2nd baquen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bch</td>
<td>ref. hetsa baquebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>ref. hina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>ref. papa xohtabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>ref. hinaquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDH</td>
<td>ref. papanchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zch</td>
<td>ref. hinaquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>ref. papa xohta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSW</td>
<td>ref. hinaquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>ref. papa xohta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spouse’s Sibling’s children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st/2nd baquen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>chahitabo (romishin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>baquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSW</td>
<td>hinaquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBD</td>
<td>baquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBDH</td>
<td>papanchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZCh</td>
<td>papa xohta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZS</td>
<td>papa xohta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZSW</td>
<td>hinaquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZD</td>
<td>hinaquen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZDH</td>
<td>hinaquen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* generation -2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st/2nd baquen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChCh</td>
<td>xohta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>chahitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>chahitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>chahitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>chahitan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* generation +3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st/2nd baquen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChCh</td>
<td>xohtahabu (romishin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>chahitabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>chahitabo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[biznietos-tatarunietos]
I use a variant that relies on the simplified orthography of SIL spelling, switching from the Spanish-speaking context to the English-speaking or international one. Nasalization is marked by “n” following vowels, and I do not mark the spread of nasalization. Initial h of a word is muted when the word is placed in internal position. This is transcribed in SIL orthography, but I omit it here for simplicity (e.g. Neteanika rather than Netehanika). The table below compares the orthographies used in: † (Loos & Loos 2003), ‡ (Loos 1969), * (Elias-Ulloa 2006). The final letter is used in this thesis. Note that in the Appendices, original spelling is conserved.

### Appendix 4. Orthographic convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Alveopalatal</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
<th>Laryngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>p’ p b’ b p</td>
<td>t t’ t t’</td>
<td>qu’ k k’ k</td>
<td>h’ʔ h’ʔ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuants</td>
<td>b’ b’ b’ b</td>
<td>s’ s’ s’ s’</td>
<td>sh’ š’ ř’ š’ x</td>
<td>j’ h’ h’ h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td>ts’ š’ tʃ’ ts</td>
<td>ch’ ĕ’ tʃ’ ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap</td>
<td>r’ r’ r’ r’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m’ m’ m’ m</td>
<td>n’ n’ n’ n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-consonant</td>
<td>hu’ w’ w’ w</td>
<td>y’ y’ y’ y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Front | Central | Back
---|---|---
High | i’ í’ ɨ́’ i’ | e’ ɨ́’ e | o’ o’ o’ u
Mid |  |  |  |
Low |  | a’ ə́’ a’ a |  |

**Note 1.** According to Eugene Loos, “o” ranges from mid close to high open, unconditioned (1969: 105). Elias-Ulloa (2006: 162) describes it as “high back slightly-rounded vowel.” I use “u” rather than “o,” because I have been told on the Tapiche that the letter “o” in the SIL orthography should be pronounced as “u.”

**Note 2.** According to Loos, “e” is “high back unrounded” (Loos 1969: 106), and Elias-Ulloa defines it as “a high central unrounded” (Elias-Ulloa 2006: 162).
## Appendix 5. Fauna and flora mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUS</th>
<th>Capanahua</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achiote</td>
<td>maxe</td>
<td>Bixa orellana</td>
<td>achiote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aguaje</td>
<td>binun</td>
<td>Mauritia flexuosa</td>
<td>moriche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aji (charapita)</td>
<td>puehi</td>
<td>Capsicum chinense?</td>
<td>in Brazil: cumari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ajo sacha</td>
<td>nawan bucha</td>
<td>Mansoa alliacea</td>
<td>garlic vine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anguilla</td>
<td>kuniwan</td>
<td>Electrophorus electricus</td>
<td>electric eel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>añuje</td>
<td>mari</td>
<td>Dasyprocta fuliginosa</td>
<td>black agouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ataudero, lanchina (ataolero, lanchino)</td>
<td>tiski-tiski</td>
<td>Pulsatrix perspicillata or Pulsatrix melanota</td>
<td>spectacled owl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayahuma (aya uma, ayaíma)</td>
<td>nawanbu</td>
<td>Couroupita guianensis</td>
<td>cannonball tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boa mantona</td>
<td>runuwan, runín</td>
<td>Boa constrictor</td>
<td>boa constrictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caña brava</td>
<td>tua</td>
<td>Gynernium sagittatum</td>
<td>wild cane, arrow cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capirona</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cashapona (ponilla)</td>
<td>pe'ru</td>
<td>Socratea exorrhiza</td>
<td>walking palm, cashapona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chambira</td>
<td>wana</td>
<td>Astrocaryum chambira</td>
<td>chambira palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charapa</td>
<td>xane</td>
<td>Podocnemis expansa</td>
<td>Arrau turtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuchuhuasi</td>
<td>chuchuwasha</td>
<td>Maytenus krukovski? or Maytenus macrocarpa?</td>
<td>chuchuhuasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conta</td>
<td>xebun nuwe</td>
<td>Attalea tesselmanii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coto, coto mono</td>
<td>ru'ru</td>
<td>Alouatta seniculus</td>
<td>red howler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuicamama/lombriz (sapana)</td>
<td>xuku</td>
<td>Cla. Oligochaeta</td>
<td>earthworm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cunchi</td>
<td>?shixu</td>
<td>genus Pimelodus (Pimelodus ornatus?)</td>
<td>catfishes order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallinazo</td>
<td>xete</td>
<td>Fam. Cathartidae</td>
<td>vulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huacrapona</td>
<td>tua</td>
<td>Iriartea deltoidea</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huahuashi (huahuasho, huághuash)</td>
<td>kapa</td>
<td>Gen. Sciurus</td>
<td>general name for bushy-tailed squirrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huancahui</td>
<td>meuykawan</td>
<td>Herpetotheris cachinnas</td>
<td>laughing falcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huasa (pichico)</td>
<td>wasa</td>
<td>Saimiri boliviensis</td>
<td>black-capped squirrel monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huasai</td>
<td>panan</td>
<td>Euterpe precatoria</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huayruro</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ormosia coccinea</td>
<td>huayruro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hucungo</td>
<td>pani</td>
<td>Astrocaryum murumuru?</td>
<td>murumuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huito</td>
<td>nane</td>
<td>Genipa americana</td>
<td>genipapo, huito, jagua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iguano</td>
<td>yahu</td>
<td>Tupinambis teguixin</td>
<td>gold tegu, golden tegu, common tegu, black tegu, Colombian tegu, Tiger Lizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isula</td>
<td>buna</td>
<td>Paraponera clavata</td>
<td>bullet ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jergón</td>
<td>tua'ka</td>
<td>Gen. Bothrops</td>
<td>pit viper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagarto</td>
<td>kape</td>
<td>Gen. Caiman</td>
<td>caiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pez lápiz</td>
<td>kushushikan xu'mux</td>
<td>Boulengerella maculata</td>
<td>spotted pike-characin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lupuna</td>
<td>xunu</td>
<td>Ceiba pentandra</td>
<td>lupuna blanca, lupuna, or kapok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5. Fauna and flora mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>majás</th>
<th>janu</th>
<th>Cuniculus paca</th>
<th>lowland paca, spotted paca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maracana or shamiro</td>
<td>majás</td>
<td>possibly Aratinga leucophthalmus</td>
<td>possibly white-eyed parakeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mono blanco, machín</td>
<td>hubu</td>
<td>Cebus albifrons</td>
<td>white-fronted capuchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mono negro, machín negro</td>
<td>tara</td>
<td>Cebus apella</td>
<td>black-capped, brown or tufted capuchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mosca</td>
<td>shiu</td>
<td>Fam. Simuliidae?</td>
<td>black flies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motelo</td>
<td>manan xawe</td>
<td>Chelonoidis (Geochelone) denticulata</td>
<td>yellow-footed tortoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninacacuru (gusano estrella, ninacuru)</td>
<td>xebuntsiaka?</td>
<td>Fam. Lampyridae</td>
<td>fireflies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ojé</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ficus insipida</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oso hormiguero</td>
<td>xa’e</td>
<td>Myrmecophaga tridactyla</td>
<td>giant anteater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pelejo</td>
<td>na’in</td>
<td>genus Bradypus</td>
<td>three-toed sloth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pijuyoyo</td>
<td>wani’</td>
<td>Bactris gasipaes</td>
<td>peach palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piripiri</td>
<td>waste</td>
<td>Fam. Cyperaceae</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plátano</td>
<td>mani</td>
<td>genus Musa</td>
<td>platan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pona colorada</td>
<td>ma?</td>
<td>Dictyocaryum ptarianum</td>
<td>araque or palma real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pucalupuna (lupuna)</td>
<td>xunu</td>
<td>Cavanillesia umbellata</td>
<td>lupuna colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raya</td>
<td>jui</td>
<td>Fam. Potamotrygonidae</td>
<td>stingray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sachavaca</td>
<td>gug</td>
<td>Tapirus terrestris</td>
<td>Brazilian tapir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shapaja</td>
<td>xebun</td>
<td>Attalea (Scheelea) phalerata</td>
<td>urucuri palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shihuahuaco</td>
<td>xuman</td>
<td>Dipterix micrantha</td>
<td>shihuahuaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shihu/shivu/shiyu</td>
<td>xisubin</td>
<td>Tamandua tetradactyla</td>
<td>southern tamandua (collared anteater or lesser anteater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shiringa</td>
<td>shirinca</td>
<td>Hevea nitida</td>
<td>hevea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamishi</td>
<td>xe’u</td>
<td>Heteropsis spp. (Fam. Araceae)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taricaya</td>
<td>kaburi’</td>
<td>Podocnemis unifilis</td>
<td>yellow-spotted Amazon river turtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toé</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Brugmansia suavolensis</td>
<td>angel trumpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trompetero</td>
<td>nea</td>
<td>Psophia leucoptera</td>
<td>pale-winged trumpeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacamuchacha/o</td>
<td>ku’in’ku’/ de: ku’in ku’in</td>
<td>Crotaphaga ani</td>
<td>smooth billed ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venado colorado</td>
<td>chaxu</td>
<td>Mazama americana</td>
<td>red brocket deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yacunuturu (yanguuturu, yancontoro)</td>
<td>panu, xumanken</td>
<td>Priodontes maximus</td>
<td>giant armadillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuca</td>
<td>nu’á</td>
<td>Manihot esculenta</td>
<td>sweet manioc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zapote</td>
<td>hechibin</td>
<td>Matisia cordata</td>
<td>South American sapote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macana</td>
<td>kun</td>
<td>order Gymnotiformes</td>
<td>knifefish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: Loos & Loos 2003; Manolo 2006; Fleck et al. 2012; Wikipedia)
## Appendix 6. List of the stories of the antiguos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>story</th>
<th>narrator</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>lang.</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Huni Yupa Hui</em> (Hombre ajuasi)</td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GHR05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GHR04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romina</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Achquin vieja</em></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro Tomás Freire Ruiz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romina</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRSo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ermelinda Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ERS01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mujer sachavaca</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Ayaymama</em></td>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romer Pizarro Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPR07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRSo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRSo3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRSo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Adán y Eva</em></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GHR03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GHR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Torre Babel</em></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GHR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joaquina Romaina</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>Bake Hene Mera Putani</em> (Cuando echaron el niño al agua)*</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRSo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olga Ríos Baquinahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ORBo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romina</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romina</td>
<td>1969a</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesto Vaquinahua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESH03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omer Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>OPH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <em>Bake</em> Hene <em>Mera Putani</em> (Cuando echaron el niño al agua)*</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omer Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaquinahua y Romel Pizzaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omer Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <em>Mana xaweua chaax hui</em></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <em>Venado y motelo apuesta</em></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <em>Chiqua</em></td>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. <em>Comejé</em></td>
<td>Elena Rodríguez Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ERdS01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Dueño de animales
Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BHR09
Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BHR22
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR01
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR05
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR07
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR27
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR28
Germes Sachico Rios 2011-13 LUS GRSo7
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH01
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH06

18. Hene yushín
Hilda Chumo Oliveira 2011-13 Cp/LUS HC001
Amelia Romaina 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.b)

19. Henen mai ma’pu’i (Noc)
Amelia Romaina 1969a Cp (Loos & Loos nd.b)
Amelia Romaina 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.b)
Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BRS03
Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BRS12
Carlos Panarua Baquínahua 2011-13 LUS [fn]JT1202
Celso Baquínahua Ruiz 2011-13 LUS CB02
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DH08
Guilerme Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS GHR02
Guilerme Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS GHR05
Jorge Rodríguez Rios 2011-13 LUS JRR04
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH03
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH05

20. Ichinca
Amelia Romaina 1968 Cp/Sp (Schoolland 1975)
Amelia Romaina 1969a Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
Amelia Romaina 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BRS02
Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR05
Elena Solishan Huaninche 2011-13 LUS ESH01
Ermelinda Ríos Sachico 2011-13 LUS ERS01
Pedro Tomás Freire Ruíz 2011-13 LUS PTF01
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH06
Ernesto Vaquínahua 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)

21. Inu & chacpe
Florentina Romaina 1974 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.b)
Pablo Rodríguez Rios 2011-13 LUS [fn]JT1207b
Pedro Tomás Freire Ruíz 2011-13 LUS PTF01
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH04
Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH07

22. Inu & animales
Amelia Romaina 1973 (Loos & Loos nd.b)

23. Inu & manuo yawe
Amelia Romaina 1969 + Cp/Sp (Schoolland 1975)

24. Inu & Maxo
Joaquina Romaina 1969a Cp/Sp (Schoolland 1975)
Joaquina Romaina 1969a + ? Cp/Sp (Schoolland 1975b)

25. Inu & riru yushín
Florentina Romaina 1974 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.b)

26. Inu & mono negro
Agustín Flores Sachivo 1974 Cp AFS01

27. Inu & Utsa (El Conejo)
Ernesto Vaquínahua 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
Florentina Romaina 1974 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
Joaquina Romaina 1969a Cp/Sp (Schoolland 1975)
Amelia Romaina 1969a Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)

28. Inu & Utsa yawish
Amelia Romaina 1969a Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)

29. Inu & xáen tari riren
Joaquina Romaina 1969a Cesar Manuel Huaninche, Cesar (Loos & Loos nd.a)

30. Inu yawish
Amelia Romaina 1969a Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
Ernesto Vaquínahua 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)

31. Tigre acababa la gente
Victor Panarua Baquínahua 2011-13 LUS VBP05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Nombre y Título</th>
<th>Autor</th>
<th>Año</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Referencia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Inu binain (Tigres y Abejas)</td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESH03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joaquina Romaina</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Inu ya e pikats’i</td>
<td>Manuel Huaninche, Cesar</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vaquinhua y Romel Pizzaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>(fn)JTI1208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Inun nuke pi’ni</td>
<td>Emiliano Freire</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Inunika nauka</td>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Juan Perezoso</td>
<td>Pedro Tomás Freire Ruíz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>PFS01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Juan Sinmiedo: vela muerta</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>DHR05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kaman Inu (Mujer sachaperro)</td>
<td>Ernesto Vaquinhua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969a</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969a</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joaquina Romaina</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td></td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kanaawari Pe’chahu</td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kapabu (El hombre-ardilla)</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ermelinda Ríos Sachivo &amp; Germán Nahuatpe</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ERS01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinhua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celso Baquinhua Ruiz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>CBR02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ermelinda Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ERS02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Omer Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>OPH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emiliano Freire</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesto Vaquinhua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969(b)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Kashi (Hombre murcielago)</td>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kashibo (Entre ellos se comían)</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edilberto Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ESR01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinhua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kerabeti Berunan</td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emiliano Freire</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kukish nauka</td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinhua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinhua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquinhua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VPB06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Loros tenian patas</td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Monos demonios</td>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nu’ín (Mujer pelejo)</td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Schoolland 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969a</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celso Baquinhua Ruiz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>CBR03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cpl/LUS</td>
<td>ESH01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hilda Chumo Oliveira</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cpl/LUS</td>
<td>HCO01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Nawishnka</td>
<td>Ernesto Vaquinhua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. Neteanika

- Tete hui
- Takuya haka hui
- Sachavaca y hormigas
- Olla que hacía herbir

50. Nubex 'aibu (Mujer paloma)

- 1974
- 1973
- 2011

51. Olla que hacía herbir

- 1974
- 1973
- 2011

52. Perros hablaban

- 1974
- 1973
- 2011

53. Rumin (Hombre mantona)

- 1974
- 1973
- 2011

54. Sachavaca y hormigas

- 2011

55. Mono negro

- 2011

56. Takuwa haka hui

- 1974

57. Tete hui

- 1974

58. Tau Tu'una (Luna)

- 1974
### 61. *Wishmabu/ Shiun ku’tu* (El nido de los mosquitos)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alida Freire Panarua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>APo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia Flores Chumo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>AFCo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BSR01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celso Baquínahua Ruiz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>CBRo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>DHR22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloisa Chumo Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ECh01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Huaninche Romaina</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GHRo3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Chumo Oliveira</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>HC001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Rios</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRo3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Tomás Freire Ruiz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>PTF02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquínahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VB03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>[fn]T1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germe Sachivo Rios</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GRS05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moises Hidalgo Chumo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>MHC01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Vaquiahua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquínahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VB03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ríos Baquínahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ORBo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Vaquínahua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969 (a)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969 (b)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 62. *Xaku Bake* (El hijo del gusano)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celso Baquínahua Ruiz</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>CBRo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESh01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSRo3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronal Pizarro Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>RPH03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Panarua Baquínahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>VB03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ríos Baquínahua</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>ORBo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Vaquínahua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969 (a)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969 (b)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 63. *Xave yushin* (Mujer charapa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emiliano Freire</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Vaquínahua</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentina Romaina</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969 (a)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1969 (b)</td>
<td>Cp/Sp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos 1976b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Flores Chumo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>AFC01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Solisban Huaninche</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>Cp/LUS</td>
<td>ESh03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germe Sachivo Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>GSR06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRo6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 64. *Xete beng* (Hombre gallinazo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Ríos Sachivo</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>BRS10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRo3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Rodríguez Ríos</td>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>LUS</td>
<td>JRo6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Romaina</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>(Loos &amp; Loos nd.b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65. **Xuke Bake pi’ani (El asustado)**
   - Ernesto Vaquinahua 1973 Cp/Sp (Loos & Loos 1976b)
   - Florentina Romaina 1974 Cp/Sp (Loos & Loos 1976b)
   - Amelia Romaina 1969 Cp/Sp (Loos & Loos 1976b)

66. **Yawish Xumanke (El demonio armadillo)**
   - Emiliano Friere 1955 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
   - Florentina Romaina 1974 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
   - Amelia Romaina 1969a Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
   - Amelia Romaina 1973 Cp (Loos & Loos nd.a)
   - Amelia Romaina 1968 Cp/Sp (Schoolland 1975)

67. **Yacuruna visit**
   - Germe Sachivo Ríos 2011-13 LUS GSR11
   - Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BRS07
   - Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR04
   - Daniel Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS DHR16
   - Guillermo Huaninche Romaina 2011-13 LUS GHR05

68. **Yashingo borracho llevan a Iquitos**
   - Benigno Ríos Sachivo 2011-13 LUS BRS22
   - Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH01
   - Ronal Pizarro Huaninche 2011-13 LUS RPH06

69. **Yashingo mitayeros y oreja del diablo**
   - Victor Panarua Baquinahua 2011-13 LUS VBP06

70. **Yashiono peluqueado**
   - Victor Panarua Baquinahua 2011-13 LUS VBP06

71. **Tigre Negro - hombre blanco**
   - Manuel Huaninche, Cesar Pizarro Romaina 2011-13 LUS RPH03

72. **Tsanka betan chaxu bechinani hui**
   - Vaquinahua y Romel Pizzaro 2011-13 LUS [fn]T1208

73. **Unchala**
   - Pedro Tomás Freire Ruiz 2011-13 LUS [fn]T1208
   - Romel Pizarro Romaina 2011-13 LUS [fn]
Appendix 7. Original quotes

\(\text|\text{self-correction, change of topic or interruption}\
\text{- unintelligible}\
\text{+ laugh}\
\text{@ repetition}\
\text{!= drawing in air sharply, an expression of fright or amazement}\
\text{() gesture}\
\text{--- pause}\
\text{(*...) question}\
\text{() minor deletion}\

---

i (Tessmann 1999: 91): Hoy en día, todos los Capanahuas son civilizados, por lo que yo sé, y viven con un “patrón” en el Tapiche superior. (...) A pesar de sus asentamientos ‘tan apartados, los Capanahuas están sometidos a la civilización de manera que puede suponerse que dentro de poco tiempo desaparezcan.

ii (Kuczynski-Godard 2004: 122) Mucho mayor peligro [to health and wellbeing] ofrece si el grupo indio se agrega completamente al patrón, acomodándose en forma nueva, desconcertante, y abandonando grandemente su vida propia, tal como se observa, v. g., entre ciertos Chamas y Campas, especialmente en el Alto Ucayali. Lo mismo ha ocurrido con los Capanahuas del río Tapiche, que se acostumbraron al colono cuando vino D. Juan Hi., que ganó por primera vez su amistad y colaboración. Al principio se mantuvo su economía propia; después, sin embargo, ya trabajando con diversos patrones, la abandonaron y degeneraron así como otras tribus en idéntica transformación.

iii (Loos nd.a): Grado de asimilación.- Es una de las tribus que más están asimiándose a la vida nacional de manera que aparte de su lengua y algunas costumbres, poco se diferencian de los mestizos de la zona.- Llevan ropas al estilo occidental, hablan castellano aun a veces rústicamente, construyen casas al estilo común con techos de hoja de yarina o de aguajillo, con emponadas se alcanzan un metro cincuenta a dos de altura.- Normalmente tienen un cuarto o una porción de la casa cerrada por paredes, que sirve como dormitorio para el dueño.- Las chacras normalmente están a una distancia de la casa por razón de buscar cada año el terreno más favorable.- Las casas son de tamaño regular, las más pequeñas de unos cinco metros y las más largas de treintá.

iv (Ribeiro and Wise 1978: 97–98): Hoy en día están integrados; se distinguen de los peones de habla castellana principalmente por el idioma. El 30% de la población es bilingüe con dominio precario del castellano a nivel del pán mestizo. La cuarta parte del grupo tiene orígenes de su idioma materno; los demás quieren abandonarlo o son idíferentes a su empleo.

v (DHR07): Pero alguna planta muere... la yuca también no muere. Ese tiene su semilla! Deste tamaño su semilla. (...) Eso nomás tiene su semilla, la yuca. Otra planta no tiene. Haces una purma, roza: eso primerito sale \(\text{\text{|}}\) Quemas: está saliendo primero ve – Porque ‘ta... su semilla ‘ta entrado ahí, lo que caído ya: ese crece.


vi (GHR01): Por ejemplo este – nombre de Alipena – no ha puesto este uno que vivía aquí, que fundado. Sino, había un trabajador de shiringa, – antes andaba todos los shiringueros acá. Y cada campaniento había 5-6 personas que trabajaban. Y de allí otro campaniento, otro, otro. El último campaniento dice era que... – el estaba trabajando solito, entre otros dos familias: otro trabajador más abajo, otro uno nomás. Un solo persona trabajaba en un campaniento. Shiringa. Un día dice bai daí, de su campaniento. Voy a pasar a mi – compañero, de este chamba. Baja el mismo, siempre agarraban azuèlo – azmelianod – llega a el campaniento, dice. Está sentaado el otro shiringuero en su campaniento. Entonces el hombre que está viendo más de...
al siguiente día ‘manecido’ — y me largado. Había muerto dos chorros, un puijil. Les dejado botando, ya no vía, ‘taba podrido ya. — “Sí que voy hacer yo?” — pensando solito. — Entonces llego a pensar... Porque nos hemos ido arriba a la madería — [¡Ahí me decía el guardia: ‘Si sientes ‘tar errado...’ — ‘puucha, caraj’! — ‘sabía ya [¿socorro?]. Por aquí era barranco, por aquí era bien cha~ — ‘bien se...’ — ‘es muy t"reste ya. — A pie de un palo... ahí me sentado. — ‘y, si ollo se quiere trochando, o sino, — de lo contrario: siga cabezando una quebrada — este te va sacar a una quebrada más grande’ —. Por ahí me ido ya! — — ‘He salido! — ‘Por lado he bajado ya. Ahí llegado a mi tambo... ¡Puucha, caraj!’ —. No había nadies... ¿Io ido a buscarme ya! — ‘¡Dónde bosque me Hale!! ½ Ni en donde ya!— Ese día, siguiente día estábamos ahí, todo tranquilo. — (Por eso dice muchas personas que van al monte se pierden. El yash el ha fundado este pueblo donde que el dejado yo Vista Alegre — para abrir ese puesto, era tremendo monte alto. Ahí empzó a rozar rojo, 1971. A rozar ese. Ya con doña Luisa — hemos hecho los despejos para pasar dahí de Bellavista - a Vista Alegre. cuando ya había mi yuca, plátano - hecho mi casa ahí.


(RPR06): Ahi decía mi abuela — ‘ta tronando — El tiempo ya sabe ya — Dios ‘ta sabiendo que ahí voy estar yo. — El día que me muego — ésta tierra me va apretar: En vano le cultivo, le labro la tierra, queriendo librarle — De tierra soy - a tierra voy a volver - decía mi abuela — El día que me muego: nnnunca voy estar juntamente con ustedes — Voy a irme para no volver más — Voy estar en ootro mundo — En su idioma me hablaba así — ‘Aja... —

(SRS05): (‘neta =?) — día — ‘tierra natal también?’ — mhmm! — (‘como la misma palabras?) — aja — aista día — tu... — donde que tu vives. — Eses son palabras t"écnicas! — ;)))))))

(Schoolland 1975: 118–19, 134): Huai sabai [the field shining through] (Loos & Loos 1976a: 74–75; cf. 1976b: 160–61; Schoolland 1975: 173, 191); nenuquesa jisobisiqii xabati ca cape jihuetai jema [they saw the light of the clearing where the village of the caiman was].


(CNS01): [José Mayoruma] era un joven cuando le tráia acá a Aipena, allí le veíamos nosotros. (*) no se entiende su idioma de él. — No nos conversaba, solamente nos miraba nomas. Nunca le veíamos lo que conversaba, porque con la señorita Luisa conversaba. Solamente ella le entendía.

(RPR08): (...) porque verdaderamente — todo se va por la costumbre de los demás vivientes — entonces ya usted tamb"ien las cosas...
(DHR27) (*"como más son diferentes los nawas – algunos dicen que tienen su otra manera de hablar. rein...*) – Aja, de hablar, de reir dice... Conversa: así como... No – conversa, dice... \। Rapidito, dice, conversa! Tatata! conversa. No conversa como... – na\। – ese deai [pointing to the village] Despacio, ya con tono conversando, aja. Pero nawa dice conversa: rápido, dice! Tatatatata! Te conversa. Mhhmm... (*"como se ríen?*) Los mestizos se rie pues puu! – Riendo, pero otro clase pues ríe, los mestizos. Aja... (*vestimenta diferente?*) – Aaa... – su vestido ya – su chupa... – No! Igual mismo, igual tenemos nustrochupa, todo: nuestro reloj todo... (nuestro reloj, todo... – tu gorra: todo! – Mhhmm... (*"Caracter!*) Character tiene otro clase de carácter tiene otro, nawa pues... (–) tú tienes otro carácte, ve... – \। Aca: otro carácte, aja. Así... – Mhhmm... – Pero mismo sangre tenemos! Todos, todito el mundo! – \। No tenemos otro sangre, amarillo, no s - – sangre verde, negro, nada! – Toda sangre: rojo! Aja. – Misma sangre tenemos!

(DHR20): Pero Pacho [the Shipibo missionary working in Limón Cocha] sí se mandó. Porque Pacho también tiene varios idiomas pues. Ese, iuuu! tiene, como, siete idiomas dice él, el hermano Lidio. Conoce, iuh! diferentes idiomas. Por eso él se va pues, derepente puede estar en cualquier... él le entiende y puede... [speak the language of the indios he is looking for]\। Así escuchado. IConoce ese pata!

**"(DHR09): ¿Entiendes [the language]?" – me dice. "Si, que no voy entender, yo también soy... este... capanahua" – le digo. i2Yy? iSey [e!] Lo que sey nadie no me quita!**(GHRo6): (...) Después ya -- ya también recibía [the father, headman] el consejo de otros, mestizos. A veces ellos cuando tomaban -- hablaba las cosas buenas, historias allí, cosas de trabajo. Y él también recibía, dice. Y por eso ya mi papá guardaba todas esas... ideas... Para compartirles a otros ya.

(Loos & Loos 2003: 138): Heen huetsa nocosaiyta tah ben coin coiinai


(VPBo3): In Victor’s story, black vulture tells the husband of the star woman whom she left alone on “this side”: “Allá he visto tu mujer – ahi es, porái paso yo!” – dice que dice el gallinazo (...) – “Aista, sentaaad’ – alegre, con su mamá, sus hermanas. – Y tó aquí, llorando, sobrino!”

(DHR03): A, así – le dice su mujer – que nos da más alegría – que no dea... \। le que no nos cae nada – para pasar bien, todo. Todo ese tiempo, que no nos compaña yushin, dice. Que manda animales: ―así como querías comer, así también queremos comer nosotros..." – Ya pues – el muerto dice escucha, – su alma ya. En la puerta nomás ‘ta ahi – éste escucha todo.

(GSR01): (*"¿qué son los buenos pensamientos?" – es como vivir, pues, juntos, unidos, alegre. – Mhh – así como – dice en la biblia, la vida de Cristo pues, como vivía antes. – Cristo – alegre con todos – ese quiere decir buenos pensamientos: Compartir unos a otros.

(EFN03): se iba, hermano, se iba a pasar. Volvía tarde, comía, tomaba, le regalaba su pierna de hunu, nami. Alegre. Llevaban a la chacra a traer su plátano maduro por allí – señora Beti. Kankan. Hawen tasa, kankan. [Colina [daughter]: Que es kankan mami?] piña pues traían, paneros llenos...


(SBRZo): Yo quiero que me vendas – yo le digo. A veces cuando estáas tú sólo – ‘tas escuchando tu radio, di? Parece que son varios, te sientes tu... no solitito. Triiiste, no oyes nada: pero con tu radio? – Parece ser una compañía pues. – Aja. – No me quiera vender. – “Te voy a prestar” – me ha dicho.


(RPRo3): Y desa manera mucho de los antiguos no querían pues que les tomén foto: ―Me van a ver solamente mi fotografía – los kapabo, los capanahua‖ (*the various categories or groups that made up ‘the Capanahua‖) (Loos & Loos 1978: 152)

(RPRo3): Y desa manera mucho de los antiguos no querían pues que les tomén foto: – Me van a ver solamente mi fotografía – en yushin – cuando yo ya no estoy vivo – Y van sentir mucha pena – de lo que nos hemos sido alegre, estabamos juntos con ustedes tomando masato, bailando también! Me van extrañar mucho -- y van a sentir mucha pena, la familia incluso, mis hijos, hijas – y por eso muchos no querían tomar sus fotos. Y así era antiguamente.

(RHR14): e3Yy! – Ya no voy hacer mi cumpleaño ya. – – Ya no quiero ya. – (*porqué?) – Ya no veo mi papá ya pues. – Cuando vivía, así le hacía yo: alegre pues, tomar! Comer! – Mhhmm – Último ya hecho ahi, cuando estaba él enfermo en su cama. Él ‘taba escuchanñdle ahi...
Porque así matando había que mataban pues — Y ellos se han largado.— Ese lo que hay pues por acá — cabecera.


(BHR01): Indio — ese se le puede civilizar así — yendo con... Así, amanzandalos pues: con ropas, con caramelos, así...

(JRR04): Ese dice han hecho así [giving things] también: — ¡IIItooodooooo!!! ¡Carajo, para quere! Mollo para mujer, para hombre: esto, reloj, ese que mire [glasses] !Todo! Aja. Otro dice agarrado... — que estaba asi, cacha-bota —mudando ese diente, y reloj, ¡todo! En ese que también: “¡Así nos hacen! No nos maten,” que decía algunos pues. Alguno ya, lo que huido. Y verdad dice, venía poraí pues, lo que escondido! ++++

(JR02): Otra que ellos también se costumbra pues ese, los indios. Y ahí tanto pues daba pues zapato, ropa, ¡Otro! Otro maloca dice se iba a contar ya: “Ahí han salido así, estamos así, inos vas hacer... civilizar! Así como estamos mudando, así vamos a mudar todo. Ese no se mata nadie!! (....) No le matas — épaque van matar? Ese nos da acá civilizar todos, aja. Para así mudamos... así como que mudan ellos. (GHF01): ellos [Matsés] también ‘tan civilizándose — salen a cambiar madera, ellos también — ya se uniforman ellos también con todo su —. Saben ya que es el mudo — ropa. Trucos, canchillos, polos, camisas. Ellos saben, saben ya como se viste [laugh] Ellos mayormente ya están... (BHR01): Y ya le amanzan hablando, todo dando pues, azucar, cualquier cosa, ropas, caramelos — Con eso se endulza. (VA01): Lo que ellos no podian es orientarse esos puros — no había quién les orienta, di. Así. — Ellos ya ven — ya con sus ollas, platos, cucarachas, platí — ya botando ya sus mocahuitas. No ya comian aí. Su sal, sus kerosene, todo eso ya les venido dar — llo. —Y así les ha ido acostumbarando ya pues. Y ese ya- ellos han abierto sus ojos también ya. —Pa’ bien, ipara ellos mismos pues! ¡Para todos! No solo de ellos mismos. Y desa manera se han civilizado ellos también. Ya no eran así como primero ya, chucaros ya. Y dese manera pues el Hidalgo se ha venido a orientar. (JPS01): (“hay otros que son indios? Por ejemplo, esa gente de Maipuco — esto son indios?) Ellos son pues indios, ellos son como Removauch. (‘y que?) — Ellos pues viven en un monte, hermano. Ellos viven en el monte, como los animales. Ellos viven como sajino, o cualquier animal que vive en el monte. Ellos no... no conocen que es bote, que es un avión, otro... ...que es un dulce, que es una ropa — ellos no conocen, hermano. No conocen ellos. Por eso ellos, como dice, quieren conocer ese... a esas tribus. Una vez que ellos conocen: iellos se ganan mundo de plata! ¡Ellos ganan ya! Con solamente... \| \| No solamente van ir entrar como entrar aquí... Tienen que... ¿Cómo se puede decir? Ellos pueden entrar, pero no a... [entrar nomás?], dice.

Cómo un perro bravo que tiene su cría: si tú puedes ir a querer conversarle, di, ellos te pueden adolar... Y pueden matar. ¡Porque ellos no conocen! Ellos no conocen, a la gente... como dicen, que uno se vive acá. Viven como [errado?] (....) Así viven ellos. (*Los que le buscan entonces pueden hacer plata de esto?) Ellos hacen plato, hermano. (*¿pero cómo?) Así ve: como te puedo decir... Una... — tu puedes ir a querer agarrar una cría de un mono o loro pues, di. El mono no te puede querer ese ratito. Te puede extrañar, te puede morder. No quiere comer, no quiere tomar, no tu tienes que amarar, cariñarle, darle su dulce, cualquier cosa. Y el animal ya te conoce, que tu eres su dueño. Y así dice son ellos [those who look for?]. — querer hacer este... (....) amanzarle pues! Así dice. El todos no quieren ir alll. —

Ohoh, ese salido ya pues desde que tiempo ya — paque se vayan a sacar ese... a eses personas... Ellos no se mudan ropa. Ellos viven así, calatos. Y puede... ¡Efracio! Y no puede, di, pero no bajar una sola. Tienes que poner dice su azuucar, su leche

Appendix 7. Original quotes
hacer carne... o se van a pescar... ellos le pueden matar a ellos. Porque ellos no conocen. Mmmmm (...) Una vez que ya pues... encuentran a esa tribada ellos ya, gobierno...

sho (JPS01): Y si se va con su señora — el esposo — a la chica — o a la mujer pues — le tienen que violarle dice hermano — porque recien dice pueden amanzarle dice esos — esos - indios. () — así dice es — esas personas que quieren irse — por eso varias no quieren irse — porque puede perder su esposo - o pueden perder su esposo - Perder su vida uno de los dos pues - se van a amanzar esa persona dice — ("o sea este gente de allá - los indios - quiere violar \(\langle\) a la mujer mhmh — ("y después ya aceptan") —

shoo (ECH01): ese Juan Hidalgo y otro hombre. Y ellos les han puesto ya a claro ya, afuera. Y allí dice han tardado, conversandono con la señora.

sho (BSR14): "Acaso la gringa te botado al mundo?"; (BSR11): Mamá nomás nos bota al mundo — parir a la luz del día; (BSR04): Ahí me botado al mundo mi mamá. Ahí nacido, por Capanahuas [river]; (FT1210): Mi mamá no, mi mamá era cholta, indita, indita botado al mundo.; (RPH05): (mamá) nos bota en ese mundo — para conocer la claridad del día; (DHR19) [bebe:] iPlo! [onomatopoeia] — Sale a la claridad; (RP07): ¿Ha esperado hasta que yo me doy de baja para que recien salge a la claridad?; (EFN03): Allí dice salía esa criaturita al aire.

1 (DHR06): Cree [in the belly], llega su año: nace ya. iPlo! de su cabecita. No ves cuando nace ya se... del aire ya se hace... hace grande ya. Es chiquito: issac!, ya se hace grande ya: criaturita ya.

(DHR08): ("¿cuando sale, recién puede su alma?"

Recién parece su alma pues ("¿porque en el vientre no...?"


h (BSR01): ("pena es también otro espiritu que entra?") no hermano, ese no hermano. Sino tú "tas pensando de lo que ha sucedido. Tienes pena pues. Osea que tienes pena — lo que ha sucedido algo — tu familia — o se ha muerto. Piensas de tu papá, tu mamá, y tus hijos: "derezte ha muerto! — Porque ese es una... cosa que tus hijos te daban — siempre te daban alegría! estás pensando a ellos. Pensando ahí. Este es pues bendó! Benakin! (...) De pena!

ii (Loos & Loos 1976a: 153-54): Nequebi queasia qui jai rahan, rohan. joni. 24 Gritado de la misma manera en que se grita acá en el mundo, hermano. Eran humanos. Also Eugene Loos in (Thompson 1997), nequebíhabo [sic, nequebihabho?] as "whole world": “all the people on this side of the sky and all the people on the other side.” [Or rather: “all those who are from exactly this side” (a:bu: contained, being the object of action, or belonging to a set?)

iii About A LONGBAUX (MALOCA) OF THE ANTIGUOS:

(ECH01): ("Como vivían en Humaitá [river] — ¿En casas?...?) ¡En casa! Casa grande, techado de tierra. Ese no hacían su [lider?] ("y así, todas familias en una casa?) Así vivían, cada familia dividido en sus...\(\langle\)en esa casa grande, allí vivían, allí otro, allí otro, en una sola casa. Tenía su puerta así, cada uno que salga por allí. Mhm. ("¿Y puro familia, puro se haga? Mezclado. (") Con na'ibn. (....) Es vivían así, mezclados.


About THE TRIBES OF THE ANTIGUOS:


(SVR01): Ese sí me contaba mi mamá, mi papá: Todo — de toda gente, dl... Todo clase de gente somos, pero tenemos nuestro raza. ("son capanahuas?) iiero no los son capanahuas? Capanahuas son de nombre. Pero nuestro tribu se puede decir de. todo tiene su nombre — plejo... los Chumos, los Huaninches... Romainas, los Freires, todos tienen, Nahautupes: xawanbu... Todo es animal nomás, íde animals! [laugh] Allí vienen pelejos! [pointing to two men with surname Huaninche!] (...) Huaninches son nomás de nombre. Pajo to the world... (....) raza de ellos, plejo, trompetero — (es panían?) nombre, pajarito.

About A HOUSE IN THE 1950s (OF A CONTEMPORARY TYPE, BUT LONG):

(GHR02): casa normal nomás, largo. Cada esquina le dividían así — este para otro familia, este para otro familia — así vivían.

About THE MODERN VILLAGE:

(GHR06): ("como debería vivir la familia, juntos? (...) Con su esposa? Con todos juntos?) noo — sí, así como estamos, la familia en un caserio, comunidad. Vivimos pues cada cual en\(\langle\) cada familia en su propio hogar. Algunos jóvenes viven dos — con su yerno y con su suegro. Un deber es vivir en una sola casa para ver como\(\langle\)...mantenimiento de cada uno. Ver su derecho — que es lo que debe de hacer, lo que falta en el hogar — y cada cual en su hogar — así se vive todo tranquilo... Apyandose unos a otros — especialmente en su trabajo que realizan. Como actualmente en la minga.

About THE UNITY OF DESCENT OR LANGUAGE BETWEEN GROUPS:
(VPBo1): *(¿Pa'enhabebu son otros [then neabu from Lower Tapiche]?)* Noo... La misma familia es... Pa'enhabebu - Que la diferencia es el apellido: Yo soy Panurua [surname], di. Ellos son este... Freires [surname]. Pa'enhabebu es igualito: Yo soy neabu, ellos son pa'enhabebu. Sí pues... Tigrea1\... este... tigreauacas, pa'enbu - aja, así es. *(¿chimbú?)* inubu yushububu [the old Jaguars]. Mhm, inubu - pa'enhabebu *(¿Osea es lo mismo?)* La misma es pues... ya se diferencia, como cualquiera pues, di? *(...)*

Nostros: neabu... somos. Pa'enhabebu es otro grupo: pero no es otro grupo, pero ahi nomás se va.

(BRS05): *(¿(...)¿Ayubu es generación?)*, Sí es. *(¿Y ayubu, neabu, naínputu, kapabu, hainabu - todos estos llaman de una sola?)* De una sola pues, como te digo, sangre capanahua, dialecto capanahua - todo concierne capanahua... - Así serán como te digo, los Chumos, Rochas, Huaninches [surnames]... ¡Cuantas son las tribus! Todos esos... A ese raza nomás vamos siguiendo, los capanahuanas. *(Ayubu serán tribus?)* Tribus. Pero ese mismo hablar llevamos todos!

ln [Hyde 1980: 46]: Jochimun jumanañci yohiyinihuñin [hermano mayor trabaja afuera de la casa].


bi [(GHR03)]: El alma el espiritu - anda lejos. Cuando se duerme se sueña porai lejos, ’tas andando en tal parte. Sí, ese es el espiritu, cuando el cuerpo ya está... parece muerto nomás. *(¿Y viene por la mañana?)* viene cuando ya entra... cuando se despierta. Entonces ya llega, entra por el cuerpo ya. *(¿Y cuando muere persona que pasa con este espiritu?)* o... ya no... porque ya no entra en su cuerpo. *(¿de donde va?)* Ese fuera queda ya, en espacio, puro alma es ya.


b2 Yo a veces pues... no digo otro mundo \| el mundo dice no es lejos. Dice. El cuento también, según... \| \| \| sino, el pecado nos hace ver lejos. Nuestro frente nos hace lejos nomás: - el cielo. Y cerquita ese mundo, cerquita. *(GHR05)*

b3 Ya cambió de opinión - ya es mestiza

ls [(GSR03)]: Mi papá me contaba así: Que dice: Antes un hombre tenía sus hijos - - dice que la mosca dice pues le picaba por demasiado no? - entonces su papá *‘sque dice*: "De donde viendo los picas de las moscas - voy cerrar su hueco!" - Se va dice - agarrando una bola de - barro - - paque cierra el hueco - entonces - se va querer cerrar así - pero no sé como dice se bota - en otra parte!


(DHR2a): *(¿y si les espantas al perro - que no haga su hueco, que no llora - no va morir?)* - no va morir porque ‘tas esparando pues - por eso dice - - ‘Ya! aquí ‘tas cavando ahí - porque ‘tas - ‘tas haciendo malaguero dice - Le talea, se larga! - Y le cierra su hueco ahí - Es porque no va morir dice - Aja. - Lora: sales de noche a paliarle porque hacen malaguero, te voy matarte! - le dice - su dueño pues ya de colera: Hen! - el perro se manda (gesture for leaving) de noche porai - Y porai se va llorar - porque - oohy - es seguro que va haber muerto dice - \|-- muerto no - no de tu casa - pero de otra parte - aja - Vas escuchar que ‘ta llostando otro. - Así - *(cómo le espantas?)* - aja *(¿pero cuando cava acá en tu casa - eso dice que su dueño a cualquier)* - aja - cualquier de tu familia puede morir, así. -


(GSR01): El hecho esa venganza - el! novios le han llevado a Iquitos - - le han hecho ver con un médico también - Y el médico dice le ha dicho que sí - como si estaría mirando, le ha dicho. - En tu pueblo hay un hombre gordo, chato - eso lo que hecho dí - ha dicho - Dea nomás es, no es de otra parte

(GSR08): Después le hace a sus tios - también - les ha hecho mono ya - Mhm - - monton de cosas haciendo se largado ya - - Se largado en otra parte, otra caserio ya quízis --

(JRR03) Aaaantes dice - hacía -- cualquier! - -- no gente! - pero gente dice es! - A?! - pero - porai - se va - no gente! - - Ya - entonces ahí dice - ya bueno - - Maneció - se ido qbrndu - qbrndu - enterrado - puro hueso va. - Ya, ahi nos va a comer - vamos otra parte - que dice - - Ya dice - otro, a sus - donde sus amigos dice se ha ido - - - ¿Para que no coma pues ellos también! Rabiando le va acabarle ya! vamos - se ido - han seguido - pero no han podido dice - Ahi - se ha parado.

(JPS01): *(aprender idiomas - los ídawas - y ganan plata con esto? - como funciona esto?)* - así hermano: ellos quieren aprender nuestro dialecto - y ellos se van en otra parte - y con ese ganan - se hacen plata ellos - porque ellos ‘tan enseñando a otra - y ese persona les paga a ellos

(MVO1) *(¿y con sus hijos hablaban este?)* - con sus hijos pues - con el - ese viejo Benigno - ese entiende, sabe - baudilio también entiende, pero no tanto el - - ahora por décira ya - este - la vieja Olga, Ohoy - ese sabe bastante. - Este X. - ese viejo dah - Haruto - esos hablaban con eso nomás pues - con su padre, su madre. - - (X) Y! - Ese sabe bien - Casi no quiere hablar - ellos no quiere ser - nativo pues - - - - - - - - - - - - - son gente de otra parte!

(RPH02): Y todo eso me contaba - - Pu! - antes dice era bien jodido - ellos peleaban dice con los Chamas. - Los capanahuanas. - ellos cruzaban dice - Se iba por Comitamana, casi todo que andaban - (? - así pues chachero - así pasaba antes - *(eso te contaba tu abuelo o abuela?)* mi abuela me contaba eso dahí - *(abuela)* - mhm mi abuela - *(o sea eran sus gente)* - aja
sus gente pues — O sea que ellos dice vivían donde que habían animales. - Ya no había ahi — iban a otra parte - A veces los Chamas les seguían, les hacían correr. - que para que hagü pues — Y ellos también le afloraban — Y los Chamas corrian.


(RM01) (*me decias que una parte que vivia ací - una parte ha salido - tenia su dinero y salido - y han quedado la gente humilde - como es este?) — claro — - - Claro, lo que tenían mas posibilidades se fueron a otra parte pues — Ya no le utilizan pues a a esta lengua ya pues - () ellos estan por Iquita, Lima, mayormente toda la gente están distribuyendo- por todos lugares - no estan en una sola. — — (VPB06): la mujer se jalado en la casa - -todo chancado - llegado ahi — ahi - una semana la mujer sin comer. — Y sv en patio taba pudriendose. — A la hija le manda mirar a su mamá - llevando comida. + El hombre - que se muerá pues le hecho asi - total la mujer es mas resistencia de hambre pues amigo Lucas - aja — Ahi le dado comor su hija, le bañado - de una semana - le hecho bonito, le ha puesto en su hamaca — un mes sentado la mujer - paque se sana ese degui? - 2-3 meses - sana la mujer ya

(Loos & Loos 1976a: 58-59): 136 Jaa shion cohto quebencatsiñqui bi que jenquetasajari jai can jaya huaca tejabahti huetsancon potaquin= 136 Yo quería taparles el hueco a los mosquitos pero de alguna manera una corriente me llevavo a no sé donde, y recién llego. 452 He traído unas cositas para sembrar.

(b) OTHER SIDE OF AN OBSTACLE: ‘ta yendo otro lado - Oy le voy seguir: — me ido me ido me ido le escapado - golpiendo con remo; Total tunchi ha salido del bosque - asi de frente - del otro lado! fiïun fiïun!: Chimbado al otro lado; al otro lado dice están del Cerro!; Fernandez Marquez - ahi, al otro lado vivía; Humaitá sale pues al otro lado — ‘ta se va asi, Humaitá sale aquí, un repartimiento. ahi dice vive pues; los Chumos vivían este lado - y los Huaninges porá del otro lado: Dahí dice ha venido Chama, dice, Kunibo. Al otro lado, caserio — uuum. Hay una quebrada que le llaman Kunibo - alli vivian; De alli me iba pasiar por alli, mi abuelo, abuela, en la tarde venia — muchacho pues. — (*) solitos vivían ellos, al otro lado. Este lado era caserío también, cuatro casas tambien - pero ellos vivían en la banda, los dos viejos.

OTHER SIDE OF PIERCED SURFACE: Por eso mi abuelo est — saaa — bien asi doble — ssrrr — -otro lado pasaba el platan. — Y esa lengueta que tenía +++ohoy — Y asi; un balista deste doble — pues quuee... — yaa te traspasa a un lado ya.

(b) HOQUE ADV. DETRÁS DE; MÁS ALLÁ DE: Papa hoque mama tashotinin tashotax bisitati. Mama hoque ribhi hea tashotix tashoxon jato jisquín. Mamá estaba sentada detrás de papá y se reía. Y yo, sentado detrás de mamá, observaba a los dos.

(2012: 100-01) 451 — ‘Hen tah hen shion cohto quebeni cahipishbi tah hen huenan cannish tah hen hahui min. 452 Hono jahuemanano rah heya huaca tejabahta cannish tah hen hahui. 453 Jano hahui qui tah hen banatibo romishinya hea hahui = pero fue a otra parte. Ahora regresó. 452 Alguna corriente me llevó a no sé donde, y recien llego. 453 He traído unas cositas para sembrar.

(Loos & Loos 1976a: 76-77): Hen tah hen hiniabho shio jaromanen hea pijana quebennon hiliquish jahuexbi tah hen janoma jano huaca heya tejabahta, chiponqui catanin ta hen hahui, min, chocan — hah qui jaquin — Huaca jaroma heya tejabahta. = tos sufrían la molestia de mosquitos feos, y venia a pararles el nido, cuai a otra parte donde una corriente me llevó hacia abajo, hermana — dijo. — Vengo después de haber estado arrostrado por una corriente fuerte.

(Loos & Loos 1976a: 77): Hen tah hen hiniabho shio jaromanen hea pijana quebennon hiliquish jahuexbi tah hen janoma jano huaca heya tejabahta, chiponqui catanin ta hen hahui, min, chocan — hah qui jaquin — Huaca jaroma heya tejabahta. = tos sufrían la molestia de mosquitos feos, y venia a pararles el nido, cuai a otra parte donde una corriente me llevó hacia abajo, hermana — dijo. — Vengo después de haber estado arrostrado por una corriente fuerte.

(2012: 100-01) 451 — ‘Hen tah hen shion cohto quebeni cahipishbi tah hen huenan cannish tah hen hahui min. 452 Hono jahuemanano rah heya huaca tejabahta cannish tah hen hahui. 453 Jano hahui qui tah hen banatibo romishinya hea hahui = pero fue a otra parte. Ahora regresó. 452 Alguna corriente me llevó a no sé donde, y recién llego. 453 He traído unas cositas para sembrar.

(b) OTHER SIDE/EMERGE ON THE OTHER SIDE: (ibid.:129): chitiñi v.r. detenerse Ponte cahi bi bonco jahuem catitahwi. Cahi bi bonco qui chitiñi. Jañbi, naman taxbataiñi huliquichahinax hoque piecohainxi cahi. El pensaba llegar directo a su destino pero se detuvo debido a la maleza. Sin embargo, logró encontrar un pequeño claro debajo del monte tupido por donde pudo pasar.


(301): maraathi v.n. pasar por encima de Chahin, hen misquixon maque bichi bi ta heen monto maraahi jenencenayca paquetiñqui. Nonti pextiñ huca bi nonti qui naneyamahi. Hoque paqueti jenencenayca maraahi. Primo, quando pesqué una piraña, la jale pero pasó por encima de mi canoa y cayo al agua. A pesar de que la canoa estan ancha, no cayo en ella. Pasó sobre la canoa y cayo al agua por el otro lado.

(777): Huen hoque queaxho queaxah neque queoxa poquejaqueehi coca. Hoque queaxho yomerataní. Después de haber ido a cazar al otro lado del río, el tío cruzó de nuevo a este lado.

ON BOTH SIDES (EXTREMITIES): (ibid.: 172): Huino ta hoqueñ behecon bi quehsho jaqiiñi. () La macana es afilada en ambos lados.
hoquenbehoconbi. La macanita tiene filo solamente en un lado. Una macana tiene doble filo.

Huen hoque queiba hiso repih. Hay un grupo de maquisapas no muy lejos del otro lado del río.

Hoquen banaquin rebessquin sirí sirijaquín. Sembró muy bien hasta el extremo del otro lado (de la chacra).

Pareteti s. macanita Pareteti ta ramiho huesti quehshoya qui. Huino cahen hoquenbehoconbi. La macanita tiene filo solamente en un lado. Una macana tiene doble filo.

Tiemne machete dese tamañ. -al lado del señor -Loos & Loos 1976a: 153

(Thompson 19346): Nequebi quesca qui jai rahan, rohan, joni. 24 Gritaban de la misma manera en que se grita acá en el este. "Ding!", "Que pues tiene ese huaihuashi dice, andando ahí esto es el lado cercano,

(Loos & Loos 2003: 165).

hoquen "on opposing extremities."

(Thompson 1997): What, Loos asked an elder, was the Capanahua word for "world," this place where people live? The elder looked at the ground. "Dirt," he replied in Capanahua. Not satisfied with that, Loos explained that "world" in the Bible has more to do with all people, everywhere, than it has to do with the land. The elder suggested, "Nequebihabo." It means "all the people on this side of the sky and all the people on the other side." [actually seems to translate as: neque+bi+hahbo = "all those contained on this very side"]


LADO O "SIDE", CAN BE USED IN THE EXPRESSIONS:

- En su lado, (close) next to someone:
  - al lado del señor; en tu lado, también – nuestra kaya; Venía echar así a mi lado; “Que pues tiene ese huaihuashi dice, andando ahí esto es el lado cercano,

(Loos & Loos 1976a: 118) nekesá – this side already / neke - este lado vs. otro lado, (also "tierra," mai) - heaven, other land, "other side"

(Thompson 1997): What, Loos asked an elder, was the Capanahua word for "world," this place where people live? The elder looked at the ground. "Dirt," he replied in Capanahua. Not satisfied with that, Loos explained that "world" in the Bible has more to do with all people, everywhere, than it has to do with the land. The elder suggested, “Nequebihabo.” It means “all the people on this side of the sky and all the people on the other side.” [actually seems to translate as: neque+bi+hahbo = "all those contained on this very side"]


tu vas mirar un lado de ojo; Un lado era así en su negro de su ojo; tran! -un lado le sacado su pierna; Ambos lados – sus ojitos eran bien – charquitos – bien bien motishito; Algunos salen barrigon, algunos salen derecho, algunos sin brazo! – manquispos - alguns con un lado de pie, algunos cojitos; Ahí cuando duerme -se apegó así - con un lado – ahí - se cansa, de un lado: - otro lado – ahí – ese vive así; Y pisado era un lado como de uno, otro de tigre; se han ido rastrando por su trocha de tigre - un lado de cristiano; le han mandado, le han hecho ciego un lado bien, para que el otro se lleva la potencia de los dos lados
OFF TO ONE SIDE:

Un día, cerca de la noche, el hombre se quedó solo en el campo. La luna brillaba en el cielo, iluminando todo lo que estaba a su alcance. El hombre miró hacia el sur, hacia el campo de arroz que había plantado meses atrás. Los tallos de arroz se balanceaban suavemente en el viento, creando un sonido suave y relajante.

LEAVE ASIDE:

A la mañana siguiente, el hombre levantó el arado y comienza a trabajar en el campo. La suela de sus zapatos se enredaba en la tierra húmeda, dejando marcas profundas en el suelo. El hombre siguió trabajando, sin darse cuenta de lo que estaba pasando.

Los animales se acercaron al hombre, buscando alimentos. Los pájaros cantaban en el árbol cercano, alentando el aire con sus plumas. El hombre no parecía notar su presencia.

loS “REACH/EMERGE ON THE OTHER SIDE”/“GO THROUGH TO THE OTHER SIDE”

Los ojos del hombre se cerraron, y se quedó profundamente dormido. En su sueño, vio una ciudad brillante con edificios altos y brillantes. La ciudad le llamaba, pero él no sabía cómo llegar.

FROM THE OUTSIDE OF THE CONTAINER:

El hombre se despertó, sorprendido por el sueño. No recordaba cómo llegó al lugar donde se había quedado dormido. Sin embargo, sabía que debía seguir adelante, siguiendo el camino que había marcado en su sueño.

FROM AN AREA:

Estábamos en el bosque, observando el cielo nocturno. La luna brillaba en el cielo, iluminando todo lo que estaba a su alcance. Los pájaros cantaban en el árbol cercano, alentando el aire con sus plumas. El hombre no parecía notar su presencia.

loS (VPB06): Ve un hueco así huecazo - bajo de tierra. — Ve dice: porá dice se va a través de la sangre, porá entrada! — () Oy me voy a mirar - se va a través - . En Entrado el hombre también + así huecazo dice: — — Y me decía así - así dice termina la tierra. — Mhmm — por eso taba preguntado si es así — — — (GSR06)

loS (DHHR2): (si hay en cielo vivien los muertos y Dios en cielo - por qué lo vemos - azul nomás ?) - que cosa - el cielo - (ajá no se ve nada - ¡) - azul - ese es la primera capa del cielo - ese azul - Ese es porque va seguir verano - bien verano - - el alto - aíta: - otra ya - - otra capa - - es lo que vive ahí el Señor. - - lo que manda llama y así como cerrador dice es - - - otra capa - - - - - porque el avión anda - por bajo dese azul - cuando hay lluvia más bajo - el se va - por el alto también - mirando por donde es lindo - - se va. — Dejando ese tempestad - ese anda - se seviva ya - - se va mirando por donde es limpio o - - asi - igual que anda el motor también pues - bajo palo palizada - por donde que es libre - porá te vas. — así. — () (Pero 2 capas nomás?) - 2 nomás - el azul y blanco donde que 'ta el Señor. - Aíta - (eso otra capa ya no se ve de aca?) - @ - (re) recien cuando te mueres te vas porá. (¡) cuando mueres - te haces bien jovencito. - La vieja se hace bien señora Bien! - Mejor te deja tu carapa ya pues - Ahi - - en su sepultura ya - - El yushin se va jovencito - Bien jovien - - Tu mujer lo que mueren - aíta señora - pero ahí te entregas otra vez te reune ahi con tu mujer ya - ahi vives. - Te recibe alegre - abrazado - - hoy - - tu viendo mi viejo () Ven ya - te lleva ya - en camino angosto - No sigues camino ancho - vamos por acá-te dice —.

loS (Loos & Loos 1976a: 126-27): 14 Hueque qui cahi can, jaya nonñ. 15 Nescari jene betanbi senen nai jaiłvi naman hiqachinah. 16 Cahi, hocaspahichapirbaicquis. 17 Nescapa sirirhichisba qui, hoque. (….) 19 Jisjaquehtan jan jañbi qui … nescabire qui jai rahan. 20 Nescaibiressi, nihi yaaamaa. 21 Jahan honanax cahtimahi [my trans.: 14 He went to other side with his canoe. 15 This way, (arriving) where the water ends and sky begins, he entered (entirely) below. 16 He emerged into what was just the same (as here). 17 Beyond was just like here, (open space). 19 He looked around… it was really just the same as here. 20 Precisely the same, noooc vegetation whatsoever. 21 So his orientation was off.]. 14 Fue al otro lado, con su canoa. 15 Volteo abajo del horizonte. 16 Salió al otro lado a un mundo similar. 17 El otro lado era “tan bueno como este lado. (…) 19 Miro al rededor. Todo estaba despejado. 20 Era como esto. No había nada de monte. 21 No tenía cómo orientarse para ir.)

loS (DHHR10): No tiene nada - que se ha muerto, se ha muerto, no quiere nada! - lo que queremos es nosotros. — () - que cosa queremos ve: queremos nuestra plática, algunos azucarito, tu arroz, para tomar mingado — todo eso queremos. Los muertos no quieren nada! - Nada, nada, ni comer, - yushin ya. — (*nui quiere estar con nosotros) - nada, nada, \ \ no, están con nosotros de noche, sino nosotros no veemos pues. Aja. Aunque sea de día está con nosotros - don se está miraand. - pero nosotros no los
veamos dice pues. — () no quiere nada el muerto. Solo que queremos es nosotros. — Una vez que morimos nosotros también no queremos nada - Ni con que voy comprar mi ropa, mi pantalon, no tengo pantalon, dice ya. — Voy andar desnudo +++

(DHR19): así como 'tamos viviendo nosotros también — Migiando, trabajando, ohoy ya — Queriendo más plata así — su cosas, su camisa, su zapatos queriendo —

En nuestro corazñn también lo que sentimos fuerza. — con su mismo agua con su querido día. —

— Aja — dice aista: ~ se toma tó malitos que entra en mi corazñn — dice en la biblia, la vida de Cristo pues, como vivía antes. — Cristo — alegre — Dios le ha denunciado la señora. (*) el diablo le ha tentado. Le ha tentado el diablo en todas partes en su corazón por que hase esto - con su propia hija.

(DRS01): — entregan nuestro cuerpo espiritus malos - que dice? — sea que nosotros tenemos mal pensamiento — lo que que — entonces el mal espiritual que lleva en nuestro corazón — y tenemos malas ideas, malos pensamientos. — Ese es pues este que dice - Satanas - ese es el mal espiritual. — (que son malos pensamientos?) — piensas cosas malas — que — piensas robar, piensas ser otras cosas, con las mujeres que tienen marido — esos son malas ideas, malos pensamientos. — (que son los buenos pensamientos?) — es como vivir así, juntos, unidos, alegre. — Hmm — así como — dice en la biblia, la vida de Cristo pues, como vivía antes. — Cristo — alegre — Dios le ha denunciado la señora. (*) el diablo le ha tentado. Le ha tentado el diablo en todas partes en su corazón por que hase esto - con su propia hija.

(DRS04) — (pero cuando estás vivo?) — aya — si quízás pues. — puede entrar un — este — tiruma yúshin ya — malos espiritus en tu corazón — o sea que malas ideas, malos pensamientos ya. — Te dan malas ideas, mal pensamiento - todo eso... — porque el alma malo - 'ta entrado en tu corazón. — Más bien ese es el pecado ya pues. — (ajá, cuando entra shinan tiruma?) — mm — shinan tiruma ya! — Hmm, o sea que piensas mal — cuando el espiritu malo está en tu corazón. — (ese espiritu malo como parece - como cristiano?) — ¡bien! — como cristiano... \( y \) sea que esos son diablos así — ya no son cristianos ya — son los espiritus malos, espiritus del Satanas (Pero su cuerpo, apareiencia parece hombre nomás?) Hmmm. (usted no ha visto eso?) no — no he visto — — (ajá, entra como en su casita?) — Hmm, como que estaria abierta la puerta. (Y como se puede guardar la puerta - para que no entren?) — — con ayuda del señor. — (o sea tienes que orar) — orar, pedir a dios que te — que le echa fuera el diablo de tu corazón, pidiendo a dios.


Cit. (Don Benigno, si la sangre es parte del cuerpo, dice?) — mm si, — la sangre es parte de la carne pues — — si lo que circula en nuestras venas. — Aja. — — - Y la vena? - Sale desde el corazón, de su raiz del corazón, deai viene, que tengas tu sangre y te da fuerza. — todo eso sale del corazón. Eso. — )) — (como dice corazón? wí. wí...\}) — huinhti. — no no es winti ++ remo! — (ahi en nuestro corazón también lo que sentimos di?) si. (‘lo que pensamos también?) - claro pues - lo que pensamos. — — — — mhhmm — — si nuestro pensamiento sale todo de nuestro corazón: - que cosa voy hacer, que no voy hacer, a donde me voy, cuando voy a viajar: - taall día voy a viajar! - todo de nuestro corazón. Por medio de tu corazón: de tu boca ya, — sale. — Ya pues. —

Also cf. (Loos & Loos 2003: 247?): Huetsa ribhi nescari, jointi norontameti, chicho ronotai yohihi. Uno podría decir que el corazón está colgado en el centro del tórax.

(DHRo8): *(ya, pero me dices que, cuando recien está empezando a pensar: que otra almida viene también) — mhm - - - - - - - -en cuando empiesta andar ya? — - - - - ("pensar?") — - - aja, pensar, ya tiene su pensamiento ya pues — Ese ya tiene pecado ya pues — Le — ya tiene pues ya — pues tiene 5-4 años - 5 meses así — ya tiene su pecado ya también pues ya — Su pecado ya pues — se rancia con su madre — mmono — quiere chuchochu - quiere morderle. — su chucho - ese muchacho quiere morder ese chucho — Rabiendo con su madre. - El ta pecando a su madre pues — mmmmm — - - - -Ausi... los (BSRo1): *(Pero dice cuando ‘tas durmiendo - tu espíritu también sale a andar en otra parte?) - así dice hermano — Sale, pero cómo será... uno no se siente. Pero dice nuestro espíritu dice sale. Dice muchas personas, dice sale a vagar el mundo. ¿Cómo quizaes. - Y ya cuando viene... (.) cuando entra, mejor dicho, en tu carapa ya, en xakati pues — aja, en idioma dice saká, carapa dice. Así como ése [pointing to a coconut shell laying on the floor] — ése deaquí es pues — tapado acá, vej. -Ése... éste se comparece que... ése es tu cuerpo. Pero acá, éste, lo que tú le tapas: queda allá vacío. Ignéalo dice entra pues... nuestro yushin ya. *("Ahí adentro queda") pues, dentro pues hermano.

(DHRo9): *("Tu yushín queda afuera — como tu... como parece no?") — @ - ("El kaya? - adentro de tu")-adentro de tu cuerpo — tu kaya — El ‘ta adentro — ("Pero donde vivie ese kaya en tu corazón quizás?") cabeza) @ --- — cuando alguna cosa te asusta — Shhhhh! (startled) — sale de tu cuerpo! — Ya — ya me asustado ya — Te asusta — porque ‘tas andando con tu kaya pues — te asusta sup — — — En tu corazón. — novés corazón te asusta? — ("No es tu cabeza?") — no cabeza — tu corazón — dañ que sale cuando te asusta— palpita — tttktt! — Peor cuando ves un jergón así — PuuCha! — te asusta — sssssacacacac — Trán! — brínicas de miedo — mirando ese jergón — tu kaya ta: trtrtrtr — palpitando ya tu corazón — ohoy ya — Miras jergón — ahí le dejas — Mmmmm — Te largas — Alg le matan — aaahn- le deja matando ahí — Mmmmm — Y así... —-

(JRRo3): (AAA) Aaaantes dice hacia... - cualquier!... No gente!... Pero gente dice es! A?!... Pero... porá se va: no gente. —-

(GHR1): *(como ahuara ya) - como ahuara, igual que ha muerto Ronal! +++ Has sabido? ("no") - ayer a la mañana se ido a matar un chorro, igual que de Gamaar — igual que esta. Se ha ido matar en esa purma de la Llanet - Ahí dice estaban andando 2 choros: un macho y una hembra. — A la hembra le corta aquí ve. — — Mi - estaba llamando rancho! - era su minga ayer. Me voy mirar el chorro 'ta echado en su cocina. — (breathing through the nose) - así yendo ve! - ("vivo todavía?") vivo! - ‘ta mirando - pero respiraba, no moría. Así estaba bien cortado. ----- por eso han dicho que es ahuara - nadies le ha comido. Solo Javico creo le ha comido. — Leider hecho su mazamorra para venir a comer dice tarde. - que voy comer yo! - — Nunca he visto chorro que anda en la purma! — (el macho se largado) Solo la hembra ha muerto. *(Pero así hace el demonio entonces? viene a la purma) - yo pienso que sí. — ("Pero yo pensaba que ese ahuara sería ese maquizapa - pero chorro también puede ser?") ----- — porque una vez allá en Buncuya he sabido que por Ucayali, Zapatilla creo - han muerto a un - una maquizapa — lo que ‘ta comiendo dice maduro así atrás de su casa nomás. - le han muerto a la maquizapa - y la mujer también estaba enferma. A gritos estaba la mujer! - y se muerto! — Y así dice que va a ser así - total nadies. — mhm, cuando le matan a su alma - ese ratito dice también pues su - cuerpo. () derepente de otra parte habrá venido.

("papá también hablaba de ese ahuara") mhm *("idioma") ahuara nomás! *(mula conocía tu papá, deso hablaba?) — aja, *(a) así mismo, mula. — Así pues le han hecho al chorro. Y así vive le han puesto en la candela - le han chamuscaba. - como miraba - ve así - le hacía juzgar a su ojo: (breathing heavily): decía. — (K: y no han visto que está vivo?!) Así le chamuscaba Ronal! como me daba miedo! — como quejaba - mhi! mhi! mhi! — No quería mirar, me largado a mi casa. - Así le estaba chamuscando así vivo *(no quería morir) @ — como hacía juzgar a sus ojos... —- y último respiro dice hecho así ve — (breathing out heavily, as if
annoyed) - con eso dice se ha ido ya - estaba mirando la Rosita. último respiro dice hecho bien largo — mhm. —— (*que clase de animal será...) — nnn — si habrá sido choro legítimo - no sé. — Endemoniado quizás. —— Primera vez he visto que ha muerto así en la purma - y a machacato — ni siquiera bailando así... ——

lxxv (DHR06): (*y como le abortan, que usan para eso?) ese aborta dice queriendo comer alguna cosa - queriendo comer algún — quiere tomar un gasiosa, pan con gasiosa. — Malísimo! - quiere comer dice unghurahu - si no le hace cas - eso cae dice. — Cae la criatura. — quiere comer - y la criatur quería comer también aquí adentro dice pues. — Sale de plooh, dice sale. — (*) (cuando siente que quiere tomar gasiosa, tiene que tomar gasiosa) sí pues - es porque él muchacho también quiere adentro. — así esta... — Algun huayo — zapote, quiere comer malis' simo dice. — =f= - que cosa - y no hay! — como puede comer - dahí puede caer ya pues - porque la criatura ‘ta pidiendo ese dahí. — (*si no le dan - se molesta y) - molesta - cae - el mismo cae dice — plooh! —
Asha, ahihuaita. ——


lxxxi (DHR2A): — lo que comemos ya pues — está ahí en nuestra pansa, su muela está llena ya — nuestro xaku está aparte. — está aparte ahí — ese comes una fruta — el también está comiendo — Tomas bushman — ese no quiere — ese te muerde ahí ve — te prende en tu carne, en tu nami se prende ahí — aista ve — -prendido, no quiere tomar ese trago fuerte -bata así — ahí abre su boquita tomando — paque queda bushiaspita.


lxxvii (DHR17): A la salida del sol y la de la entrada de sol - y saca su sangre. (...) Consejando le saca su sangre también. Corteza - dexe el cuerpo - otro lado también le saca. - Ahí queda ya.


lxxix (GSR01): (*y parece tan simpático, ¿no?) simpático parece pues... Pero no se le ve... por dentro. Porque este clase de persona se... () Cara se ve, pero corazón no.

lxxx (IT1208): During the evening preaching, the pastor from Fátima talks about pecado, being crucified with Cristo, along with him crucified sin, so that Cristo could live inside: botar, arrojar, pecado, pasado de pecar, instead: abrir al luz, nuevo, dios. Besides, often mentioned: a) cuerpo: e.g. cuerpo comín — when it comes, in the future, there won’t be separate people, those from Limón Cocha, those from Fátima, those from St Elena: there will only be the cuerpo común! — and other examples of cuerpo. b) enemigo — siempre está esperando, pecado, satanas, others who try to cheat them, mame them, sects, liars - enemigo, pecado! —

lxxv (GHR06): Por eso digo yo — me habrá castigado, porque una cosa he hecho contra él que no le gusta — entonces digo - pido al señor para que me limpie, lava mi corazón - y que así me perdona las cosas lo que hago - aquí en la tierra - por propio respeto, por propio lo, ideas que pasemos uno. Por eso es lo que — cuando se piensa una cosa, cosas de naturaleza - se peca. Si queremos hacer una cosa - se pide al señor para que nos da, nos ayude, nos apoye, no. Entonces - sino que tenemos que pedir con fe! - si el señor me va a dar, entonces hay que pedirles. Entonces antes —mos que pensar - nos da y nosotros no nos damos cuenta. Así

(DHR06): así como ‘tamos conversado no - no es pecado, ‘tamos conversando cosas de bueno - Señor ‘ta escuchando — donde que te vas - ahí ‘ta el Señor - ‘ta cuidando — Te vee. que vas a comer, que te va de comer — por eso dice - otra dice - que voy a comer manana? — No digas así! — El Señor sabe que te va dar a comer. — Solo el Señor sabe - que te va dar - un alimento — que te va regalar tu vecino - otro. — Mal es: "que voy a comer" - no! solo el Señor sabe —

lxxxii A sample of reduplication uses in LUS and Capanahua:
- a continuous or repetitive activity: himihimi' [lit. "bleed-bleed", or menstruating], llorando-llorando [crying] hablando-hablando [talking];
- state of distribution or uneveness: pau pauti [lit. "hold with arms-hold with arms" or with arms on the shoulders of others], caserio-caserio [dispersed villages], ventanita-ventanita [distributed little windows (in a longhouse)], un pedazito-un pedazito [bringing by small quantities], en casa-en casa [staying over in various houses], bula-bula [speak unevenly, with a strong accent], en partes-en partes [partially];
- emergent or intermediate quality: tibio-tibio [like warm], joven-joven [almost adult];
- smell: gasolina-gasolina [of gasoline], muerto-muerto [of a deceased]
**Appendix 7. Original quotes**

- or emphasis: *sina sinayama*[
  - not angry], hinchado-hinchado [very swollen]; nadies-nadies [completely noone]; demonio-demonio [quite a demon], barro-barro [pure mud], bota-bota [completely abandoned], bien mismo-bien mismo [the very same], legitimo-legitimo [the very real].

**BRS15:** Ilora acordando de antes, no — lo que ha sucedido — sus padres, sus madres — queda uno para dar ejemplo deso. — Ese, ejemplando a los antiguos — puede ser yo dí — puede hacer wini’i —: hablando en tu dialecto ‘tas llorando — pues —. Ese nadies te entiende — habiendo uno que te entiendo por ejemplo yo le entiendo en partes ese dahi — ‘ta llorando ella — mujer, no? — aísta — ese es bueno. — — (…)O sea como lo has dicho? — que una persona ‘ta ejemplando di? — mhm — por decir se muerto su hijo o su marido — así dí — Ese ‘ta haciendo ese — (‘Cmo puedes decir ejemplar en idioma?) — mhm — como — Ha — n-haskati — Mhm — nunhashkatí — Nosotros también para ser — para seguir ese mismo — ese mismo ejemplar di — Ejemplo de los antiguos. — (‘‘así como esos cuentitos no?) así pues — — — Winíi dice —

(‘osea este habla de cómo vivido ese persona que ya no existe di?) — sin no existes ya — todo eso habla pues — que cosa hecho — que no hecho di — — todo eso ‘ta hablando también — ‘ta llorando — Ha sido un hombre — trabajador, luchador en su vida — así ‘ta diciendo — O sea hombre que viendio durante su existencia — Ha hecho cosas en su vida — así habla eso — ‘ta llorando — por eso es oye muy triste, ilora pues — — (?)‘esos cuentos entonces que estamos hablando — -es eses te dan ejemplos también como ha sido di?) — así pues, así mismo es aí — por eso ‘ta llorando — un ejemplo que ha sucedido — (…) (BRS16): wini’i - así (*) ese es otro — como ‘tamos diciendo ya — ese es — eso son los ejemplos ya de los antiguos, pa’n hui. — — (‘que estaban diciendo en esto, pa’n hui?) — pa’n en hui, pa’n enanu - conversan fuerte! pues - cuando ‘tan borrachos - noves borrachos conversan fuerto, como Carlos - fuerte hablan - () es conversacion(‘de que están hablando en esto?) — eso hablan - ellos también de sus antepasados — pero ese no puedo explicarme yo también — pero como te digo, oí lo que decían ellos así - pa’n en hui’i (…) — Escuchado ellos hablan así, nukén xenibu dice. — Nukén xenibu pa‘uen hunihui. — Hablado dice de mariado tenían - hablanado todo lo que eran esos pues.

**ACH01:** “Pero gustó que te habia hecho vieja si no sabes nada!”

**RP07:** como que no existirá ‘te viejo, ‘te ancianito, mi abuelito pa que me —


**BRS10:** Hay su cuentos pues di — Como vivían antes. Ese… sus cuentitos. — — Ha quedado un ejemplo… de cuento de antes vivían.

**BRS13:** Ahi está, la historia de los antiguos: ejemplos. (*) Me contaba mi mamá también. Escuchaba. A veces en la noche, en la tarde: “Oy los voy contar un ejemplo” — decía mi mamá. () Ahí nos contaba mi mamá.

**BRS18:** - ooo — como se engendra esos [mellizos]! — Como será pues esto — paque sale así — Yo también me pregunto eso, por qué salen así. () Dice así debe. — Rabwe nane - así dice, tiene que estar los dos dice. — No así cruzados. — () Ese es desde antes, no. — acá también lo leído así. — Rabwe nane [two put inside] - De los primeros padres que hicieron eso — — Rabwe nane llamamos nstrs. Rabwe nane - dos mellizos.

**BRS03:** ‘hijos de Ezequiel son tus primos? — en cast mis primas ya di — y en capanahua — me decía mi padre: min awiintuinu — me decía mi padre — — () ese dice pueden ser tu — como es esto? — — O sea que esos son mis primas di — pero dice puede — ellos decian — puedas también — puede hacerte reunir tu díce con tu prima — y te hace de familia — entonces — paque la raza no poderia: — si tú quieres pues hacer de tu — puedes unirte con ella — si tú no quieres pues no —. Aja — pero aun — que puedes unirte — porque — si se desune desa familia — pues la familia se va perder como te digo — Se termina pues — donde vas aumentar tu generación — cuando — tú ya te vas hacierte de familia — con otra — otra raza de — persona ya. — Por eso ya pues min awiintuinu — tus primas — — asi ya sigue! — Entonces — — entonces — dahi ya — desa familia va aumentando ya — y los otros tambien van siguiendo haciendo otra familia mas — dí? — — Ese pues ya no puede entender ese ya — Porque igual que en la biblia pues — como te quiero hacer entender — pero no veo: de… vamos decir de Jacob, de Abran, de Isaac — todo es — Habido generación — y más generación - seguia aumentando - no — sé como te habla la religion también — eso también yo no puede entender de Isaac — había otra — — — Ese dice - ese — como me estas preguntando — “de tu - que van hacer esos ya +++ — Sigue asi — un montón — no termina! — Aja — Esos son buenos ejemplos que decimos ahí — no dejar pues como te diggo — — como —. Ahi va — hanepa — no sé que le dice en la biblia, lo que ha escrito don Eugenio — Isaac — bake kan - nun epabu — no sé que dice ahi — aísta ve. — Eso pues yo no le puedo entender también — Solo puede leer la biblia, pero ya no puede — — Hasta aquí puede — yo puedo alcanzar como te diggo —

Sus — sus hijos de mis tías — de mi tios — ellos son mis primas di — como te digo, con ellos puedo yo unirme — hago donde ellos — — Y esos hijos como va ir multiplicando - más adelante - como le puedo tratar? — Y eso yo pues no puedo ya \| \| — solamente hasta ahi puedo yo entender — hauen… epabu — pero sigue más adelante! — que quizás ya pues — Aja — es una cantidad de palabras — para decir — para — a — cantidad — — — (‘‘Pero esto recuerdas todavía?) — - eso recuerdo todavía — nuestros nietos — y los nietos — nuestros nietos también van tener hijos — Esos hijos van a seguir aumentado nomás — pero ya como pues sera ese pues dahi ya? — (*) ya no puede yo saber como se va tratar ya — - - - Porque como te digo - en mi libro leo — dice — la primera creacion de — Adam y Eva — es lo que se han — lo que se ha formado la generacion ya — De — este — como se llama — Adam y Eva… dahi viene — de Jacob — un montón — di — Ese nos hacer leer en libro de Genesis — Ahi empieza pues — — — nomás — que vienen - su hijo del julano - como se llamaba — Y pues dahi — como era pues — más por adelante. — Y así sigue — eso yo no puedo ya... —

**GR04:** me decía mi papá: ‘Hazte oir lo que te cuentan, me decía — en la tarde que me contaba di — Yo huamabra pues - ahi me quedaba dormir: [hitting] Hazte oir! me decía - Hazte oir - o yo no te voy a contar: algun dia cuando tienes hijos, - paque
cuentas a tus hijos me decía - Ahí me asustaba mi papá: ‘toy oyendo, papí - le decía! +++ (engañando!) (*Peró ya sabías todo, no?) — yo — sabía pues - — Así como la Minerva quízás - así me contaba mi papá. (*Peró verdad que lo dices a tus hijos o no?)! — No los digo nada a mis hijos. — Mhm — a veces... - a veces les cuento — el otro día les he contado de - Achśquín Vieja.  

**Another example:**  
(HOC01): (...) a mi ya vuelta me contaba así mi tía — Uuuu - yo tenía sueno ya - no, quiero dormir ya decía yo - Pero antiguos no querían dormir! - Ruke hanishiki [Kapabu?] matu yu’iunun! Wsetsatun matun bakebu yu’axanun [what they would say about the Squirrel Lad I am going to tell you. So that in another time you tell it to your children].-nos decía — así me contaba tu abuela paque digan, un día cuando tienes tus hijos - me decía a mi. (...) -Yo quiero dormir ya! - le decía yo. Ninkakatsiama’i! - decía: “no quienes escucharnos” - “Ya he eido! le decía yo! ++++ (!) sí, me decía mi. finada también.  


señ (AFCO1): Así me contaba mi mamá. No sé si así quízás era cierto... Como es cuenta...  

(GSR06): (*Ese de la luna — por qué me has preguntado sí había gente ahí?) — la luna? — aya... - Porque... - Por qué sea pues - que de verdad los scientificos llegan allá? —Mhm... Ese ‘taba preguntando, sí es verdad que llegan a la luna. (*Como piensas — era ese hombre que vivía con su hermana?) - nunissabe [ni se sabe] —— (*Así se creado, o...) —— icóm? Pero en la Biblia dice que Dios ha creado a la luna, al sol. — Mhm — Bueno, ese sera cuenta... (*Cuento nomás entonces?) — yo pienso así... —— (*Eso de la Biblia será más cierto entonces?) — No sé pues — —¿qué es lo que piensas tú? —— (*Piensos que nadies sabe como era) — por todas partes gente tiene sus cuentos deso. Nadies no ha visto — Porque ese era antiguo-antiguo Mhm... así me decía mi papá. —— Por eso pues digo ya: Cómo dice en la Biblia que Dios ha creado todo: luna, sol, estrellas, la tierra... Mhm? ¿Cómo se puede formar de un hombre? — Ese pienso yo a veces... —— (* ¿Cuentos pueden ser errados?) yo pienso así... —— (*Por le estaban diciendo, pues) Nnnoo ssé pues... Por eso digo yo: es cuentro. Ese es. Un... nada más, iún CUENTO! (...) (*nadies sabe como era. Dios es un cuento de judeos) Ese será cuento pues... ese es una historia pues. Una historia que... - que Dios ha hecho.  

(JRR05): ¡Ya! ¡Ahora vamos a engañarnos un ratito!  

señ (BRSO9): a su mujer ahí ya le usaba ya - ahí aumentaba ++++++++! pucha +++++así me contaba mi mamá. - lo que le contaba dice su - abuebli \\ - su madre dice le contaba a mi mamá así - Hawera nuken xenibu hapa’unkishki, liun - me contaba mi mamá. —— no sé como se llama ese envase que le recogen pues aquí — +++++ por acá dice! +++++ — Varios hay de los antiguos que contaba - pero yo ya —- Sino no me hace acordar - entonces yo ya pues me olvido! Aja, pero cuando conversamos, siempre nos hacen acordar di? - y se puede conversar pues. - () (*te gusta recordar?) - me gusta reir acordando lo que hacían por acá dicce ++++++++! —- no sé como pues le ha visto a ese shiun - ese pues no podían chocar la vagina de la mujer pues - porque dicce que dicce que: “tremenda llaga es que dicen ells - sipi, sipi’wan! - llaga dice - ahir’un - heaven sipi’wan - por eso no chocaban dicce ahí. - (*tienen miedo?) miedo + + [Kinga enters] (me hace reir mi mamá cuando me contaba: “Como le van hacer por acá mamá?” - “Los antiguos dicce pues - han por ahí”. — no sé como se llamaba ese que recogian - tiene su nombre, maxen - no se como. — Maxen - decimos el huino — pero otro nombrecito hay — () ahí dice crecía pues el niñito ahí - sea hombre o mujer - pero crecía en ese envase - cuando llegaba su tiempo, dice - reventaba ahí - su lullu ya pues parecía, así como que tiene ahorita.  

señi Joni behnatin, nea mai behna Diosen jato jonihaha jiheucani [At the time when the people were fresh/new, this earth was fresh/new, God still lived with the people that he made] (Loos & Loos nd.b); Jaatían ca hisin yamahii, joni behnatin, mondo behnatin. [At that time, there was no disease, people were fresh/new, the world was fresh/new] (Loos & Loos 1976b: 26); Xenibo qui joni behnatin [At the time when the old ones were fresh/new] (Loos & Loos 1976b: 116); neutema, joni behnatin [long ago, when people were fresh/new] (Loos & Loos nd.a).  


(BRS10): Dios ha puesto ya a los hombres en la tierra — que tengan ya... - las iglesias en sus casas y que sean fieles para Dios. — Porque Cristo dice hecho el principio muriendo en la cruz - para que los judíos ahí ya le han agarrado y le han traído su preso. — Primero le han paliado con palo, con espinas le han picado y... — Y nuevamente dice le han colgado en la cruz del Calvario - ahí. — Por ejemplo dice 7 pulgadas de clavo, aquí picar; - ahí que esté ‘ta ahí cruzado ahí. Ahí también. — Mirave. — Haciendo el ejemplo dice paque — nosotros suframos ya para el pecado. El paga del pecado dice pues la muerte: dice en la escritura. Paque nosotros los hijos que somos - ya, - después ya... - paguemos ese pecado. — Si queremos ser salvo, dice - debemos ser fio con el Senor. - Alabando, escuchando sus Santo Palabra...  

(RP07): Y así que usted, Adán - él es de hueco \( \text{\textbackslash} \) de tierra", le he dicho. "Polvo de tierra. El día que te mueres: polvo de tierra volveras. Tienes 5 sentidos, le dice - de hueco ves - de hueco respiras - y de hueco orinas y de hueco cagas. Y al hueco de tierra...
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volveras. La sepultura.‖ - le dice Jesucristo a Adán. \\ Y desa manera a nosotros nos sepultan. Porque el dejñ el ejemplo - muriñ
en el cruz de Calvario - tan solo por nuestro pecado.
cii (MHC01): Quedado en la luna, hasta ahorita. Por ese tiene esa mancha. Y dahí su castigo es: cada luna que menstrua mujer, todo
eso por eso. (*) Cñmo ya… ése dice le puesto ya su recuerdo a ése, dejando empreðado: mensualmente ‗ta… – para cada mujer.
Su herencia de él ha dejado. Castigo.
ciii (DHR07): Se mandñ dejandonos ya. Por eso estamos nostros ve: sufriendo, cultivando… Sacar yuca, botar al agua… turrar. Si
no, no iba ser así dice pues. Con su poder nomás de él: ¡aísta! tu fariða, ¡aista! tu… todo… ¡tu chacra todo hecho! Te daba nomás
ya dice. Todo hecho. Cada uno su chacra: chacra, chacra. Pero eso va… \\ no vas a cuidar nada. En su poder de él: otra vez va
estar yuca así. ¡No se va terminar nunca! Mhmm… Nunca, nunca no va terminar. Así-así va vivir.
civ (BRS13): Ese tiempo dice no había gente malvado — como robaban pues — palo de yuca: por eso que roban ahora pues — Aja,
ha ejemplado ya pues — el ladrñn ya — Les roban yuca.
cv(BRS13): (*Como me decías antes que los antiguos tenían miedo del chishpi di?) — aja — tenían miedo dice — no querían dice
usar a la mujer — Tenían miedo - decían que es este — sipiwan — ’’ — tremenda dice le veían pues — por eso ellos dice no — —
-no le usaba a la mujer — como te digo — por aquí nomás le daban pues — acá abajo — y la mujer recogia — así ~gado - cuento
de mi mamá que me contaba —— por eso ellos no conocian su parte de la mujer pues — Antes, los hombres — () - Tenían miedo que le decían sus madres: no, ese no se debe tocar. — (*) es una herida grande — sipiwan — como le llama eso? — cuando te
forma una herida grande - como llama? (*angochupa) — no, otra hay — ese va huequiando tu carne - — como se llama eso? ——
— tiene su nombre, —— -noves muchas veces la gente tiene por aquí no — así grandazo — y su canto es medio - rojo! — ~
pudriendo —— como se llama es — — Nosotros decimos llaga a eso. — Pero hay otro nombre. —— Uta! — la uta! - dice va
comiendo carne — ese carne va pudriendo y va — Sino te cura, va — — Va — hacerse así grande pues — — Y eso dice se referian
ellos, los antiguos — que ese no vale es —— sipiwan — Una llaga grande — por no querían ellos — Antiguamente no le usaban ahí
— () ’’’’’’’Ahí ! trabajando puu‘ — se formaba pues - -cuando reciba ahí —— ’’ — De un envase — — lindo como este —
finito — ellos recibian - - Ahí dice crecia pues la criatura — ya se va — crecienndo — Se iba haciendose grande — hasta que llega
tiempo de que va — reventar ya —Ploo! — ya — ya salido muchacho ya — No salia por vagina — aja —— Todos esas cosas a veces pensando a veces tengo miedo. ——
cvi (DHR07): (*y donde se largado Cristo?) — ‗ta allá — ese que nos vee nomás — Jesus — ese ha llevado su tierra de el — como que
tenía sus plantas, sus yucas — El se largado — (*con todo la tierra) — — aista su yuca- -ahí hay todo dice — (*donde?) — en cielo
— Y nosotros nos quedamos sufirnedo, haciendo chacra ya — así nos ha maldecido a nosotros ya — así vivirá — haciendo chacra,
dicho ya pues — Robando — Traicionando — así! — por eso algunos traicioneros — con su maridos — la mujer traicionera - por
ahí pues. ——
cvii (RPH02): El dice está viniendo ya! pues ese hombre Yawísníka dice — -cargando su olla, alegre así viene — Yooou! — como
esta? — ―Ya tenido ya! — ‗squeledice —— - — ‗ta rabiando: ―‗ta! madre, dice — caraj! — Chaaah! — dice le botado a su olla lo que
estaba yuca rallado — polvia todito. — así van a venir! — Teniendo hijos por sus culu! — así van aumentar - dice diciendo —
hablando hablando ya! — Y se ha ido ya —
El dice está pensann‘d — agarraba dice su hamaca, su machete - todo lo que tenido dice - le botaba al agua — usted vete hacerte
boa - dice le decía a su hamaca. — Ploom! — Una boa dice se iba — A su machete: — ese… — atingas — a su palanca, lo que
palancaba yuca dice le botaba: hacía anguilla —— Todo! — que lo que que voy hacerme yo — decía el ya —— Aver. — voy hacerme
sol. —— Sol — les quema! la gente — que dice — -O me voy hacer la Luna — la Luna tampoco! — — - Voy hacerme palo bien
grande! — que nadie puede derribar — pero cortando también le derriba! — — Escogia dice el - que va hacerse — así — dice —
paraba — por último, me voy hacer una boa. Una fiera — inmensa fiera para vivir en el mar - que dice — Pucha, se hecho dice un
inmenso! fieraso — donde que estaba viviendo — ahí qdo una cocha — El ha salido - se ido para - nunca mas—— Por eso dice en
ese tiempo pues las mujeres — se embarazan y tienen su llullu pues por su parte ya ——.
[207 Así hacía —se dijo mientras seðalñ otro sendero en circuito y arrimñ su hacha, pero no hicieron nada (los espíritus)] 208
ˀAˀyamaskakin. [208 Ya no hicieron nada.] 209 ˀIˀyamaskai. Huai yamascai. [209 ¡No resultñ nada. No había chacra.] 210
Hawen yuˀa taxu xanaˀi. [210 Se secaron sus tallos de yuca.] 211 Haa ki ˀaˀmebi haa chashixun… makan ruwen hiwi reraˀaˀbi ki
hawen ruwe tubiti. [211 Entonces él mismo marcñ ios límites de la chacra, y comenzñ a tumbar un árbol con el hacha, pero
quebrñ.] 212 Heen. Tubiti. [212 Sí, se quebrñ.] 213 Haskaraiyaska ki tiˀruma pishka ˀuatiˀupa pishka ˀuru ki haxun mekemanska
haxun … haan yuˀa … mebi neatiˀubu rumishin hua hukunkanaˀi tirumabu pishkabu [213 Con su propia fuerza hizo un pequeðo
claro, pero quedñ feo, y cuando sembrñ unas rainitas de yuca, crecieron pero bajitas y daðaditas.] 214 han banakatsiˀkin yuˀa
mikaˀaˀbi ki hawen chipa teˀketi. [214 Para sembrar, usñ su palanca pero al ser metida en la tierra, ésa se quebrñ también.] 215
Wishin kastikanaˀ. [215 Fue el castigo de la estrella.] 216 Parisiska ki hai kan, banaˀi. [216 Ya había que padecer para sembrar.]
217 Haska^ani keskaburibi nun neskarai. [217 Ahora nosotros también tenemos que padecer para hacer chacra.] 218
Nukenbiska ˀaˀkin waiaai. [Tee teexun] Tee teexunska ˀaˀquin. [218 Tenemos que trabajar mucho.] 219 Haskani keska. [219
Como hacía él.] 220 Hanuska ta keyutiˀki, ruˀan. [220 Allí termina, hermano.] 221 Hanubiska ta banetiˀki. [221 Allí se acaba.]
cix (EFN01): En su cara mismo le ha dicho - por una media de trago. Te crees… Así te voy a ver toda tu vida - que vas vivir
vendiendo. Te vas a creeeér! Así diciendo se reído. – (…) te creeees vendiendo una ~ de trago - así te voy a ver todo tu vida. Que
vas a vivir vendiendo. Allí te voy a ver. Lo que vas vivir vendiendo. Te voy a veeer! (…) Mi hijo le ha dicho - maatame - pues no
tengo miedo de morir, que me importa que me mates, le dicho. Ni tú no eres de fierro. Voy a decirte tú también vas a vivir.
Meejor para mi cuando me matas, ~to tranquilo, no como usted, suufriendo y pecando en la tierra - le contestado todavía,
hermano. Mhmm… ….
cx (GSR10) malaguero ’’ — (*que puede ser malaguero?) malaguero oigo lo que dice que así cuando grita el vacamuchacho —
kuinkuinkuinkuin - cuando hace — eso dice está haciendo malaguero. — cuando grita pues así — que muere gente dice. — () — Y


Todo ese cosa nomás se que es malaguero. ("cuando ves que el perro está cavando ahi: le espantas — eso borra le malaguero o no?)


Todo ese cosa nomás se que es malaguero. ("cuando ves que el perro está cavando ahi: le espantas — eso borra le malaguero o no?)


Todo ese cosa nomás se que es malaguero. ("cuando ves que el perro está cavando ahi: le espantas — eso borra le malaguero o no?)


Todo ese cosa nomás se que es malaguero. ("cuando ves que el perro está cavando ahi: le espantas — eso borra le malaguero o no?)


Todo ese cosa nomás se que es malaguero. ("cuando ves que el perro está cavando ahi: le espantas — eso borra le malaguero o no?)

(*)shiningura?) — aja — "No quieres dietar: entonces vas vivir sarnos - dice le dice — sarnoso - así vas morir — Haciendo sarnocito bien! — El palo mismo te shiningura — por eso tiene que tomar otra vez: — consejándole - a el ya, a ese palo — "ma va a curar" - dice - que - viene sacar ese su raiz ya pues — "Me vas curar a, — que — tengo eso todo ese deki — Ese 'ta escuchando dice - Y le deja su cigarro ahi — Mhm — así — — — Todo palo cutipa. Hay que dietar — cuando quieres sanar. — — — todo palo todo - que lo son brojo: todo ese cutipa. ()


(...)(*Lo que cutipan los animales?): - tooodoo tipo de animin\( \) — la sachavaca cutipa - al bebeto, cuando es nuevo nacido - ese tamaitito — o sea que la sachavaca es demonio del monte es pues — cuando tú 'tas escuchando en la colpa: - si 'tas solito, primero llega su alma: — saram saram sarama saram sourom saroup saroup — viene: — blan! bloommm! — 'ta tomando agua — Te le enfocas — silencio. — De un — a media hora que ya pasado ese deai - recien viene el mismo ya — por eso dice - el muchacho cuando es chiquito - le hace asi - parece mordido! — - Puta si no hay un medicu bueno, se mueren! — Puuuh! — ese empieza llorar — hasta que puede morir llorándose — Tienes que buscar su uña - paque con eso le hueves — y tiene que haber un medicu que le sople — ahi se normaliza. — Ese maata! —

(WCuantoh como su carne - cómo?) — no — cuando le rastreas - a la sachavaca — O sea que su alma de la sachavaca dice le muerde al muchacho — aja — novos sachavaca es diabo? — por eso pues — cuando tienes un bieehto chiquito - si es que le vas matar — baleale bien balaído — Si se larga: - puut! - en una le maata! — — A ese Jackson casi le mata también así — - todo hecho bien negro, negro, parece mordido. — como gritaba! — Y yo tenía que buscar siquiera su uña - siquiera su hueso para raspar, para humirar — con eso se ha calmando — más le han solpado: y listo! — Sino, se moría. —

("o sea los animales también tienen su alma?) - tiene, tiene su alma. — ("que más animal tiene su alma? — todos nomás?) — todos tipos de animal. — - - mhmm — todos tienen su alma ("dice que la pelota también cutipa) - pelota también cutipa. — cuando - llullito - su papá juega pelota - le hace hinchar su barriga - no puede respirar - C eso calentando tienes que sobarle — le sobas — ya se desinchá su barrigita - — llulito - Cutipa la pelota, cutipa el bombo - (?)"? bombo también cutipa! — Cutipa la pona! — Motosierra — se hace negro-negro —puut' empieza gritar! — Ahi llora pues — ahi tienes que curarles. — — ("como puede ser que cutipa también?) — pero que sera pues! — noves fierro es? — o sea que su. — a su almita dice - el fierro le apreta — ahi que se hace negrino-negro — Ahi griliiia ya pues! — "(o sea quiere decir que fierro tiene su diaibo también?) — tiene también su diablo, @ — - - Todo! - cutipa.

ci) (BR56): Mi hermana me dice: dile que entra al cuarto, me dice - ese buchisapa 'ta fregando ahí — noves ss barriga ahi — Ella dice le había — doler más fuerte — su barriga - le doilia - Le dicho [whispering]: "vete dice al cuarto, no veas este barrigón - está cutipando" - Se ido al cuarto ya — - De un rato otra vez ha salido - yo dice estaba calmando ya — trin - se ido a jugar pelota. (RPH5): ("de mujeres: — dice que la mujer embarazada te puede cutipar — (eq) ese cuando le mires: — novos que estas dietando? - — - Y — la mujer embarazada te mira: — Y pucha, ya has quebrado la dieta. — uy? — por eso cuando 'tas dietando: — tú debes 'tar solito! — — — Y cuando cumpies la dieta — A la semana recien sales ya — pero mient\( \) - ¡- tú - - \( \) has tomado y 'tas dietando: que -te vea: -puuuta, ya no hace nada! - Te puede matar, el palo mismo te puede matar. — (-"por ver ese mujer?) si pues — — *por qué tanto el aburrece? - - queee sera! — noves — palos son fuertes?! — Ese son - remedios vegetales — ("la mujer embarazado sera debil o...)- -debiel sera — mhmm — como jode asi. —

("Maldormido?) — Es pues - mujer barriga esta — — — ("eso es?) — aja — maldormido — — (y no es cuando tiene
relaciones con mujer?). aja, igual mismo es! — Ajaa — (*)(°) sí, con cualquier mujer — Cuando,'ta maldormido — o cuando está embarazado — igual nomás es — Te cutipa nomás —

cos (DHR2o): (*maldormido?) eso también, ohoy! — ese no te va a ver — ||| ese cuando te muerde jergón ya vuelta! — Ese es maldormido porque ‘tas haciendo con tu mujer — Haces tu mujer de noche — Te vas ver: tu mujer al enfermo: henhren - quiere aloarse — te mata! + (°por qué?) novés porque ‘tas haciendo relacion con tu mujer — es venenoso - es prohibido que se vaye el enfermo. — Solo el que no ha su marcido — ese se va — curarle - lleva su remedio - No se va ver por gusto nomás sin llevar su remedio - nada. — (°Pero sera el otor o) @ ||| - el - mirar nomás — con mirar nomás ya es jodido ya — con mirar: el enfermo - ya puu- mejor haga tu atual - dice ya - Bruto dice que te duele-- toca tu corazón - mhm - quiere matarte — por eso tiene su remedio - como se cree disa ese — antebióticico creo ese deai — Ese te pone ampollita - recien te calma — aja — Un negrito es - un momo - ese ponen jeringa - también te tomas un poquito — pero más ammarmmmgo dice - bien amargo. — así pues

(BRS2o): (*maldormido - que es?) aya — cuando tú estás en curación o te picnicada una vibora - ese es que viene haciendo relaciones sexuales con su familia - ese es el maldormido - que viene a mirarte. — Ese ese pues muy peligroso paque nos haga - cuando estás enfermo - te hace más daño ya — es ese maldormido. (*por qué?) - que seria pues no - peor dice cuando muerde vibora - ni — [oyes] su voz de la persona: yaya — en tu chica choca - puuta que ya - que tienes una herida de vibora - eso te apeara ya - te duele demasiado, demasiado - quiere matarte. — Y ese es persona que dice - maldormido. - (*Que ha tenido relaciones) - con su mujer. + (*te debilitan las relaciones?) no debilita - sino es dañino a esa persona es así - Te va a mirar: - te agrava el dolor que tienes. - por decir de vibora. — Es igual que cuando venga una mujer ebarazada - más bien no te va a mirar - porque t'pas con todo el dolor de - cuando te muerde vibora — Ese es como tuvieron dice — picando de nuevo! - te duele demasiado! - cuando oyos hablar a la doña que está ebarazada. — O cuando te vees mismo — ahí dice — Te hace dolor demasiado. — Ese es - persona maldormido dice — — que no te vea. (*la mujer ebarazada también dañino?) - eso - @ (*)(°) que sera pues no?

cos (DHR12a) A veces cutita tigre — quiere nomás de día - y de noche no quiere doormir - abre su ojo — llora: — Tigre, tiene que matar tigre - paque saque su cerda - paque la empuña con ese - el bebé ya - Y se sana. -(*como puede cutipar el tigre? - por que no se come no) - porque le has visto! — — por ver nomás - le hace daño algunos — (*peligros) - @ pues tigre - con ver nomás te hace daño a tu hijo ya — aja — porque tiene que buscar tigre - recien le baales - traer la cerda +


cos (GSR06): (*otras cosas tambien tiene dice — horcon puede tener su yushin — todo eso que puede cutipar los ninos — su yushin 'ta cutipando) — ayaya — mhm — (*como dicho la doña Ermisha ayer - shinun kupini - di?) — mhmh — shinun kupini. — O sea que el mono dice le cutipa. Mhm. -------- (*cutipa como entiendes?) — le hace dano a muchachos — - *('sera yushin entrando su cuerpo o cómo?) — si quiúzas pues.

cos (DHR2o): Ese — paque nace puro hombre — tiene que comer su bushi de: manan xawe - *‘Yo quiere tener puro varón — dice — como su unlu - de manan xawe pues — cangita - asado nomás — Cangita le dice asado! — — le asas, sin sal. - eso como sin sal - cuando es señorita — así como Lulisa — quiere tener puro varóncillo — tiene que comer su unlu de manan xawe - () dahí nace puro varón! — hasta quatre venos! — Deai recien — sale mujercita. — Sale mujercita - 1, 2, 3 — asi — hasta que termina su huervea. - Sale eso. (...) Alguno platano ya vuelta le asa — así verde pues - le asa así en ceniza — el platano se revienta ya vuelta! — — — aha parte — saaa - se apre así — ese es porque vas - tener tu hija - mujercita. — mujercet va ser mi hijito - dice - como ‘ta partiendo mi platano! + El ya — el que no quiere tener mujer - jándolo se hace, no parte: — varón — Aista ve — hasta platano sabe, ve. — — mujercet va ser mi hijito cuando tengo. - mhm - pero parte ahí mismo ++ hasta la yuca se parte cuando le asa así en ceniza — se parte: — ahí le pone su ulito ya - porque quiere tener varón ya — — Corta un palito - dese tamañito palito - taa — le prendes en medio dese partido - Ahi así — aha — cuando ya vas comer - le sacas — Aja dice va salir varón ya dice — +++ — Ese es su unlu ya pues — ++ (*)

cos (BRS0g): (K* curan con orina de bebe?) - tiene que ser puro - el bebe que ya como sal - quema vista, salado ya su orina. Pero bebecito - ese no - puede curar la vista. - - tiene carniosidad — y hace huuumo por ahí - no puedes divisar - y eso es buen remedio, pero hasta los 15 dias — — la gota del niño - su orina, te hace lagrirmar, saca tu — — — — — — hace lagrirmar tu vista en la noche - parece que lo saca pues - con la orina de bebe. Yo tengo mi pimonto ahí - orina se echa en la tarde, en la tarde - casi no tanto no le utilizar, porque tengo ya - eso me ha dado la Maria Lancha, ya se terminado. — Quiero recoger de mi hijita - de la Jenny (*)
noo, ese no come sal - pero no se puede acá que orina...

(GSR11): ese dice es paquete como - el que 'ta cortando, lo que tú eres: si es chambero - va ser chambero igual que el - o si es estudiante - ya igual. Así es.


(DHR20): (”*sea eso cutipa - pero para bien) - pero bien pues hace mmh — No hace podrir los dientes (”*que más puede dar al muchacho - que le...) kapa, mari — y perdiz - (”su muela?) mmh (”*para que sea forzado -oso hormig?) - ese le soba con su manteca - que haya fuerza. todito su cuerpo + — Ahí cree mucho bien gordo - no enferma - bien gordito, fuerzudito + noves oso hormiguero no sabe enfermarse - sano crece - nunca no sabe enfermar. Igual que manan xawe — también se cura con su manteca mismo - pero no hace derritar en candel — en solazo derrita el mismo - llena pomito: — cada luna noves - le soba - paques es fuerzudo dice. Anguilla - paquete es fuerzudo - paque pega un hombre - pelando - aguja nveta - noves saca su vena? -su vena le anilla - al le saca, le corta acá -de su cuello - suuu — aista su vena - parece hilo, blanquito - sacas - ruuu — sale + Secas en solazo bien + - metes en aguaja — y le metes aquí ve - saa — le sacas - le hace traspasar - ahí le amarra - le troza - tkt — - que es fuerzudo - ohoy yo — con eso no te pega nada — un solo trompazo — porá te vas caer dice - no resiste. (”muchachos siempre tienen un hilo - soguita) — este — chambara. — Yo veo también lo que amarra también — es paque no le aguara camballie - dice — e aqui en su patita ++patita! digo - piecito! manito — A veces amarra aquí en su cintura - veo así también (”por qué chambría?) - porque es fuerzudo, duro. - Duro pues - + no le puede trompiar - el le trompea pero no le hace nada - queda igualitio nomás — nada, no bota ni sangre, nada. + Mmh

(GSR11): (”*yo que hace - cortar sus uñas — que recibe su... caracter del otro, su - como puede decir... su ...))/(o sea que dice: eso lo que cortas uñas, o la cortas su pelito: ese es paquete como - el que ‘ta cortando, lo que tú eres: si es chambero - va ser chambero igual que él - o si es estudiante - ya igual. Así es. — (”*asi hacian los antiguos también?) así hacia mi papá — () cortar pelo, uñas (”*algo más?) eso nomás — cortas uñas — va ser chambero, o estudiante - va- la uñas: - va hacer una cosa rápido - así. — (”Yo le ponen en su nido de araña también, no?) mmh. ese es dice paquete hage pues rápido su trabajo - lo que va hacer (”*como araña?) ajía- araña. —(”*sea que le cutipa, pero para el bien, no mmh-. (”cutipa de buena manera?) sí, así.

(Y* su nombre, no le hace nada) no — — (”*no pasa nada si el bebe nace y vive sin nombre - no se puede enfermar, o no es más debil) — dice así que -cuando no tiene nombre o no tiene su aguera de socorro - ese para enfermar - así oigo lo que dicen - no sé si será cierto. — (”*eso le puede proteger un poco?) — e so le protege dice - porque ya está - bautizado en el nombre del Señor ya. — (”Pero ese agua del socorro es otra cosa que bautismo, dolor) - otro. — (”*quien puede hacer? cualquier (”*Jairo & Omer echando a la isidora - o sea persona puede hacer, no hace cuentca? no?) , — el que sabe rezar: padre nuestro, el ave maria - eso nomas. — (otros animales que puede proteger el ebe? — — derepente oso hormiguero o shuyu - su uña...) — — ajía, mi papá me decía así- su manteca dice le soban al su brazo de la criatura - paque sea fuerzudo. — Así le hacía a mi hijo, a mi Julio, su abuelo. — — por eso sería chambero mi hijo. — (”eso le prestó su poder, el osu?) — mmh (”*yo otro animal?) — carachupunama — como dice — panun - yangunturu — ese — también es lo soba su manteca.

(DHR10): (”*eso no te hace daño) — no, te da más fuerza — es animal que no sabe enfermar — por eso le comes dañó — Le das a comer a esos chivititos paquete no se enferma — paque no tenga nada nada enfermedad - tengo fuerza! — para luna nueva le da - su uña, raspado — paquete tenga fuerza — mmmh. — Bueno es ese animal —

(EFNo1): Por eso dice que Y. vive así enfermo, tosiendo - eso lo que tosea le ha shinguriado también Z. — — (”*pero despues de su muerte o cómo?) antes que muera! ese tiene años ya. Con ese ya quedó el. Osea era para que dieta. Total, no dietado - [lowering voice] mucho toma, trago. — este si, no se podría sanar sino dice se sana. Sino ese se ido mandar a curar en Requena, a su médico, tiene allí. Allí le han dicho ese pues le ha hecho así. Y que dieta un año de trago, masato fuerte. Nada. Y eso otra vez le está cayendo. No es porque tiene - no es porque ‘ta [tapado la caja]?: Es porque le shinguriado Z. — Así astaba diciendo su vieja... el otro día aquí -este topado otra vez comiendo su contra. Por eso pues este clase. Más peor ha llegado - quuu - no ha dietado, - otra vez. —(”*no le pueden sanar?) Le saaanan, lo que pasa el no dieta, como dice en nuestro idioma - unmpa kushini, bushman.
bushnan numi ki. Se sana dictando. No tomando fuerte. (*fuerte daña, masato) sí, pues hermano, este masato. {} taba contando ella, por eso se. Este lata- dica es dañado. Taba diciendo su mujer.

Ella también dice lo que le sobreingurido X. con mantona, allí en puerto. Y ese dice dállí está bieeen seco, no está igual como este, como digo, jo- - bien seco, dice se va bañando. Y le duese su hueso. Por eso (*diciendo vaay mandar curar allá. No dice quiere ir. (*por qué no quiere? - quiere morir o cómo?) quiere morir.

(DHR20): Todo palo! tomas así que - tiene que dictar solito + que no te va mirar ahí - embarazada, maldormido + solito - tienen que cumplir un mes - recien sales ya - Ya medio — medio medico ya.


(RPHO7): (*brusos - si un brusio mata persona - ese le come?) - Le chuntea - o sea que le hace daño pues - O sea que el brusio: - el dice apriende - de palos - fuertes! - tomando - O sea que toma ajoskuru, toma ajoschaya - mayormente aprienden tomando ajoskuru y ajo schaya - Ayauna - es eso tiene - poquito - cocinando.- La primera toma - - -

(DHR2g): Jesus chunteado

(DHR4a): (*agarrando uno de los bufeos - yacurunas - se le podría traer acá también?) - no, no come - - porque ellos no comen - huenales nomás - hace sueño como pero ellos no comen ya - pero ese no com - LE puedes agarrar - pero no come - por eso le largas pues - Sino dice el - - va seguir lluvia-lluvia *ajá, la sirená -

(*o sea no se le puede traer como Remoucaus). - ese muere de cólera ya - De cólera se muere - porque no le quieren soltar pues - *(y de pena) - de pena por su familia pues - su madre, todo - ella también tiene su madre pues - Y así pues -

*(y hace daño a la gente?) - aja, hace daño - lo que baña así con su regla - ese ya le hace daño ya - le chuntea ahí - ah? (cuando baña con su regla, con su sangre ya pues - Ese le quiere más dice - lo que deja con su regla - le hace doler su estomago: - le puede matearlo - cuando no hay brusio - le mata. -Pero eso con ese tabaco le sopla, le chuntea su yachay - su flena dice - - yachay de un brusio dice - Le saysa pues - - ahí queda lindo ya - Ya no le duele ya - Este dice: te hecho daño el agua - el bufeo - porque has bañado con tu regla *(y el bufeo huele esto y - - - este huele el agua pues - le gusta la sangre --- *(o sea este le quiere comer di?) - aja @ (*igual un brusio entones) - igualitoo, aista. -

(DHR16): Te hace daño del agua - del agua también tiene su madre pues - Ese también te hace daño: - así como baña mujer así con su regla - - regla. - Hoy, te hace daño - *(cual?) - el agua mismo - mhm --- - Tiene su madre --- - que quiza su madre - el yacuruna - que sera! - - que chuntea pues ya - - nove - sangre - ese le aburrece, sangre de mujer - dice -. Mhm - ahí viene ya: oligendo dice - (*no) - le gusta - por eso la mujer cuando tiene su regla dice baña en la quebrada - Sino, con tazón - aja - no buza. - - *(en quebrada ya no) - no en quebrada ya no - ahí *tas bañando ahí con tazón - no tazón pues no ahí pu. - - Así ese de agua --- --- ---

(DHR19j): *(no ha escuchado que les comían quizaš?) - - aa - los muertos? - noo, no le comían dice - le botaban --- -

Ese tiene que matearlo todavía pues - ese gordo pues - lo que son... - mueren enflaqueciendo - flauto dice no le comía - porque es flautico. - Mhm - Lo que son gordo pues - ese mata lo que son vivo: - toool! - ese le comía. --- Pero es flautico, enfermo lo que mueren el - ese lo botaette - parece un perro: - taal! - al agua! - - A un hombre si lo que son gordo: Ese si le mataba dice - - - - De su. - cocinar - Todo. - su cabeza: - comerle + + + La oreja si le botaba - mhm - - *(*oreja botaba?) +++ mhm +++ + Y lo comía todo su dedito - como chopaba dice pues los antiguos; - Parece del mono lo comes: Bien! - cocinado pues - - - - - - - Su único le 'tan comiendo ahí - Yo chuncas sus ceso para comer: - Cierra sus oídos - dice: Tran! - lo que va chuncar - el nomás ta: *hit, hit* - to! - porque ahí dice va chucar aquí en tu - sentido dice - -- porque 'tas chuncando su cabeza de el también: - Su ceso - - - - Aaaan - otro: - todos *tan comiendo así sentados - Tendiendo hojas nomás - hoja de platoano - regando la presa, yucha. - -! = Cerrando sus oídos toditos. - hasta que chanca la cabeza: - Taaya está bueno ya, le dice - Regado su ceso ahí - No es grande pues - este, ashi bolita dice - Poquito-poquito cada uno: que comía dice - Aja. - El *ta riendo ahí - Igual que comemos: - cualquier animal: así - - riendo! dice comía conversando ahí - *(no llorando? ) - nada! - que van llorar: rico comer! - Dahí - otro día: de otro vecino van matar ya: - Dahí de otra casa - le van matar. - Ahí se reparten - así - todo comen! - Ahí. Una sola, una sola casa - mhm- -.

(RPROY): "porque has comido el fruto del árbol prohibida? Dese árbol que está dentro prohibíssimo?! - Ym sì, has manchado a la tierra. Has manchado a la tierra, y ahora: - (:) - y a la mujer le dijo: "Eva, desde hoy por adelante usted también vas a sufrir. Tu esposo te va mandar: a lavar la ropa, a cocinar, acarrear agua. Hacer todo en tu casa para que - criar. Y cuando das luz, vas a sentir mucho dolencia. Para dar luz, tener ese bebe. Y vas a sufrir duro." - - "Y así que usted, Adán - él es de hueco \h/ de tierra", le he dicho. "Polvo de tierra. El día que te mueres: polvo de tierra volveras. Tienes los 5
sentidos, le dice - de hueco ves - de hueco respiras - y de hueco orinas y de hueco cagas. Y al hueco de tierra volverías. La sepultura." - le dice Jesucristo a Adán. \Y desa manera a nosotros nos sepultan. Porque el dejó el ejemplo - murió en el cruz de Calvario - tan solo por nuestro pecado,

(RPpOi) si, se conocían ya con Ruiz. Se conocían con Ruiz. (*Pues Ruiz ha recogido todos?) sí. Y el dejado también también, haciendo raza allí con los Capanahus. Y de esa manera que han quedado los hijos. (*Y Juan Hidalgo quien fue?) Juan Hidalgo... son los hijos. Que han hecho engendrado pues?onde? la mujer Capanahua. Ellos han dejado los hijos.

(RRPRQz): (*Freires dice son Pa'embakebu?) otros Freires, es un raza brasileira — — que han venido de Brazil con Constantino Nogueira y se agrado con una mujer que s llamaba Elvira (*) Ruiz creo, no tanto conozco su apellido. — — y dahi fueron los Freires de los Pa'embakebu. (*) - el con los Nogueiras ha venido a trabajar shirringa - y como se quedo - ya había conseguido su pareja, mujercita, el quedado vivir ahí, en Frontera. Dahí aumentado los Freires Panaruas - Ruius. Por ejemplo. Bernabé Panarua, Adolfo Freires, Alberto Freires - esos son los hijo ya del Brasilero. — Y cuando la señora Elvira - ella - no aumentaría más con brashico: porque no es mi raza - — ydai que hace el Brasilero - el tenía su familia - y le hacían llamar de Cruzeiro, y el ha regresad a sus regla y no ha vuelto más - y dices ellos se quedado a criar la mamá a sus hijos - hasta que se hecho hombre — ellos no sian ni leer ni escribir - porque no había colegio, no había nada. Aja — Así me ha contado abuelito — y desa manera que nosotros somos Freires.

Y ahora esos Ruizes - han venido - aquellos tiempos de Vidal Ruiz - ellos ya han engendrado ellos hijos acá también ya - y desa manera es que nosotros somos poquitos — porque… nos \Y nuestro pueblo era grande, grande — y cuando había terramoto de — — — en que año - se ha sumido su pueblo de ellos — cuando ellos han venido a visitar a sus hijos — y esos han quedado poquitos. han regresado ellos cuando su pueblo ya no había ya — taba todo agua. (*Es Freires - hijos de Constantino Nogueira?) — — no, esos es de Caldino Freires su hijos. Ese era el brashico. con Elvira. (*Quedado Nogueiras allá?) no, ellos han venido con toda su esposa - por eso es que no — — Tenían hijos, pero han vuelto nuemebenta a Brazil - ellos eran de Belén do Para. (*) Elvira ya quedado ya con los hijos - ella era natural de Pa'embakebu. (*) Caldino era el esposo de Elvira - y Constantino Nogueira era el patrón. Caldino trabajaba para Constantino.

(RDHR2): @ aja — hay — su hijo de Luzmilza - lo que está en Requena - se llama Huarimboba — Aja - ese es su marido de Luzmilza que era - que vivía allá en Tamanco - () Carlos Huarimboba. — Aja - un profesor dice era. — Ese era su marido de doña Luzmilza - y tenía 1 hijo todavía ahí - pero no le puesto Huarimboba - nombre de su padrastro puesto - Rios - de Machshu. — Porque no le criado pues su padre legítimo - le puesto nomás - con su shinguito - le puesto su nuevo nomás — otro ya le cia, ya le pone su apellido. — Porque pues su padre en su poder de su padrastro - en su cama: — por eso es su hijo pues — mhm. —

(RBSRQI): (*como te explicaba tu papá - que pasa cuando hacen relacion — de que hace el bbe?) - a - este - - dice, profe - \Y hermano Lucas — O sea que él me decía: para que forme tu hijo - tú botas gusano - me decía. — Gusanos botas. — Y ese ya se - hace - - - Cree ya - como gente pues - un ser humano cree ya — de gusano dice hermano (*xaku?) xakú dice — aja! aista! ese xakú! exactamente! — Ese bota un ser humano - el hombre bota! - como la mujer - ya con - su regla - ahí mismo — Sí botas 2 xaku adentro: 2 crecen! Sí botas 1, 1. Ese me decía mi papá — Ha ta nun kaicha' - me decía - - que tiempo que — - si no vale - donde va botar su xaku ya? - cuando esta payu! +++++ ("Sea mamá no hace nada para crear niño?) — — — ooohoo hace naada! — Ella le mantiene solamente en su vientro nomás — Ahí cree pues - xaku - ese lo que le das ese — aja — así. —

(GSROVQ):(*otr cosa: como piensas usted se hace el bebe en la mujer?) — cómo? — (*como aparece el bebe - como se crea el bebe en el vientro de la mujer) - en el vientro de la mujer — como me dices? (*como se hace bebe) - el bebe aparece de la célula — De la célula del hombre — (*que es célula?) el microbio que tiene el hombre — mhm — - -("Y entonces eso entra en la mujer - en la relación - mhm) — en la relación ya se hace — hay varios microbios — mhm — Varíos microbios hay que hay - pero va quedar uno - Ese va - Dese ya se va formar la criatura — ("y como se forma ésta criatura en la mujer ya?) — no sé — El microbio es como un gusano. — Ese va creciendo — Primerito - primeramente su ojos — dahi va creciendo su cuerpo — Sus dedos, — Yo he abortado cuando he tenido uno — de 2 meses he abortado — Un bebé ashishito — sus deditos no eran completo — así mochito — Mhm — — pero ya todo pues completo ya - un varoncito. — Ese se forma de microbio - se forma el muchacho — ("y la madre que parte en esto?) — — la madre no tiene — no no es de la parte del hombre nomás — — —

(LOS & Loos 2003: 190; joro s. 1) hodogo [bird] 2); semen;

Cf. joroshi v.n. hincharse: Yapa cokhinjaha jauhuan pamis páiscca sanahinata jorossacahin. Cuando se cocina pescado, las escamasit se hinchan; Yonan cokhinjaha jorossacahin jorossacahin, pit bahmah, choysacahin hiñgui. Cuando se cocina carne ahumada, la piel se pone suave y se hincha; Hochiti sinatas jasacari jorossacahin. Cuando un perro se enfurece, se le paran los pelos de manera que adquiere un aspecto hinchado. joroshihacuqin v.a. leudar pan

creee(DHRh6o): (cuando se nace este bebe - de este carne — o sea como empieza a crecer - como se crea en su barriga de la mujer el bebe?) Se cree ya pues - mujercita ya se cree. Forma ya su cabezita - todo su brazito, su pie, su chichito - mujercita. — Por esos otros saben tocando nomás - mujercita es tu mujer - porque tu mujer - — ("Su carne de la mujercta - de donde viene?) — de - de nuestra sangre mismo — de la sangre dice pues - - - noves cuando le hace - cuando relaciona con un hombre — ese es nuestra sangre dice —. Aja, nuestra sangre mismo. — Por eso forma pues gentecito ya. — ("O sea el hombre le da) - Le da a la mujer (..sangre...) — sangre - y se forma - gentecito. ("O sea con bushi le da sangre?) — sí —, pues con sangre llama su - sangre ya pues — su bushi. (*O sea la semilla también es sangre?) la sangre pues, aja — dahi ya pues sale ya. — Se forma gentecito ya: de tu sangre mismo. ("Y huesitos?) - como saldra su huesito - todo ya pues como ha puesto el Señor para que sea así ya. — Aja. — lo que le hace de borracho su mujer — sale loquito sus\(1) —) - por eso sale dice dañadito, loquito, aja, mudo. — Por eso tiene que hacer sano - sano tienes que hacer tu mujer - no de borracho. Mhm. — De borracho pues un loco sale — no sabe - faltado su sentido. ("por qué es esto - el trago hace tu sangre...) - aista pues - sangre está - purito alcoh - esta tu sangre - purito trago - ("y eso le das al niño ya) - â por eso salen locos, mudos los ninos - algun bien, alg mal —Alg manquishtos, alg sin pie. — Alg no puede ni sentir — Echado nomás vive. — según le visto en Pacasmayo - ya tenía 5 años - ese no se sentaba - ahí nomás sentado - ahí patialinnnd — su mamá tenía que hacer mudar su calzoncito, tenía que banarles, todo. -
por lo menos 5, años, 6 años - hasta que le recoge el Señor. — Ya se muere. — aja. — Y le recoge el Señor ese chica — se ha muerto - ya era grandecito - ya tenía sus chuchitos, pero no se sentaba - no comía — su madre le daba con mano, con cuchara. — paque come, igual que lullllito - tiene que darle. — Así - sale del borrarlo lo que hace su relación con la mujer - ahí le castiga el Señor pues.

cxxxvi (BRSr11): yo no tengo sangre de mi madre - solo de papá pues mhmm — ella pues - porque me botado al mundo — pero no: soy leche de mi padre pues - la leche lo que — somos — dice - -de padre legítimo sangre — por decir - usted eres leche de tu padre — no — legítimo himil! de tu papá — De mamá — no, no tanto — mamá nomás nos bota al mundo - parir a la luz del día — pero nosotros como varón — papá nos ha engendrado y somos pues " llevamos la sangre de papá — Leche de tu padre dice ahí - así.


cxli (DHR06): Yo la placentas ya la entierras ya. — bajo de un arbol — Ahí te vas enterrando la placenta. — Tripa ya pues. (*por qué?) ahí pues le pone bajo de un arbol (*cualquier?) cualquier arbol. — cualquiera - te vas enterar ya - paque no come el perro —

(DHR06): (*o sea izana para amarrar pupu?) - no - ese es paque le pones asi ve — aquí ta amarrado ya - * en la punta de tripa está acá - allé le cortas - tah! — ese medido - tah! — És para que no sale el sangre. (*) izana es ese de ese caña bravu (*con esos cortas?) ajaa, con eso le cortas así ve - le pones así - le apretas con la tijera - le das ya: trah! — para que no sale el sangre dice. — Ya está ya.

— Le amarras con reta\{| - con ese - come como se llama ese dañ — paque no queda pupu así saltado. — Paque queda pupu chiquito - le amarras - pa! — ya está ya. — Le hace bañar, todo. — Y con la mismo - /! tacle - chapando ya.


(BRSr12): (*esos! - porque - me has dicho pues que tú eres himi de tu papá — no de mamá?) - ya, primera leche de - papá pues. — Es uno. — cuando ya cae pues la papá engendra ahí pues - como dicos — escucho que dicos — La primera leche de paque dice - la sangre. — asi. — Debe venir por varios pues - como te 'toy diciendo - Después dahi viene otro, otro, otro — aja. —


(BRSr12): Bake teke - Hawn bake teke - por eso dice pues: — despues de mi viene otro, otro - pedazo de su umbligamos dice: otro, otro, otro. — Cuando salen varias ya. — Hashpi puku teke, dice. —@ pedazo. — Mi pedazo puede ser: Macshu, di. - Pedazo de Macshu puede haber otro. Así si mi mamá había botado más - más bebe. - Pedazo de mi umbligamos dice sigue así - hashpi puku teke - Pedazos! - () ("oesa tu hermano es tu teke)- yo soy su... - Macshu es mi teke de mi ya - mi pedazo ya pu. - De umbligamos di. — ("y usted no eres su pedazo de el?) - noo! - De mi mi pedazo es Macshu. — Ulmíma ya. — así. — Y de su... De mi hermana Ermisha venido. — puku teke era la teresa. - De Teresa ha venido... su puku teke de Teresa es mi hermano Pancho. — Este Pancho - ya su... puku teke soy yo, y despues de mi - Macshu, último. Aísta. Así dice pues. — Puku teke.


(cxlvi) (DHR06): aja, hombre y mujer, cuando ya tiene su - cuando 'ta sus tres dias - ahi dice le hace, a la mujer, - relación ya pues — Ahí ya está jodido ya - hace una sola, - *ta jodido - que no vea 3 meses su regla - 2 meses - un mes — ya 'ta jodido la mujer, ya está - embarazada dice ya - le jodido a la mujer— ya tiene un hiijito ya. — De un mes, 2 meses ya parece grande ya — así como la Jenny - ella tiene 3,2 meses crez. — Ya 'ta engrasándose ya. — Ya 'ta aishito ya.

(cxlvi) (BRSr12): (*como hace la mujer que el cría?) - -Ahí aqui adentro pues. — Ese recibe su alimento di - también va, desarrollando poco a poco. — Y esta. — (*)"o sea ese come lo que mamá come?" - no come. — (*No come?) no come - como debe criarse pues adentro! — Como debe criarse pues. — - -
Ahí se engranda, engranda, engranda. — Come, Come. — Ahí crece pues - gordito es - ese criatura. — Toma - el también - recibe adentro. Toma, dice. — todo que toma, come, ella recibe —

(GSR02): ("Y la madre que parte tiene en esto?) — la madre no tiene — no — ese es de la parte del hombre nomás — — ("no le da de comer, no le comparte su sangre, algo así?) - no. — O sea que el muchacho se alimenta de lo que tú comes — o sea que usted te embaraazás dí — tiennes ganas de comer fruta — Tienes ganas de comer otra cosa — esos comes — deso se alimenta — como su sera pues — que la criatura se alimenta de lo que ustedes comes — así — así crece muchocho. ("Pero la mujer no le da a bebe su sangre...") — cuando nace ya - sí. — cuando nace — ("*) le da mamar pues su sena - o sea que la leche es la sangre —

(LCO01) sí, tiene sangre — como le cria — en su - en su vientre — y como le da de lactar también — paque lleva su sangre! — por eso crece — si nuestro padre solamente es como — como puede decir? — un gallo — pues solamente le pone — y la mamá le cria ya! — así es —

(BSR01): ("o sea mamá no hace nada para crear nino?) — nooooo hace nada! — ella le mantiene solamente en su vientro nomás — Ahí crece pues - xaku - ese lo que le das ese — ajá - así. — ("o sea niño quizás no tiene sangre de mm?) — no pues — todo es tuyo, hermano.— porque tú estás poniendo — ajá — porque le ha criado: ya pues dice "mi mamá — Ajá — (leche) - le da su leche — mhmn — eeesse pues le criando — la crianza ya —

(BRS09): ("en este tiempo - los bebes deben tener sangre de papá nomás - de mamá no?) — ajá, aista, de papá. ("ahora? Germe dice sangre - de papá - y mamá - su leche?) — de papá nomás - y después cuando ya le lacta el bebe - entonces ya la sangre se debe mezclar - o no? Yo pienso que 'ta bien - primero de papás, después de mm. — Lactar teta de su mamá — y ese va criar ya - ese le cria. — ("y su leche será como sangre entonces?) — si, sangre es la leche materno. —

(GSR07):(*Muchos me dicen que hijo tiene sangre de papá nomás - de mamá no?) — ajá, mi marido, mis hermanos — mis primos, mis sobrinos — esos son mi sangre! (aja, mi papá — ("Yo ahora tu hijos de usted - tienen tu sangre o no?) — si. — (porque a veces me dicen que sangre de papás es primero — hijo no tanto tiene sangre de su mamá...) — si tiene — mhmn — ("O sea ahí cuando se hace hijo - el padre deja su - gunasito ahí) mhmn! — (asi sera?) — así es pues — — ("y por eso dicen que la mujer solo bota al mundo - no da sus sangre al hijo) — — si, tiene sangre — como le criá — en su - en su vientre — y como le da de lactar también — paque lleva su sangre! — por eso crece — si nuestro padre solamente es como — como puede decir? — un gallo — pues solamente le pone — y la mamá le cria ya! — así es — — ("el hombre se larga ya) — @ — por eso pues digo así — que! — Quien te engañó que no lleva su sangre — (que es esto (K Olga dice que de mamá nomás) — no se, al — — hm — — ("y a usted como parece?) (K*) pero para mi es el hombre y la mujer - la tiene una misma sangre, tiene de los dos! Mmh - porque ni modo que - solo - solo del hombre es ajá — ("de los dos se hace?) — mhmn de los dos es! — Otra cosa sería - si un niño - habido nacid - de usted nomás! — entonces sería de ti nomás! mhmn — (antes me estabas diciendo que niño en su barriga de la mujer se hace dese microbio - ahí tiene la sangre de papá nomás - - y recien cuando le doce de su mamá — ahí viene mezclarse la sangre) — mhmn — mhmn — ahi circula la sangre ya - mhmn. —

(LCO01): ("Nuken himi — que es esto - de usted tu sangre quien sera?) — mi sangre? mi familia. — ("quien de tu familia? - tu mamá?) — mi mamá — mi hermano, mis primos - esos son mi sangre! (aja, mi papá — ("Ya ahora tu hijos de usted - tienen tu sangre o no?) — si. — (porque a veces me dicen que sangre de papás es primero — hijo no tanto tiene sangre de su mamá...) — si tiene — mhmn — ("O sea ahí cuando se hace hijo - el padre deja su - gunasito ahí) mhmn! — (asi sera?) — así es pues — — ("y por eso dicen que la mujer solo bota al mundo - no da sus sangre al hijo) — — si, tiene sangre — como le criá — en su - en su vientre — y como le da de lactar también — paque lleva su sangre! — por eso crece — si nuestro padre solamente es como — como puede decir? — un gallo — pues solamente le pone — y la mamá le cria ya! — así es — — ("el hombre se larga ya) — @ — por eso pues digo así — que! — Quien te engañó que no lleva su sangre — (sí lleva! — de los dos! Mmh! — (Pero has escuchado que dicen también?) — no! — yo digo que sí lleva los dos — por — por — 'ta bien que el hombre engendra pues — Pero la mamá es lo que cria ya — mhmn! — mhmn — si — pues — — — —

(GSR02): ("otro se entonce?) — si una mujer por ejemplo tiene un bebe, recien nacid — pero una razon o otra — le da a otra mujer que le puede mamar - no — Y la otra mujer, que no le ha dado luz - le está mamando — entonces cual de estos sera su mamá legítima - de cual sera su sangre (sic) — de su mamá - lo que le dado a luz - ese es su mamá - ("y no este que le estam amando?) no, no — igual que — este mi winsho — mi winsho le hecho asi a su hermana — La — la Meri — Y mi hualuito lloraba — y ella - su hermana le daba de mamar — por eso le dice mamá — mamá le dice a su hermana — ("o sea el entera la sangre de Meri?) mhmn — tiene un poco de sangre de su hermana — ("y de usted no?) — también — ("Pero no le de dado de mmar usted?) — si, — también. — ("O sea los 2 le llama mamá — si?) — sí, a su hermana dice "mamá" — ("*y no este que le está mamando?) — sí — su hermana era — es tu hermana! — Mi mamá es pues — — — — ya es grandecito - 8 anos tiene. — (J Nilbert! (…) ("bake unan creo — adoptados los niñlos?) mhmn, unan bake — ("*no suele eso igual como tu hijo como ||) no, nada - no es igual — Pero a veces - criando así de chiquito - chiquito — es como tu hijo — (Y le dices una bake o no?) — sí — (eso para siempre va quedar - adoptado) — mhmn — para siempre ya pues — Es como tu hijo ya — A la vez tu hijo, —

(BRS09): Yo pienso que 'ta bien - primero de papá, después de mamá - . Lactar teta de su mamá - y ese va criar ya - ese le cria. — ("y su leche sera como sangre entonces?) — si, sangre es la leche materno. — ("como dice que semen del hombre y leche de mamá son sangre - si tienen otro color que la sangre no?) — no tiene otro color, ese mismo color tiene — igual nomás queda. — ("Pero leche blanco) ajá, blanco, pero echas un taja de limón, y queda sangre. — — La leche de mamá es blanco, como del vaca del pasto: es una leche blanqueita y se toma - pero pasa dice limón - q - — - —— sangre - ya - (*) así simplemente queda blanco - pero metale una acida - ya cambia de color, queda rojo. —

(BRS12) ("Pero este digo, su leche — Por eso el bebe — como lo cuidan ya, ya la mamá tiene que tener su dieta, dí?) — ya pues - -tiene cuidarse dice. — No comer cosas que no debe comer — Ni le... — así dice. — No come. — cualquier cosa no come. — Porque come gallina...
cuando nace su bebé? Se alimenta de puro pollones nomás — Caldo, dice. — — paque levanta la teta ya — tenga ya su — hablamos - la leche materna que decimos — ella crece chuchu ya - así grande ya - ya no está - tablachito ya — por eso ese toman al caldo - caliente. — paque - su seno crezca. —


(“Pero ese, su leche de mamá no es sangre ya — o si?) — a. — sigue nomás — sangre de mamá. —


(“ese — huru - haskaribii?) — eehhh! — asi también pues. — — — — Te das cuenta Lucas, como es! —! - (‘tu saliva?) - noo —

(‘eso no es sangre?) noo — — Es una. — — espuma nomás — — (‘sudor?) — sudor también es — — — Sudor es... — — salado! Y la orina es salado pues. — — (no puede ser sangre - sudor dí?) — — noo. — Ese es lo que tomamos agua quíazas, no. — (*esaliento no) - ajay, esos pues. — — tú cuando chambebe - ve - Uuuuh! — To me loja la camisa, bien mojado — y esprimalle. — Rruuuuh! — (*puro agua) - @ (‘Perod salada ya) - ajay, salada pues! — Yyy? — como es eso!

GHRo2: (“generación - que es esto? que dice?) lo que hay a vivir pues con todo que se aumentado - de un... se puede decir de un padre, no. Un padre se ha aumentado allí. () sus hijos, también, nuestros – sus hijos de nuestros hijos, generación completa ya, laugh.

GHRo3: (‘la generación que será? cuerplo o su — espíritu o) ... no es cuerpo, del cuerpo es. Lo que se forma pues, los hijos, se van naciendo - y los hijos crecen y se va. Y ellos tienen su ser, su marido - y se va aumentando la generación de uno.

GHRo6: generación: es lo que nace de su hijo del hijo - hijo, su hijo (‘hijo del hijo que nace - ese son generaciones ya - allí se va, engrandizando ya. Como dice en la biblia: descendiendo...

BR5(x): Dice que buscaba idea el hombre — como voy a transformarme en luna?\] — Que voy hacer – es que decía... Hay estrellitas — Hawa haiti’in? [What do I make myself?] — dice, en idioma. Hawa en haiti’in?... Wishi ka’ha’i... baririhi ha’i? [What do I make myself? There are stars, there is also the sun] — dice — Uxne ka’i... yamai’! Uxne en hanun [The moon of course, is not there! I will make myself the moon] que decía. Oy, voy hacerme\ barriers a convertirme en luna yo! que decía pues (...) el dice... estaba pensaaando... Y el hombre ya... ya no va ir allá ya... Ya va pensar: que hay se. Hay estrella: no. tambien hay la. Luna no hay! — squeledice. Ese voy hacerme luna!

ECHO1: De allí está pensannnd’to que cosa va hacer. “Me hago rio - grande - No, mejor no”. Pensannndo: palos gruesos — palo también se le derrita — en tanto dice de luna - allí me voy, al cielo.


(GSR07): noves cuando quiere llover - noves suena: ese es dice su rupa; o sea que su rupa dice le cuelga en una kurima - el ronsapa - ronsapa grande lo que ahí - eso dice amontana dice en camisa, ahí dice lo que suena. — cuando una persona morra, me decía mi papá: sonaba por acá. “Achí viven los neubu, me decía - acái viven los neubu...” — moría otra gente: “Binabu” — me decía - por donde (...) sonaba. “Ahí vive” - me decía mi padre. “Achí viven, los neubu viven acá!” - me decía. (*sea cada una se va a diferente parte del cielo entonces?) diferente quizás - como quizás pensaba mi papá - digo yo así!

no se mezclaban pues: así como Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia - ese no se mezclan. - (hablaban mismo idioma?) si, pero con otro tomo, claro! —

dcho (Loos 1960: 13): elder, usually the grandfather, recounts that in the old days before the white man came there were no fatal diseases and they were more healthy and much happier than they are now.

(LOOP1): (‘So was it evident that they were (...) dropping the language when you went there?) No, at first there was nothing, it was all really Capanahua. And quite vigorously Capanahua. They described their ancestors as being very strong. ...And brave. (...) Tessmann, have you read Tessmann’s account of his visit? He didn’t actually get to Buncuya, but he did aquire a Capanahua bow and arrows. And he said they were bigger than any others he had seen. (‘And the macana) And the macana, yes! Well, they, the Capanahuas would say, ‘Yeah, that’s us, we were strong’. [laughing] But, that didn’t last too long. Maybe 15-20 years, then they started going downhill.


dcho (RPR01): (‘Pues, que dice la ‘raza’? Que es la raza?) Raza es pues... osea raza es de... cuando un solo grupo, idiomatico, e viene el otro, allá, este es por decir, del otro grupo e y pues es la raza, decimos en castellano. Y ellos pues no querian que el otro grupo entre por aca. Y desa manera es que plebanean. Entiendes? Pues los Huaniches y los Chomos seran diferentes razas... Diferente... Pero tenia la misma lengua! La misma lengua. Ellos no querian pues que penetren pues los Chomos, ni ellos tambien se iban, ellos tambien no querian para que penetran de vuelta los Huaniches. asi. Ellos: Ustedes son de Tapiche, nosotros somos del Buncuya, dicen. Y desa manera yo estoy[de aca], largate, halla, Na! No le permitian.

dcho (RPR01): (‘Como se casaban la gente de aca? Entre la familia, entre primos?) Mira, el dice que este, ellos no querian cambiar la raza. Por decir, Ud es mi hermano, yo tambien soy tu hermano. Y una de mis hijas, ud tienes un hijo varon. Yo tengo una hija mujer. Y entonces ellos no querian mezclar la generacion, que vengue otro de lejos, mas bien tenia que hacer la reunir. Y ud le entregas, ya te entregas, yo entrego mi hija a mi sobrino. El otro le entrega su hijo a su sobrina. asi era antes. Antes se puede decir, entre los primos, se cazaban. Alli, desa manera aumentaban pues, alli nomas. No querian que entre de lejos. asi. Por que sera? No querian que cambie la raza. Sino, el no es nativo, sino es que ... sino ellos quieren aumentar puro nativos. No querian que vengue otra gente de lejos. Porque a veces... dice que ellos no querian que las hijas se vayan lejos!. Porque si el vive, por decir, asi como vivo yo por Zapatlita, y se enamoraria, yo tengo que llevarle. Ellos no querian eso. Y por esa razan es que ellos aumentaban acá nomas. Porque si es la mujer, siempre el hombre le ha extranar, no es su tierra. El querra irse a su tierra. Llevandole a su mujer. Y por eso hacian eso antiguanamente. asi me explicaba don Manuel Huaninche.

dcho (GSR12): Asi vivian antes, me decia mi papá. - Vivian antes con su familia, aunque sea con su hermano! - Mhm, quizas porque eran asi - no tenian este \}\- no sabian nada, ni quien es su familia - asi vivian antes - con su papá, con su hermano. —


dcho (AR01): Alli vivian purito familias - Puro familias. - habia uno nomas - se hecho de familia - allá ya se ido a vivir - Deaquí allá para que podian reunirese haciendo de esposo di - traian sus hija, el padre. - ahora el tenia su hijo - para que haga cambio - con su hija de el. - asi que le hace reunir - y con su hijo - le hace reunir - y asi. - asi - asi dice hacia mi. \]\- asi me contaba mi padre: - o sea que - t'u haces tu hijo: Bueno, hijo - queriendo hacer de puro familia, di?: no, no vale asi. - Ahora, hijo: deaquí toditos son tu familia - ese deaquí. - Aver, hay que llevar una tu hermana - vamos hacer cambio allá. - ellos venia a remo! - la pkkp asi! - - Remo! - tsk - Ese vanien comiendo pues - tenian todo! - Llega en su casa de su amigo - conversa con su padre - Y mujer entre mujer. (…)


(*y cuando se casaban - pareja quedaba donde padres de la hija?) si! - *(o donde padres del hijo?) - no — ese quedaba acá nomas. —

(*siendo varón - tengo que vivir con mis suegros ya) correcto - *(o llevo donde mis padres?) - puedes llevarle pues — claro, asi lo
hacían. - - A veces hijas lloraban - "No, tú tienes marido, acá está tu marido! - les conversaban. - ahora tu tienes que tienes que enamorar las chicas - en tiempo de antiguo no era así: "Ya? Hemos venido amigo, buenos! - mi hija - su marido. - Su hijo joven - conversa con sus padres - Ese deaquí va ser tu mujer. - El joven de igual que su padre, - - - - - Y así hacía su casa - todavía de yapa. - *(yapa) claro pues - hacía su casita. - *ahora aquí - se reúnen con sus hijas)\1 < a veces los yernos quieren hacer sus casitas ++++. Por ejemplo en Tamanco - me ido mirar -?metidos? en su casa de su suegro no - A veces yo les- oy hasta - así su casa - - - - - *Tu suegro te aburrece - tas durmiendo en su casa de tu suegro. Ese - mi tía Rosa sí sabe. - Ese te habla correcto! - - - Y donde has aprendido también? ++++. yo sabiendo - te iba decir todo! así como 'tas diciendo pues - ese neabakebu - ese es aparte di - ese no se mezclaban. Pa'nebakebu, pisabakebu, inubakebu, neabakebu - hay este ... - decía mi padre - hay como varios nombres: - pero no se mezclaban pues: así como Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia - ese no se mezclan. - *(hablaban mismo idioma?) sí, pero con otro tono, claro! - *(xentibakebu?) ---- xeni? - - ese creo había por Buncunya, mhm - Pero ahorita la generación todo se acaba pues - los - antiguamente era lindo! - Realmente lindo! - paque tú realmente aprezas. - - Ese que - ha quedado así como vive. -

*choi (RPRes) Y por eso es que su tío le entregaba a la sobrina o sobrina - entonces ella puede ser Huaninche, el otro s por decir Romaina. también su sobrino, pero tiene otro apellido - pero ahí es la misma raza, la misma generación. *(esto no molesta, no mancha) no *(si apellido es diferente) - s cae bien, bien. Si va ser mismo apellido, por decir Edi Huaninche - Huaninche Romaina, y ahora deso las hijas ya van tr otro apellido cuando viene otro mestizo - u otro paisano de más dallá - tiene otro apellido, por decir Chumo, Chumo Huaninche, con Pizarro Huaninche, o Pizarro Chumo - su hijos firman así - pero de mismo apellido, por decir Huaninche Huaninche - no. Tiene que ser pues mezclado - Chumo Huaninche o Huaninche Chumo - entonces ahi aumenta generación, aumenta pueblo. Pero sin embargo en Alpina no es así - todos los que van creciendo - viene el maderero - le lleva, le lleva lejos.

*choi (ELQ3): Well the thing I remember is that it had a... it came into discussions when a marriageability was discussed. So a man's marriageability to a female would be dependant on his clan name. And I once heard a discussion between two men. They would -- -- one was wanting to explain how the sister of the other man. And he was trying to explain how he was eligible to be... marriageable... marriage partner to that young lady. And uh - he was a binabekabu -- but the girl was not. So his logic was that the two clans are not incompatible - they are compatible. And so they should be allowed to marry. Well, there weren't very many instances when such discussions took place, at least in my presence. Usually, men who had a daughter, a marriageable daughter - or even long before she was marriageable - they would be looking for the candidate for her. And they would take the initiative to go to the parents of the boy and explain that he would make a good mate for the young lady. And if the others were agreeable, then the arrangement was considered made. They were then supposed to get married, and then finally consummate the marriage -- and take off... - So - that was where proper clan relationships entered into the picture: marriageability. I don't know of any other practical consequences that the clan membership had. And I didn't succeed in tracing it in those unions that were formed - I didn't think to go back and check and see who was what - I don't think that the clan relationships had any relationship to real life... that I could tell...

On our first trip that we made to the Tapiche, several young men accompanied me. And when we got to the Tapiche, the Tapichinos' approach was to ask the young men who their father was. And therefore that would determine what relationship they would have to them, because the kinship term was the primary concern. It was kind of curious. Older men would turn out to address the younger men as baken. That didn't seem to matter to them -- So that's as much as I can relate about the clans. But I could see that very easily a person with come from the outside and ask a man or a woman "Are you a Capanahuas?" or... they would say no I am binabekabu or na'binabeku. And then that became what would be a term for identification for those people. (Loos2009-2014): I did once overhear two young men discussing the fact that one wished to marry the sister of the other and explained to the other that he (the first) was of the [nahninbaquebo] moiety and the girl was a [binabaquebo], so he was a suitable match for the girl.

*choi (Loos 1972: 2-3): Tanto hombre como mujer pertenecían al clan de su padre, y en casos de personas que no se conocían cuyo parentesco era difícil de trazar, se valían del linaje parental, el "clan" para llegar a acuerdos matrimoniales.

*choi (Loos: 1960: 1) Thesis: the Capanahuas tribe was patrinnuela-patrilocal before contact with white civilization, and became matrilocal as a result of economic changes brought on by white contact.

*choi (Loos nd.a: 2) Los Capanahuas no tienen una organización política y por lo tanto carecen de un curaca reconocido. Normalmente viven en grupos de una familia extendida, formada de un padre de familia con sus hijos y especialmente con sus hijas y yernos.

(Loos 1960: 7): The aged patriarchs are men of much influence and prestige among their own families. A grandfather has authority to expect his sons, sons-in-law and all lower generations in his line to work for him when the clearing of land, planting, or construction of a house or caney is necessary.

(Loos 1960: 8): Though formerly the Capanahuas lived in large community houses, they now live in smaller settlements along the river as a result of the rubber-gathering industry. Consequently elder married sons and sons-in-law may be living apart a bit from the patriarch's locality and constitute a sub-section by themselves, though still subject to the patriarch's call. (ibid.); [Father] may oblige his sons and sons-in-law to help and in return help them in their plots, through a community fest in which the host, who is the "owner" of the plot while it lasts, provides huge quantities of home brew for the consumption of the workers during the day's work and the following night's dance.

(Loos nd.a: 2): El matrimonio es matrilocal de manera que el joven al casarse tiene que vivir con su mujer en la casa de su suegro, y está obligado a servir al suegro hasta que la muerte lleve a uno o al otro. Después de muchos años el yerno podrá construirse una casa propia, pero generalmente a una distancia no lejana de la de su suegro.

*choi (Loos 1972: 2-3): El hombre se unía a su mujer en la casa de los padres de ésta, al consumarse el matrimonio, y servía a su suegro siempre en la producción de chacras, canoas, mangues, y casas, y satisfacía sus necesidades de carne y pescado. (...) La
relación suego-yneco era entonces importante para la familia porque la adquisición de hábitos yernos significaba un aporte económico valioso para la cabeza de la familia.

*Loos 1972: 2-3: No habían caciques. El suelo dominaba la familia extendida, pero otros podían adquirir ascendencia por su merito como guerriero o mitayero. El guerriero capturaba jóvenes y mujeres. Los jóvenes le servían en una especie de servidumbre pero con tiempo, si no escapaban, tomaban parte en la vida como otros adultos.

DHR06: Taah, sale la placenta — y tiene que buscar su compadre ya pues - tu compadre, quien ya ser tu compadre - Yyy — le traen un - izanita — y con eso le apegas así - trah, le cortas con la tijera ya - umbleigo ya. —. Le amarras — y aista ya. (o sea izana para amarrar pupu?) - no - ese es paque le pones así ve - aquí ‘ta amarrado ya - en la punta de tripa está acá - allá le cortas - tahl! — ese medido - tahl! — Es para que no sale el sangre. (*) izana es ese de ese caña brava [(con esos cortas?)] aja, con eso le cortas así ve - le pones así - le apretas con la tijera - le das ya: trah! — para que no sale el sangre dice. — Ya está ya. —. Le amarras con reta\(\) - con ese - como se llama ese dahi — paque no queda pupu asi saltado. — Paque queda pupu chiquito - le amarras - pal, ya está ya. Le hace bañar, todo. — Y con la misma - () tac! - chupando ya. —

GHR05: No. No hace nada, sino tratamiento - ya es como una familia, segunda familia, — un hermano allí, una familia -tiqo- tiene respeto, por eso - y además también cuando ya - a veces la familia se sirven entre compadres - le da alguna cosa cuando tiene, se da - por ejemplo en cosas, entonces le alcanza ya.

GHR05: (‘comadre, compadré = familia legitima?) este es segunda familia se puede decir. Por ejemplo - tu ahijado es como tu hijo, no, porque tú has tocado su sangre. Y te puede decir padrino - como segundo padre. Aja, así es. (*por la sangre entonces) por la sangre! por la sangre, por haber tocado la sangre. (*panu...) si panu, laugh (*antes también?) aja, antes también, igualito. (*que hace compadré para su ahijado o compadres?) No, no hace nada, sino tratamiento - ya es como una familia, segunda familia, — un hermano allí, una familia.\n
DHR10: (*cuando ya se nace el bebe - y quieres buscar tu compadre — \(\)h) — ese se busca que tiempo ya - compadre ya - — para que tengas ya ahí tu compadre (*para que es esto?) — paque corte ya pues - el umbleigo — este compadre está tocando tu sangre, de tu hijo — es tu compadre legitimo - no le puedes ignorar - pues es tu compadre legitimo, ya ha cortado su pupu ya. (*o sea está compartiendo sangre de Z.) entonces compadre legitimado ya — señor compadre — compadre sangre ya [unconvinced?]. — Aija tu hijo legitimado porque ya le has cortado ya su pupu ahí - tocado su sangre — has [¿visto?] chiquitito —

GHR05: se van - buscarle, para trozar así como has trozado su umbleigo - y a eso es mi compadre ya! - entonces así hemos - respeto- más familias, agrupado más.

BRSt1: vivido dice más arriba ya — por... - — más arriba por donde te has pasado yendo - arriba de San Antonio — aja había — no sé como se llamaba ese sitio — Este — A. — un punto ahí llamado A. — Ahi se han ido a vivir dice otra vez — a trabajar shirinking — Ahi dice estaba X. ya viviendo — aja — ahí engendra ya — al Y. ya — Primer hijo, de la Z.: Sale el Y ya - ahi en ese lugar. — como quízás - de entre ellos — como quízás se trozaban el umbleigo — no sabemos.

RPO1: (‘ Pero después, con Bidar Ruiz, ya se empezaron...) a trabajar ya (*...y mezclar mas...) mezclaron mas. Allí desa manera que ya allí se quedaron por Tachip. Estos trabajaron ya pues con Machado. Allí ahí si ya, se han repartido. Ya no había pelea, acá ya vivían ya pues tranquilos, los Huaninches. Aaha, los Huaninches, Pizarros y los Freyres. así todos se trataban así, de primo. Primo pues es cha. Ya pues allí les daban sus hijas, a los Freyres, a los Pizarros. Por ejemplo a mi me han entregado... yo estaba mi... su nieta de Manuel. Se llamaba Luisa. Luisa Huaninche. Su sobrina de Mariano. s. Ya no, no tuve ningun problema, nunca con ellos. Por lo contrario.

BRH01: así como vienen a vivir por acá di - así como tú puedes vivir aquí - pero tú eres mestizo - no eres nuestros paisano. Así: mezcla ya! tú puedes tener tu mujer aquí soltero — Ahi puede mezclar ya tu apellido ya - teniendo tu hijo - Así, así eran antes. Ya aumentado así. (‘Si me caso con una chica de acá: este mujer de acá que se casa conmigo - este será mestizo - o nuestros hijos?) No - tu - por ejemplo un varon: no mure el apellido - Y cuando tiene la mujer - mure el apellido dice hombre. Así. — Así pues, Varios aquí: por eso algunos son Jimenez, Velas, Reginfos, Hidalgos - ese son otros - gentes de afuera: Tiene su ahijar, aumenta sus hijos - asi -

BRSt04: (**‘-bakebu - por qué dice así?)— sus hijos ya dise generación de abayubke - dese raza indigena, abayubke. Ese clase de gente. Ayabukeyu. (‘ayu huni) Ayu huni - entonces como te digo - entonces sigue pues la generación no pierde - sigue nomás. Pero si no aumentas -ahi termina, mueras, se acaba, no sigue más — pero si has aumentado hijos - va pareciendo los hijos, pero ya se diferencian también. —. Pero como te digo - Si yo me reunido con mi problema - engendrado hijos - entonces ese no termina, sigue. ahora - si agrada siguiente, otra - de otra generación ya — entonces ahí ya no va avanzar - ya no sigue ya. Sino pierda ya. Va perdiendo. — Yo me cruzo con mestizo por decirte, - ya, ya no aumenta mi generación - ahi mueren.

BRH01: así como vienen a vivir por acá di - así como tú puedes vivir aquí - pero tú eres mestizo - no eres nuestros paisano. Así: mezcla ya! tú puedes tener tu mujer aquí soltero — Ahi puede mezclar ya tu apellido ya - teniendo tu hijo - Así, así eran antes. Ya aumentado así. (‘Si me caso con una chica de acá: este mujer de acá que se casa conmigo - este será mestizo - o nuestros hijos?) No - tu - por ejemplo un varon: no mure el apellido - Y cuando tiene la mujer - mure el apellido dice hombre. Así. — Así pues, Varios aquí: por eso algunos son Jimenez, Velas, Reginfos, Hidalgos - ese son otros - gentes de afuera: Tiene su ahijar, aumenta sus hijos - asi -

LCOn01: (**Quien será eses capanahuas?) eses capanahuas no existen ya — Existen, pero sus hijos nomás ya — Ya no son - no viven — antiguamente - lo que sabian las historias ya - ellos ya no vivien ya”

LCOn01: (“O sea no hay los neabu legitimos ya?) — ya no pues — ese son sus ramas ya.

JRR02 (*Sachivo son otros ya?) ese son otro! — — (*no son Chumo?) no. ese no es Chumo. Ese Sachivo son otro. Pero ellos no... - no son antiguos pues - como estamos - ese... Aja. (*conocido su abuelito de estos Sachivos acá?) no. ese no. Ese — cuando estoy muchacho, se ha muerto allá, arriba de Fortaleza, aja, ese no ha venido por acá, por allá nomás ha - se ha muerto,

(*dice donde - su papá de Rozendo?) de donde quizás? — dahí nomás, lo que han crecido, ahí nomás - en su tierra, acá arriba, en Capanahua, - cabecera - ahí: así como indio pues! - pero se han - ha venido pues acá en río, ahí han costumbrado ellos también - ahí ya tenía su mujer, sus hijos, bautizó que pues — Y aquí ya vuelta hace sus hijos ya - hacen pues ese - todo! esos muchachos son - todo ese muchachos son ellos pues. — Baquinahua!

(*Baquinahua dice donde?) de aquí nomás - lo que han crecido su padre! - Su padre dice han muerto, pero hijos ya vivía ahí. todos ya han tenido pues Baquinahua, todo, todo, todo. (*padres de Baquinahuas?) donde quizás! (*Pero como indios también?) ajaa, así pues \} no son indios, pero - así como estamos - ese hacía. Mhm.


dius (RPR01): (*Y esa gente... los diferentes... tipos de gente, o como - los xanebu, inabu, binabu...) Ese pues... ese era - así se ponían ellos sus nombres. Yo voy a ser este, decían pues ellos. Y de esa manera ya todos son de xanebu, binabu, xawanbu, todo ese. Y esos eran sus nombres de ellos. Pero no porque realmente eran de diferentes grupos, sino la misma, la misma lengua tienen todos, sino así se echaban nombre ellos. Sus tribadas pues. Y de estos nombres pues... "yo voy a ser este..." pues otros, dice, decían: 'que va a ser su nombre de tu hijo?' y ella decía así pues, xawanbu, dice, Referiéndose a un guacamayo. El loro que vuela. De pecho rojo. De eso. Y el va ser xawanbu, ya. Xawanbu?! se le llamaban, su mamá. Y así era antes. No se diferencia la lengua, sí no así se echaban nombres ellos en sus montes, en la selva.

(*Y de estos nombres se ya crearon las familias.) Los familias, yhm. (*Descendientes). Descendencia. Ya se han quedado con ese... se puede decir... con ese nombre. porque no porque de otro grupo, dib? No, sí una sola. así se echaban los nombres ellos en su tiempos de los antiguos. Por ejemplo ese xane, binabu, inabu... no, sino que estos se ponían nombre entre... entre la comunidad, entre los nativos. así era antes.

cs Agustín López, Diario I: 1903-09:
1907 dec: -te día tomando de nuevo nta monteria que habíamos dejado [?] la surcada por otra en mejores condiciones q nos ofreció D Heri[v]eto, bajamos al Capanahua. El mismo día llegamos, habiendo visitado en el transito la casa del curaca de esa tribu en q encontramos á sus hijos con sus mujeres. Visitamos la [ca]sa de otro capanahua q vive junto á la boca de esta quebrada [en] la cual encotravamos varias familias q habían venido con patron Maximiliano Freire á hacer una casa. Me reci-<108> bieron bien y pude hacerme comprender de ellos por medio de uno q me conocía del Ucayali y hablaba bien castellano.

El 15 todos los niños vinieron á visitarme trayendo 5 criaturas p[ara] q se las bautizara. El 16 vino el curaca con su famil[a] trayendo 4 mas. El 17 volvió con otros 3 para bautizarlas [el] mismo día salieron del Capanahua dos familias de siring[ueros] trayendome otra criatura par bautizarla. Hechos los bautis[mos] se verificó el matrimonio del D. Teofilo Piñero brasileiro [con] la Srta Encarnacion Vela. Por último se me presentó un c[a]panahua como de 20 años pidiendo el bautismo. Conociendo en el uno una gracia extraordinaria q Dios queria hacerle el adm[inistr] el sacramento; é es imediatamente contra el parecer de todos sus paisanos y especialmente de su abuelo el curaca, q trataban de dis[uad]irle, píjio bájese conmigo. Habló al patron a quien deb[i], como 200 soles, el cual accedió á sus deseos, por lo cual no tuvo el menor inconveniente en recibirle. Preparó sus cosas y fue - á buscar la cama y ropa y después de almorzar, como a [p. 109] las 2 de la tarde llenos de alegría nos bajamos a Francia. Aquí pasamos tdo el día 18 por hallarse Ramon [Pacaya, boga] enfermo à consecuencia de un dolor de oído q le hizo pasar muy mala noche.

cs (TO312): [so are people here Capanahuas?] Yo digo que somos Capanahuas. Ese es nuestra raza, nuestra generación; "pertenecemos a esa raza" - y 'en mayoría entendemos'. (*?) No se puede negar eso ya. (*) ‘Algunos así dicen – sus padres, madres, abuelos, eran Capanahuas, pero ellos no los son) así, dicen algunos así. Incluso mi abuelo entendía todo lo que se hablaba, conocía bien, pero decía que cuando ha ha ido y bajado del ejercito, ya no recordaba mucho y que ya no era Capanahua

cs (RPR08) (*Leandro Torres?) Sí, Pizarro también () hermano menor de todos, del mismo padre (que Tomás Pizarro, Santiago) (no sabe quién eran esos padrones) no.

(*como lo hacen - de chiquito?) chiquitos. Desde pequeño - entonces ese queda - esta va ser mi apellido - ellos mismo echan nombre - Leandro Torres. Posiblemente creo un señor Torres de Tamanco, pero no acuerdo su nombre - así me explica también - Manuel Huaninche. Un Torres, pero nombre no me dijo- un Torres le ha bautizado. Le ha querido - la barriga de su vientre - de la mamá - el ha pedido - para ser mi ahijado - sea varón o mujer. Y nació Leandro - y allí le – que va llamarse Leandro. Va ser Leandro

("que hace padrés?) el padrino: muere su mamá, su papá - yo lo recogiré como padre verdadero dice el padrino. Por eso muchos ellos le querían al padrino - ya padrino le dío ese apellido. (*a veces solo nombre no apellido?) sí, pero ese le daba con todo nombre y apellido. — Y por eso él ya no es... Pizarro - sino Leandro Torres. (\"") creada otra generación?) sí... [unconvinced] — Su mamá era - no lo conocía pero apellidos Isamano. (*que de Tomás?) sí. (*La señora estaba Capanahua?) [no,] pero entendía así pues, que ha sido de padrino? (*antiguos no tenían apellidos castellanos, no?) algo difícil. Yo creo que era de padrino. () (*padres legítimos que hacen para su niño?) solamente le dan su pan de día... mhm, su pan de día... (y la caricia, o amor para el niños
eso es\l los padres!\("\) cuando el niño crece\(\)\), sí, con los padres, padrino no tanto - papá y mamá, y demás hermano. Pero ya pues quedan con ese apellido - con ese apellido crece - son hermanos que se conocen, pero de diferente apellido es - Si sería de otro padre.

(cso (ACo2)): J: “- bueno que no estabas capanahua hija,” me decía mi abuela. — “Hacia correr hijo de campo. - Terminando - el capanahua”.

A: Mhm, no ‘toy diciendo - los campesinos estamos acabando a los capanahua ya pues. Aaja.

J: tú no eras hijo de capanahua cuando ya hacías correr.

(cso (ACo1)): Porque desde entonces - ya los capanahua no querían hablar ya pues sus idioma. Ya los parecía feo dice: ya no somos indios, ya nosotros también somos mestizos, dejan ellos. + + +

(cso (ACo2)): El ha dicho que ya no quieren ser ya capanahua, quiere ser mestizo ellos también ya - aja. - hasta que viejos saben hablar - decía pues - y los hijos ya no deben ser así ya. Porque los hijos deben tener estudios superiores - ya decía pues - paque los enseñen.

(cso (VPB01)): Mi abuelo me cuenta: - Sus abuelo de el: querían como comer gente! - Uno que se moría deaquí - por no desperdiciar dice querían comer. - El\(\)ya dice: - "Nnno, para que vamos comer? - más bien hay que enterarles - Y dice querían comer - ellos viejos querían comer: - para que no desperdicie! - Mi abuelo: - decía: para que vamos a comer? - aquí hemos venido para comer gente? - No. - Hay que enterrar. - Enterraba mi abuelo - ya, listo. - Mi abuelo era joven pues! - Y si que vamos a comer? - - Eso querían los - los antiguos querían comer dice - paque no se desperdicia dice - - Aita ahí - amigo Lucas - que sera pues carne de gente dí? - - como no - - - que vamos a comerlo? - Henhen! - Nnno. - - + + +

(cso (GRSB08)): ("tu papá decía que tu primo sera tu familia también, que no se debe casar?) --- --- . - ha. - nuestro primo es dice nuestro - bene defete dice - Nuestro - marido dice como - - - "Con tu primo te puedes casar - me decía mi papá - "A cuidado - decía yo! ++++ - ("o sea ustedes no ha querido?) - mhmh - yo veía feo pues di - di que ya voy a -- Tiendita y yo sabía pensar - - que voy a meterme con mi familia! - - decía - como ya pues tratar a mi familia! - mhmh -- - "(y así no veo - estes mujeres - esas chicas ahorita no veo así - con cualquier se meten! - - No dice es mi familia, nada! - - ("o sea ahora es peor que antes quisas?) - igual, igual nomás - - ("Pero para tu papá entonces el primo no sera familia quisas?) - - - - - como sera pues! - que quisas -- - igual quisas pensaba el! - De un primo - Mi beneyura - me decía. - por ejemplo este X - 'ta mi primo hermano - mhmh - su hijo de mi tia, su hermana de mi mamá - de mi papá -- Y su mamá de mi ---- Es mi primo ---- ---- ---- Yo me acuerdo que X le decía así a mi papá: "A mi me vas entregar tu hija, tio -- decía -- MmM -- Yo le rabiaba y lloraba cuando oía así ----- +++++ No me gustaba paque me diga así mi familia. - - Y les he frenado hasta el último! - No quería saber nada. - hasta soy así - ahora yo le digo ¡flano! - y no digo primo, nada! - Les tengo como a mis hermanos pues di? - - Aja.

(GRt01): ("mejor aguarras su primo - prima para pareja. - Benigno - Ezequiel: agarra mi hija, paque no se pierda generación ---- - Y usted estaba diciendo la misma cosa - decía tu papá (\- mhm, así pues me decía mi papá. - ("como has pensado que eso puede ser?\) -- yo no quería pues: - yo pensaba como que voy a meterme con mi familia di? - - El apellido que yo tengo: - yo pensaba asi - Yo tengo el apellido - que tiene: - el -- que puede meternos ---- asi como ya pues? -- para mi quedaba feo asi -- A pesar que era huambra - sabia eso? - Yo no me dejaba - "mi papá me quería entregar! - No quería! - - -

(K: y como es que para ellos no parecía feo eso?) - porque ellos taban costumbrado así. - ("y ustedes, jefes ya vivian en otro tiempo ya)\- cómo? - ("ustedes ya no querian eso - no hasquerido que no se pierde la raza ya?) - m-m --- --- \- Casi con la misma me quedado pues! - porque mi tío este -- su papá de Eugenio - es - Sachivo también. -- MmM? -- (...)"(Pero había otra gente que decía que tu primo sera tu familia? - - - Si tu papá te decía que ese quisas no es familia: que le puedes casar - O te decía que es tu familia, pero puedes casar) - mhmh -- así pues -- ("que es familia, pero puedes casar?) - aja, con tu primo. - así me decía mi papá. - ("Por qué los jóvenes no han querido, han dejado ese costumbrar?) - no ya pues - uno mismo se - ve feo - vivir con nuestra familia. ("Pero has tenido vigencia que otros van venir y te van mirar mal?) - yo pienso pues - que otros vengan di, dice dicen: "Con tu familia esta! - mhmh ---- - ("como dicen, dicen, como los indios quisas?) - como los indios ya pues - ("irrazonables)?) ---- - que no conocen a su familia. - - así pues es ("o sea les reñían los mestizos que venían - que viven con su familia, todo eso) - no es que nos reñían - sino - te dicen pues así no ---- "Por qué te metes con tu familia, mhmh - Habiendo tanta gente ‘tas metiendo con tu familia!' - - Igual que Z: - Z. - ‘ta con su sobrina! - mhmh. ---- ---- Ese es según de cada persona. - Ese es querer de cada uno ya. - (...) - mucha gente lo hacen - para algunos lindo - que no pierda la generación - pero parece para mestizos acá - no les gustaba eso,) - -nno es que les. - - algunos mestizos también se meten así. - - Mhmh. - Por eso pues digo - ese es querer de cada uno pues - mhmh - Aita don\\(\)\- don X Y de Santa Elena: - está con su - prima, sobrina creo - sus hijos firman Y Y ----

(GRS01): ("ustedes ya no querían eso - no hasquerido que no se pierde la raza ya?) - m-m --- --- \- Casi con la misma me quedado pues! - porque mi tío este -- su papá de Eugenio - es - Sachivo también. -- MmM?!

(GRS11): ("según lo que has escuchado - te parece que antes se vivido más lindo o ahor?) - yo pienso que igual se vive - pero ya no pues como vivían antes así - con sus familia ya. - - Ahorta ya conocemos quien es nuestro familia. ("Pero con eso se pierde la raza ah?) - ya se pierde la raza pues ---- así decía mi papá. "Tas queriendo hacer aumentar nava", me decía. -- ------\- \- "Tas queriendo hacer aumentar cocama", me decía mi papá + + +

(cso (BRSt1)): ("yo así hacían los antiguos?) - así pues dice! - Te hacían reunir con tu prima! - A mi quería reunir mi tio pues con mi prima. - con este, la Margola - me quería tío - hacer reunir su papá de ella -- Yo no quería pues! - más bien me largado a río Blanco a chambiar porrá. - - Y venido de frente ya - para casar con Estefita ya - al Buncuya - De alla ya te traído a ellos ya - ("por qué no has querido casarse - con mi prima - aïsta pues! - Sino - hubiese aumentado bien! - Hubiera sido - mis hijos pues ya este. - Victor Rios Sachivo - así hubiera seguido ya - metiendome yo con la Margola ---- Aja - ("no has querido) yo no he querido pues - Ni - pensaba eso también pues yo! - De que - voy a perder mi raza dí? - - pero siendo con ellos - hubiera aumentado cuantos mis hijos - así como la Beti, otra la Rabi - otra Luli - otra - Beti - ese hubiese sido mis hijas ya pues de mi - Aja - entonces hubiera aumentado mis hijas - Y mi sangre no se iba perder. - ("y tu papá mamá - no te reñían - que. -)-
...no — también pues me largado — no sabía ellos nada. — No decía "Mm, mi tío me 'ta queriendo entregar a mi prima — Nunca he dicho eso. - más bien tenía que irme ya pues — porque no me entreguen. — Y largado a Rio Blanco - cambiar ahí — — pero yo era joven, así como Toni - 18 años — así mismo. — Y 4 meses cambiando por Rio Blanco Curinga Lobo Tambor Cung - poráí también + Poráí me largado; andammm!! — cambiar...—

(BRS04): Entonces - mi tío me querido hacer reunir con su hija. Yo ya vuelta no quería. — Uuh! - Tío era un travieso - este te agarraba — así dormir con su hija — bien! — ++ yo ya talán! - ++ Oy no - deuez — su mujer igual, mi tía. — Aki mi han/ibu—betan uxanwe, ñun! — "duerma con tu mujer, aísta!" — así pues no queria eso - uuuh! - Echado donde ella — salia - Vam — me largaba. ("por qué no querías? no queria. aísta pues! - me - — porque diciendo por su hija! por eso yo no quería pues! — Pucha, una borrachera me hacía eso mi tía. Mi tío no, no - — dado mi masato — ha — yo era un muchacho pues — tenía miedo que me agarre mi tía. ( *no son ahauara, es diferente?) no —

— Chumo, Chumo aquí — Cooomo dice han gritaba, que bruto! ''' Mhm

— Mi mamá nos habid. — Tu madre — — voy hacer mal, carajo — pero mi tío me está entregando pues su hija — como dice para no perder la raza pues — para aumentar dahí — Yo no quería pues. — Mi mamá no sabía — yo hacía mi traversura por ahí — jovencillo, 14 años — así era. — No quería pues. Hasta el último! — Tenía otro su hermana de ella, más mayor — con ese mi hacía igual: aísta tu mujer, lleva — duerne con ella — Vam — no quería — tu tio, no le, no compadré - Mi tía también igual, mi tía vieja era así — como mi mamá Ermishia. Así. "(F'kunin ra'e butanwe - min 'aibu!’) — "no, tía, digo yo — no se trabajar — decía yo — como yo le voy servir!"

decía yo. Era un muchacho. — O sino pues — aumentado una cantidad de familia ahí — no quería pues yo. —

(BRS08): ("Pero quien te dicho que mejor no le cases - que es tu prima?) - ha? - ("quien te dicho que mejor no te \[io]. — no —

ese mi tío Tarzan — hombre fuerzudo — el decía pues así — que tus primas, — con tu primas puedes casarte! (P: ++++) — ¡aja! — Pero

no con tu sobrina -- + ("Pero no has querido usteds?) — no yo he querido pues (P: ++++) +++++ (—") porque era mi prima pues — yo no quería pues — pero mi tío me quería hacer dormir con su hija — Yo le digo — noo — "tengo miedo. — "por qué vas a tener miedo? — tu mujer es pues — me dice — yy? — acaso es otra gente? - ese es tu 'aibú! — !Mhm — Yo le decía - no — así me

agarraba de mano — Vay - vay - dormir con mi chamba — (P: ++++) — ¡aja

(GBS04): ("cuando la Kinga estaba haciendo su olla, nos has dicho que don José se comentado para que vas hacer esto — eso

e es la cosa de los antiguos) — si, pues me ha dicho él. — ("Por que no Vale esto que es de los antiguos?) — o sea que el yo no

quiere para hacer a mi olla. — ("K: para el en cambio esa?) — yaya no — qué? — (K: por qué?) — porque ese dice eran de antes, dice

los antiguos ("hay que dejarlo?) mhm — poniendo comprar ellas dice - van estar haciendo barro. — Así hacían los antiguos— los antepasados cuando ellos no podían comprar. Mhm.


e ese nuestros paisanos de nosotros. Claros que nuestras abuelas, — abuelos - hablaban nuestro dialecto di — pero ya pues — ahora nosotros ya hemos dejado eso pues — Ya se han terminado abuelas, abuelos, se han terminado - ellos pues hablaban ese


Aquí creo que hay uno — — pero - no yan bajar - eso no hay Chumo aquí. No hay Chumo. Allá ariba creo que no hay. Pero aquí ese Padilla también, ese también es Chumo. Padilla Chumo pues. Ese — — Ese dice su hija hace pues su este - Shabi lo que ha tenido - Ahí

ehay tenido todos, todos, todos ya.}


tiene todo, todo sus botas, todo - dice ahí. (*ellos veen en ocurrencia?*- ahí viven ahí en ese oscuro. (*no le molestá oscuridad?*) - no, que es dahi (*parece como de día?*) @ así salen en día - noves algunos le esconden a muchacho, señorita cuando está el día.  
(EHR24j): (madre de carnával vive en su hueco de curuhuini?) - de curuhuini? - ese vive en hueco de palo - () así paloso - a veces en hueco de tierra - hay así hueco de tierra - ahí dice está adentro - hueco de palo - que va vivir en hueco de curuhuini - aista su madre - te puede morder! - En hueco de palo si - aista su - casa - Hueco de tierra, así. - Un huecáz. - así se le halla en monte a veces - Tremendo huecazo ve - Bien - libre - cossGUadientro - pero lindo es pues - libre! - Ahí quizás duermes adentro - pero no se adentro - oscuro -

**E.g. (RPH01):** (*Madre de carnával - es lo mismo?*) - ese es shapshicho, lo mismo! - pero ese la mujer, ese madre del carnával - y este. - Eses, había entonces a hombre al monte, día del carnával dice era pues - Se va al monte - ese día que prienda la húmisha. -Se va - despacio ya - Mata dice un sajino, le destripa el sejino --- Y - ta volviendo. En este que 'ta volviendo - dice encuentra - oye bombo adelante: escucha bombo atrás. Que lo que hace él: - Amarrar \| le corta dice un palito - le pone - cruz - cruz un arco un cuerno en su pecho le pone. - atrás también. - No hecho caso: que dice el diablo venía, venía - tran! - le dice se ha escondido, (,) en un hueco. entonces le dice - Amigo, que haces ahí, amigo? - "vamos ya a pasar la fiesta del carnával! - Y - sale ya pues - El sale: sale dahi --- Y se va ya - El dice mira así - ya no eras monte! - era una linda carretera! - Bien limpio! - entonces le dice era quienista - le dan la quena ya pues a el - Había dice bombo redoblante - Bruutto! dice la gente que venía jugando. - toda la gente pues - muchachos y hombres, tomando - algunos dice dieran dieran pues. - Dahi se seguían - él se iba con su quena ya - se iban tomar masato, trago, lerva? --- Puta, se largo! - su mujer dice espera y espera, no parecía - que va hacer? - entonces ya llega pensar: yaa le robado madre del carnával -

**E.g. (GRS07):** nín yúshin, así he oído que decía mi papá. (*gente o?*) - ese es pues la chuyachayi, yashingo. (*) ese es lo que vive en el monte. (*lo mismo que viene para carnával?) no. - a, por carnával dice entran todo clase de demonios: ellos, los que muren - porque une vez cuando ya taba fundado ese Limón Cocha - había un señor que \| este prima Estefía vivía con su marido allá en Requenillo. entonces dice se han ido tomar de día, para carnával. () masato. Y queda dice un borracho. Había un hamaca de mi prima Estf ahí, en su casa () Ahí dice ha quedado el borracho. Y los demás han venido ya. --- No han dejado ni una canoa - todito han traído. entonces el borracho dice despierta: Oye dice bombo en la loma, por el camino, por donde se va al Buncuya pues. - Oye que viene gritando, bombo, su quena, y Venían jugando dice los hombres, venían riendo. entonces dice - se echado más en hamaca, se tapado con su hamaca. - De frente dice han venido a subur - como dice han pandillado ahí, en su patio. Había dice caimito en su bajo dese caimito como dice pandillaban dice. - Y uno dice subs a casa. - Pero aquí hay uno, que dice - Vamos dieran! - el demonio ya. Vamos dice - sube uno - No, dice sd -el bueno quizás pues - No, dejale a este borracho, han dejado - deja, que descansa. --- pero era su hermano dice - de lo que taba echado borracho. - pero ahí dice le conocido a su hermano: "Dejale ahí" - y se han ido. El dice - ellos taban yendo - el empezado a nadar ya ? - Bien bajo dice era. Empezado nadar, vadiando a la play, dahi ya venido por canto, asustado. - Por eso dice que hasta - este demonio que muren - hasta ellos salen. A fiestiar, carnával. (*y tú nunca has encontrado?*) - no. - no! !Eugenio sí me cuenta allá en Buncuya - del airoputo noves vivian ellos en la loma - del arprt de la subida te vas - a la loma ahí vivían ellos. Ahí dice quedado su mamá también - que ya estaba - omarle vivían en hueco de palo. Ale - la empezado a nadar ya ' - Ese día, --- - Ese día, --- - Ese día, --- - En hueco de tierra, --- - En hueco de tierra, --- - Ese vive en hueco de palo? - Ese vive en hueco de palo? - Ese vive en hueco de palo? - Ese vive en hueco de palo? - El empezado a nadar ya ' - Ese día, --- - En hueco de tierra, --- - En hueco de tierra, --- - El empezado a nadar ya ' - Ese día, --- - En hueco de tierra, --- - Por eso dice la madre del carnaval - y verdadamanete estaban surcando en el bote ya: Taban surcando! --- "No te dicho, dice le dice - así te van hacer! - tú no sabes hacer caso!" - "por qué no te han llevado" - le dice - "En que - yo agarrado mi canoa y vadia al otro lado!" !++* cocojido di++ - duro dice le hacían reir! - por eso dice la madre del carnaval existe pues! - ese es este shapshicho.
**APPENDIX 7. ORIGINAL QUOTES**

---


**DHR20:** Este también — carnaval — tiene su madre — Carnavalón - hen! — ese pandillero en monte! — Vete en su día del carnaval (en monte) — hen! — te lleva dice! — 6= — Mhmm — Te jala de tu mano dice pandillero bajo de húmisha - tomar masato — Bien colorado su cara — jugando con achito — novos hay achiote del monte - ese tamanito rojito 6=!: Senoritas ahi — como jegan, Jovenes! — Danda la vuelta bajo del húmisha - desfrazado ahi — Por eso sale desfrazados aqui cuando hace con carnaval — ese tipos que cumplen 12 años — Yo también he salido desfrazado - he salido 6 años — Dahí ya no querido ya — Bruto que me hacía soñar — A mi sueño el diablo del monte ya pues — en tu sueno te viene llevar — Brrruuut — se — Senoritas — lindas señoritas, rollo su caras — te jalan en tu sueno =!: pendillar — es porque no sales desfrazado aqui

**DHR20:** Sino cumplies dice así vives así entonces dice — te compaña — — (...)*y después te hace soñar este demonio?* — demonio nomás — cuando no sales - te hace soñar nomás — así vives dice - poshece'co dice —

**DHR20:** (*y es caño has hecho esto también?) — ya no querido salir ya — aha, pero me hace soñar - pero no quiere salir ya pues — más antes me gustaba — ahórra ya no quiero ya — Me cumplido — (*) tienes que cumplir 12 años — tengo 6 años nomás — me falta (!) molestar pues — a mi sueño para — cuando se acerca carnaval pues — Febrero — ha caído este febrero — Ahi me hecho soñar pues — no he salido pues —! — No he — no quiero! — (por qué no quieres?) — * y ya no quiero ya ++ ++ mhmms — cuando era muchacho salía — pero ahora ya no me gusta ya — ya no ya - ni me gusta jalar, nada ya! — Ahi estoy escondido en mi cuerto ahí — ! Echaah — d d o — para que no ensuciien — por eso no quiere jalar — — Se hace tarde — recien salgo ya — recien me voy a la fiesta ya — Aha, ahi no te va ensuciar - puro almíon — y talco nomás te ensucia — colorete — te ensucia con colorete — tu camisa, todo — tu cara — Manece - puro aceite — puro ese colorete

**DHR20:** dese dealla — ese — cashaponha. — Ese la corta [maletoncito?]- nomes tiene su huoyo? —! — Ese le corta tan! — bien su hójita bien — Y su huoyo no le corta — ahi queda su huoyo. — ya le cargan ya — acá le ponen en local. — Le pone en una mesa: — ahi le trensa su su huoya — vaya trenzando — tra tra tra — paque haga asi ya - mhm - Le hace trinar así ya — trenzado — aquí le amarra un palo — ya — Aísta ya — las - costas amarrados — todo — bien adornado! — bien cargadito ya! — Mhm - todo — En la punta está la bandera rojo y blanco ahi — peruano -- + (por qué bandera?) ese porque somos peruanos dice — mhm — peruano — rojo y blanco. Por eso... — en la corona, misma coronita le amarra eso —

**DHR20:** (*que más se colabora — que es bueno?) — de todo! — (*Pero carni, pescado ya no?) — alg pone motelco: — le cuélan! — carni así envuelto — aha — también pues — yyy - no quiere carne? pues están de hambre alg - pooh! — me voy a la carne, dice — para que te lo va comer — (*inguri?)- inguri, galleta, pan — aha — zapote — de todo! — () dulce! — gasiosa — gasiosa no sabe romper la cimba pues — Cae — yy! —?A veces que ese? motelco - eso se mezquina— ayaauu! — se montona - lo que tiene — ahi agarran - aha, pelea — ahi — bruut! — puntuta al monte esta — hormiga en su encima que ++ ++ ++ ahi tiene que correr ya! ++ ++ ++ Puerta, ese — hormiga bravio — ahi! — recien se retira — lo que lleva el motelco - lleva ya — yy! ++

**BR57:** Tiempo de carnava lo que va estar la palmera — Se van con quena y bombone ahi — paque levanten a la palmera, bombon, musica - Y le parai a la palmera bien cargado con pañuelo, — muchas cosas se pone en prenda pues - todo eso hay. Van tener que — celebrar la fiesta por la noche, todo el día. — 5 de la tarde van tomar en la palmera.

**DHR20:** ese es — hasta — estas horas ve — tumba la húmisha — po, po! — Blon! — ahi gana a ese húmisha — uuuu! — ahi carga la palmera ya — botar al agua! — Se terminó — la fiesta ahi —! — Yo también me he colaborado: una lejía, una bolsa de ace y un jabón.

**RPH01:** (*o sea si no le hace caso y no participas en carnaval...) — tienes que hacer caso por fuerza - novos el fiesta del diablo ahí — por eso ese momento en la noche, todo el dia, o la 9 de la noche - salend disfrazados. — Algunos salen barrigón, algunos salen mujercita - algunos su cara bonita, algunos trememndo lgar su rabo. — Había pues el año pasado un joven que se dib- — parecía un mono: bien fec! — Se iba ahi — pucha, queriendo jalar: ++ ++ como gritaba la muchacha! — hacían reír! — Ahi había una mascara, bien feco - ashi bolito su nariz. — Ni más ni menos una mujercita, peludita, amarrado todavía! — Basilla - ni más ni menos - una mujer! — pero — desfrazado pues —

(*o sea — para que hacen esto?) — o sea que imitando dice al diablo! — o sea que comparando al diablo lo hacen ese dañ. — Julio: (o sea que ese es una fiesta de carnaval hermano — ese es cada año —) / \ Cada año los celebrian ese ahi este fiesta / \ Julio: así como hecho esa vez aqui — Nunca en su pueblo esa clase? (*)! (J: primera vez has visto?) () (Así hacemos - así festejamos nosotros aqui cada año, esa fiesta de carnaval) (*estos que se disfrazan - esto imitan al diablo, nomás? - no es que diablo está viniendo) no, ahiyro ya no. —

De— A media noche - a partir de media noche que salen disfrazado - el diablo dice se presenta juntabien con los personagens que están saliendo. — Ahi dice esté el también! — pero como son varios pues - uno no s les conoce — Algunos salen barrigón, algunos salen derecho - algunos sin brazo! — — manquishios - algunos con un lado de pie, algunos cojitos — Y ese diablo tiene su capataz, o sea su jefe — un otro diablo más arias viejiiliito (J: apu como le dicen) — El le comanda a todos — el primerito entra - cojenniendo se va ese viejiito - con su bastoncito - llega a los diablos ahi pide ya a la padilla- una musiquita típica - el esta ahi — le convidan su trago - pero bienn?iponechito? - pero como pues le hacen así?! ++ ++ Un viejiito! Algunos dice ya se ido cagar - asiiii++ voltazo ya - Dahi el se va ya: se cansa ya pues - el que sale eso: bruuto como caldeesa mascara que se muda! — 'tas bien! sudado ahi — Algunos ya no aguantan ya - algunos trna volviendo pues ya — Y ahi también dice está el diablo. —

**DHR20:** (*uno de demonios que viene — 4 caras no?) — + el capataz pues - ñ! - Igual del monte - también tiene 4 caras — Y por eso - deaquí mismo incluso dice - de 4 caras ya - igual. - El lo que va salir así nomás - tiene 1 nomás @ - (*capataz\...\*) su dueño de yushin — todos. — (*de los animales?) - aja dueño también — novos — del monte? — ese sale capataz adelante — Y sus cria viene atrás ya — Viene ya — () el se va adelante — como un matero pues — aja (*capataz + madre de demonios?) - su
madre (*Pero hombre?) hombre pues — hay de mujer también - lo que sale viejita, bien viejita — () Viejo: sale viejo, un capataza un viejazo - barba blanco. - (*cualquier puede salir como ese viejito?) - cualquier pues — sale — pero sale bien potolomito pues - con tu gastoncito. — hace un capujillo - tejas hoja - hoja de unruguali - se teje - igual que la cumbia — Ahí se hace - tongor de coto dice - así se le levanta - por acá se le teje ya - queda ya: tejido así - ahí paque le montona ya — Le monton casco de molote - que también hay. - Viene cargando ya - así. — (*don Eugenio taba haciendo eso) —! — (*Pero cada año?) cada año - hasta cumplir 12 años — (*sea como saudes de un demonio - tienes que seguir cada año con ese mismo) — con ese mismo nomás!

Sales de hombre — de hombre — sales viejito — viejito — hasta tener 12 años.

**DHRR22**: (*como lo hecho Eugenio paque salga como viejito? - o sea soñado - o. - cómo?) No, el mismo quería salir de viejito nomás — De capataz — Yo voy salir viejo - dice - ya listo - tu vas ser nuestro padre ya - nosotros tus hijos (Ya listo - Por eso el ha dicho el mismo pues así va — (*) ajaa - tu mismo puedes - que quieras - (*) Yo quiero hacer un capataz — un viejito voy hacer - hasta el último! - hasta cumplir 12 años. Bien fesismio - difrázada - ese -Eugenio - el sabe hacer pues — ohoy! - da miedo! - A los muchachos como le hace gritar!

**GSR07**: (*cuando se disfrazan - quiere decir que viven demonios cuando están disfrasados - ...-) no, ese son cristianos que son - que se disfrazan aquí, salen. (*no son demonios verdaderos?) - ese no pues — lo que - a veces dice - a veces salen 10, di - después de esos 10 cristianos vienen dice más: ese ya son los diablos ya. — Cuanant cuanto hay - ahí parece más ya. Así dice era antes, tenían más de lo que han salido ya. —* (ya no?) ya no! - ya no veo así ya - (antes has visto?) no — así mi papá me contaba. cuando - eso lo que han visto aqui — ese dice es cierto. Mhm.


**GSR07**: (*y si lo muda la mujer - esto le puede dormar entonces: el demonio?) — ese vive posheco, enfermo vive - ()- no quiere comer - asi soplando sí, con cigarro, con brujo ya - ahí se arregla recién. - está compañiendo demonio dice. - Su madre de carnival. — Ahí le saca todo de su cuerpo, ‘ta otra vez orden.

(*o sea la gente que se mudan como demonios no se vuelven demonios para siempre? —) - no, no es ++ — no es demonio para siempre - gente se hace otra vez. — (*no es peligroso?) no pues — un rato nomás quedan demonio - hasta 2 horas, 3 horas — (*y después...) ya te vas [gesture for leaving] al monote otra vez ya - saca ese camisa — (*si no lo hace - te puede hacer daño?) si, vives así, posheeco, no quieres comer, quieres dormir - () porque te compaña pues.

(*diferentes demonios que salen en carnival) ajaa, mujeres, hombre, viejitas, señoritas, viejitas — (*eso escondes tu? [sic! escoges!]) — no, con eso salimos, salimos con el - pandillar ahí. salimos así en carserio - pandillar el húmisha. — Ahí pandillamos nosotros ya. (*sea tú dices: este año voy ser viejito sí?) mhm, tienes que cumplir ahí. — saldo viejito - tienes que cumplir hasta - el ultimo viejito - hasta tener 12 años de viejito sales. No te cambias de mujer, de hombre - nada! - Viejito sales (*cada año) - mismo nomás - viejito sales, viejito, viejito, viejito hasta 12 años. — No cambias pues. — (*y como has salido tu?) yo he salido de hombre nomás - no saldo de viejo - careta de hombre - ese nomás - camisa de yerba, de todo, te pones - noves te pones bien, con yerba aquí - bien. le hace de yerba todo - tú te lejes así — Aquí callampa de palo - aja, aja! - - arrete cuando es mujer, callampa de palo. —- Todo. — Su boca rojito, + + pintado sus cejas + + lindo también, oohohoy, Lucas - mujer - demonio - chuchito bien — señorita pues - y con su taco ++

**GSR02**: (*muchas veces me parece que a la gente que vive acá - le gusta aprender de los que vienen no — aprender otras cosas, otro conocimiento - otro — su cosas - le gustan más que estos de acá no?) — mhh — (*estaba pensando sí dереpente a la gente -
capanahuas - le gusta volverse en los nawas - en los otros, mestizos — se quieren volver mestizos los capanahuas?) —— noo — — — de lo que somos - uno no podemos ser más ya — No podemos cambiar lo que somos — (*y si aceptan su ropa, cosa, idioma - castellano — eso no dice que no existe capanahuas — no se puede escapar?) — no pues — - - s i pues — pero la raza no se pierde — la raza no se pierde nunca — Uno se puede hablar así castellano — pero la gente conoce que gente somos — Conoce la gente — que raza tenemos — - (*donde entonces - a veces viene otro y le ve a la gente de acá — bueno, le parece igual como los mestizos no) — igual pues igual — (*su ropa, su idioma, su costumbre - todo sera igual que los mestizos) - todo, todo es igual — - - (*Pero todavía la gente dice que son de otra raza) mhm - (*y me pregunto - donde es esto?) — o sea — por qué es otra raza — que hace otra raza de ustedes?) —— porque es otra raza — porque son pues — son una raza este — indígena — una raza que tenemos di - desde antes — tenemos un raza capanahuas — eso no se pierde — nunca — — (*y donde queda esto - en tu cuerpo?) — en — así nosm — no queda ni en donde - pero es raza de uno — — (*o sea esto no sera sangre?) — no, la sangre tenemos igual todos — (*o sea este es su descendencia raza - mhm, somos descendientes pues de los capanahuas — lo que eran antes —

**EFNQ3): Ignorando - que me voy hacer? No me voy hacer más - más mejor. Porque mi carácter no da. (*carácter - osea...) mi carácter no da para ser gente wirakucha, para igualarles a ellos. Ellos son wirakuchas, no son chulos como uno. No da ese, hermano. Ni mi apellido tampoco no da. De que sirve que yo voy ser ya wirakucha, (*pero puedo cambiar... apellido) - pero mi carácter no da! mi color también no da, lo que soy negrucha. (Celina: no como hermano, blanquito - entre un - de cuchillo! - [all laughing])(‘‘como yuca’’ [laughing.]

---~(Ehari entre ellos nomás es! — aais es pues — — — Esas tres personas después que lo que muerto finado Miguel - Jimenez - del Maranon - Ellos nomás - no son — re — tro — Así tienen el apellido de - Ollanta - ellos son deaquí nomás! — Aja!

**(EFNQ3): Por eso digo hermano, eso desde antigüamente era - ignoranam!tes ese gentes viejos, Ignorantes, como a veces digo de mi papá reyendo - lo que tu has que no quiere ser capacho ve [laughing] I never actually said “capacho”

**(GSR10): (*Pero cambiado su apellido ahí?) — aja — o sea que el era: — su mamá era Y. — Pero no firmaba Y: — X. Q. — A su mamá le ha dejado a un lado. — (*como, por qué estaban cambiando su apellidos?) — o sea que su padrino dice le ha dado su apellido mhm — La A. — su mamá también era igualito! — Mhm — ella no era Z. — M-m — su padrino era Z. — su padrino dice de su papá. — — Su padrino de su papá de la finada A... era — — (*o sea de B. Z.?) — aja — le ha dado su nombre y su apellido — padrino se llamaba B. Z. — (*y como se llamaba antes?) — como! - - - no! — (*o sea ahí empezado la generación de Zs?) mhm — — con el padrino?) — ahi pues. — — ella era — Z. V. — Pero su verdadero apellido.


—— Y este X. — ese es más cholo que nosotros, hermano - más cholo que nosotros. — Su apellido es buen - su apellido es bueno — Yo si soy Y, legítimo mi apellido — yo no he cambiado mi apellido - deses Y soy yo — — Y esto: esto lo han cambiado su apellido! — X. — — Comos los escuchas cuando habla? — (*bueno, tiene un poquito...) — tiene de su dejo! — Y a mi como me escuchas, hermano? — (*no, ‘‘ta bien tranquilo’’ — tranquilo. — (...) (*Pero que clase de gente - capanahuas también?) — capanahuas también pues - pero diferente apellido — yuchiyuha, capanahuas pues — Pues digo hermano — como le oyes, a estos — (*tiene un poco de dejo - pero dicen que son de A.) - No! — no — — — — bastante dejo tienen! — bastante dejo tienen! — (*y hablar bien el idioma?) no, no hablan bien — a veces conversas con ellos - con X. conversas - no, no te hablan bien! - Esos sí! — como ‘‘tas diciendo usted — Hablan bien idioma, pero no te quieren hablar idioma! — No son capanahuas: wirakucha quiere ser! — No imaginas! ve! — *++++, yy! — No quiero hablar idioma — yo los hablo en mi idioma: no quieren oír, ya ‘‘tan mirando por ahí ve’’ — No quiere hablar su idioma - pero saben bién! bien saben ellos su idioma — su apellido es bueno — que ya quiere hablar contig++ — Imaginate! — (*m dicen que no son de acá — — Que!! — esos son de acá hermano, de acá son — legítimo. (*) sí, más que nosotros pues — que vale ser la - que vale ser cholo, o Y así nos insultan a nosotros pero siendo mas, ve! — — Imaginate. — (‘‘se piensan más’’ — mhm se piensan más — Su apellido es bueno — con pero... como (como se puede decir? —

*(‘‘vergüenza tienen?’’ — sí — ‘‘usted no tiene vergüenza de ser capanahuas?’’ — que puta voy tener vergüenza yo — sí así me puesto el Dios, por qué voy tener vergüenza? — Yendo en cualquier parte que me voy- yo estoy hablando! do - mi castellano - mi idioma — — paque voy tener vergüenza?! (*claro, en vez de estar orgullosos: ‘‘yo soy capanahuas’’ — mirame hermano — como voy hacer — como voy que hacer mestizo - ni mi manera tiene decir mestizo — No tengo ni mi manera de andar de ser mestizo, no tengo de manera de reirse mestizo - No tengo de hablar de mestizo — No! si o no? — La persona mestizo tiene su manera de hablar, actuar, reir - siono hermano - por eso yo digo: que pute voy hacer mestizo yo - A mi me conocen lo que soy! — Y hablar en idioma pues no \ mi hablar dialecto — paque voy tener vergüenza —no tengo vergüenza - hablo nomás.

**BRS18) Com te dicho que no se puede hablar de cholo no? — Porque aquí nadies somos cholos de ningún patrón. — Y cholo como te digo - es mandado por otra persona - ‘‘haga tu tal cosa - o vete a tal parte! - haqame... traele tal cosa’’ — ese dice es el cholo. Un cholo obediente. Te hace caso pues no. Como un criado. — Por eso dice que ‘‘es mi cholo’’ - de la genti así (‘‘inabu’’ — aaaa. — nukem en ‘‘ina’’ — inahue pues. (...) — No podemos pensar de que yo tengo un apellido más mejor - o - más menos - todo ese cosa yo puedo pensar deso — Pero como habran vivido pues. — — (‘‘asi pensaban los antiguos) - asi pensaban — — decían que ‘‘era mi cholo’’ — mhm — — — — — (*pero cholo puede decir la misma cosa que lo que dicen indo?) así! — ese es ese. — como escucho hablar en una tomadera dice - ‘‘el tiene — meno\-yes menos que yo, dice no. Yo tengo mejor apellido, — y el puede ser mas... — Que vale su apellido di? — por decir - yo pudo ser Rios - o pode ser Perez! — dice que tiene mejor apellido, así se refieren la gente. — Ni su apellido vale! - dice — asi saben decir pues. — No siquera bueno apellido tiene! — Quiere ser obra de la vida, dice pues

(GSR02): (*cholo dice igual que indio?) ——— mm, así. (*que quiere decir indio?) — indio es pues — lo que vienen, ese — los primos: los Mayornacas — mhm — - Deso entiendo de indio. — Pero llegando a la realidad: todos somos indios — somos indígenas todos —

(GHR03): nos hemos salido de - somos todos indios, del indio hemos salido, nos hemos formado - así yo fregaba a los mestizos yo también. (*que los mestizos también son\) si, de la india pues. Los españoles - - han nacido di. —

(RPR05): Aquí no ves - no esquchas ese apellido Baquínahua - pero somos nativos, sí o no! como yo veo verdad, le digo. Yo quiero ser mucho le digo - nativo. Acaso soy indio?! –indios - somos de la raza indígena - Mira de tiempos de imperio que fueron los incas - ha sido los indios del Peru. Por eso los peruanos somos indios - somos toditos la raza del Peru. Ese no vas a decir que no! Y puede que soy Vásquez - que eres usted Vásquez, yo soy Pizarro - pero yo no voy a decir que no! Yo soy de la raza, que generación soy conozco. Reconozco - que soy de la india.


(JR02): (*y ese X.Y.) ese también es Chumo! - era hacía su abuela ese Shabi — esos son Chumo pero. — ya no ps. Se acabado - Pero - hijos hay, ahi, abajo, hasta - hasta Lima hay Chumo — lo que se van - señorita, jvenes - todo está - Uuhh! Pueblo! — En Requena: Chumo, Chumo, Chumo, Chumo, que bruto! — En Iquitos: todo, Chumo! - ese nunca no pierde (*se han aumentado bastante) - se aumentó Chumo ("*pero regado) si!

(MHR02): Si te vas por Requena — Huaníchces bastante - pero esos son los bisnietos ya - ni - yo no les conozco - pero ellos — Huaníchces - no quieren borrar Huaniches ellos. (*)esos serian capanahuas también?) Capanahua son. — pero - no quieren hablar mucho - mejor dicho - no están dominando su idioma ya en entremeso de mestizos - y por eso no pueden hablar - pero - son razas! (*) Huaniche Capanahua. (*sangre?) — sí, sangre [not convinced]

(BRS03): Pero delante de el yo soy — ahorita 'yo' - como - de Dios. Lo que he cruzado en mi vida - mis borracheras, mis. — mis?peles? - he dejado ya, digo: por motivo que toy. — he sido mal... de mal de salud... — Me dado cuenta que hay un solo Dios. — — asi — demos nuestro testimonio no. En Pucallpa. — cuando Estado yo con... el clavo picado acá — echaaahdo ahi: vinieron como 4 hermanos. ———— Hermano: - me dice — tú eres el paciente? - sí, señorita. - "Hermano' - me dice. — Nosotros 'tamos andando visitando a los enfermos. \| todos los enfermos. Venimos a dar nuestro testimnio." — "ya, muy bien." — Ahi, primeramente, hermano ahi va a dar su testimnio. Ahi dice 'ta dando su testimonio. - "Hermano, dice — yo dentro mi juventud he pensado que este mundo es bueno. Total, que este mundo no es bueno. Es un mundo corrupto, en la tierra. He seguido fielmente al Señor. — Total que el Señor - es un - un maravilloso vivir en este mundo con el Señor, dice. — Es un gozo! - Desa manera, hermano: he dejado todo: —me gustaba la vida, tenía las fiestas en grandes bares! - así habla su testimnio dese hermano en Pucallpa — "Puto! Señorita. — Me doy cuenta que no es bueno. He dejado pues. - He dejado lejos. — desde - desde... — desde mundo corrupto. - más bien, estoy con el Señor. Estoy ahorita en su presencia de nuestro padre celestial. que es Cristo, Jesus. - así me hablaba a mi. — Oootro va hablar — - de mismo modo: "Yo también sido así - un evaragando? un mujeriego - me gustaba engañar las chicas así, — pero un día, hermano, me dado cuenta que ese no es bueno - Estoy yendo cosas malas, que no do hecer - así (].

Así. — así son allá, Lucas, los hermanos. — Verdaderamente son - cayente, no. — Las cosas que han hecho antes - han dejado ya. — Por seguir al Señor pues. Por decir - ya no estamos sometido a los - como te digo, en ese grande — hechos grandes que hacen allá... — Purito ellos estan en sus iglesias, Aja, en la ciudad. "que también que se hagen ahi: — tú no te vas allá: apartate de ellos," como te digo. — Aja — — todo eso. — entonces Dios: — Dios está dice contigo, mirandote. — El 'ta dentro tu corazón, haciendo. — \| tu hagas buena obra, aja — el ya está en tu corazón. Como viene tu mente, tu deseo, mhm — tu yushin esta... - liendo con el Señor! - No esta con... — con... pensando hacer maldades, no? — como ahorita - también se lo practican mucha gente! — lindo — Nosotros dice debemos dejar eso. ———— Tantas cosas como digo, hay, para... mirar en el libro. lo que se hecho?pues el Perfecto?

(GSR01) (*nuestra sangre se puede cambiar cuando vivíes - o no?) — no, eso no se cambia nunca. — — (*y cuando vives por ejemplo como nosotros - hemos venido acá — vivimos - no se puede cambiar nuestro sangre, nuestro cuerpo?) no! — (*porque comemos otra cosa, vivíamos con otra gente?) — nnno pues — la sangre es igual nomás — — como puede cambiar. — (*dicen algunos que cuando se vive con otros - se puede cambiar tu cuerpo también — cuando comes lo mismo - que personas - que te dan comer — como juntos y todo — ahí se puede cambiar tu cuerpo) — yo pienso que no! — () no se cambia ni cuando! — (*por eso dicen — que cuando una persona no es tu familia — pero vives con ellos mucho tiempo — ese se vuelven tu familia, porque se cambia su cuerpo, sangre) — hmm. — — (*)no? no. — ese es mentira ya. — — (*otro no se puede hacer tu familia legítima?) — otra gente pueden tratar de familia así porque — te tiene ese estimación — no es porque es deveradamente tu familia. — mhm (*si estás criando un niño - desde muy chiquitito - le das tu leche quízis — pero es de otra mujer, de otra parte.

Appendix 7. Original quotes
— Si por ejemplo nosotros tenemos un hijo, lo dejamos con usted - desde chiquitito, desde cuando nace: ese puede volver tu familia legítima o no?) — tu familia — porque le has criado. — Mhmm — - No es porque es verdadero tu familia. - Mhmm — (*no es familia legítima ahí?) - no. (*ese familia legítima - en idioma?) — nuen henayura. — — (*y ese que has criado - siempre va ser tu... — unan bake) — aja, únan bake, aja. — (*no se puede cambiar su cuerpo, su sangre?) — no. — Su sangre está hecho ya. —

(GSR04): (*hijos de capanahuas son otros ya - tienen otra sangre, son diferente - pero lo que queda es la raza - que es la raza?) — la raza? la raza de los capanahuas pues - eso no se pierde nunca — (*que es en persona - no es su sangre?) — no sé - yo pienso que no - o sí? — o no? ++ (*yo quiero entender como piensan? — oigo raza, pero no se que dice) — no sé - yo también oigo lo que dicen así que la raza capanahua es esto nomás... — (*raza en idioma - palabrita?) no sé - no puede. — No es que no puede - sino no sé. Mhm... — — Voy preguntar a mi mamá. () le voy preguntar — — Mi mamá no sabe también...

(LCO01): (M: este X pues saabe)

\(\text{no quieren decir!} - \\ (\text{ignoran} - \text{no son pues} - - \text{saben ellos, pero ignoran.} - \text{quieren ser mestizo — como no pueden!- aja, así}) \\
\text{no pueden ser mestizos - porque su forma de hablar no parece que son mestizos!} — — \text{lo que somos- como se puede cambiar? - ni como!} — — (*) \text{no se puede engañar — por decir - tú eres de — tu generación de ti es así - como — tú te puesto tu papá, tu mamá — — como te vamos a disformarte a ti?} — Ni como! — así — Y ellos hicieron así — No quieren ser — le dice que no entiende idioma. — — (*)- entienden bien! - ellos conocen - que gente son!) — ellos hablan BIEN - idioma, Bien mismo, — conversan. — Pero cuando te ve — ahí se calla ahí — — ()