

# Aʔiwa\*

Christine Beier and Lev Michael

June 20, 2019 ~ Draft

## 1 Introduction

Aʔiwa (Glottocode: abis1238) is a minimally documented and now virtually extinct linguistic isolate, formerly spoken in the lower Curaray River area of the Napo River basin, in what is now Peru, near the border with Ecuador. This chapter aims to provide the most comprehensive description possible of this language, based on work with two last known rememberers of the language, Delia Andi Macahuachi and María Estrella Clavoy. We also aim to contextualize minimal lexical documentation of the language in previous sources, especially Villarejo (1959) and Tessmann (1930), and to clarify the relationship of the Aʔiwa language and people to a number of names that have surfaced in the linguistic, ethnographic, and historical literature since the 18<sup>th</sup> century that are connected in complicated ways to the Aʔiwa people, including ‘Tekiraka’, ‘Ahuishiri’ (and numerous various variants), and ‘Vacacocha’. Because of the extreme state of attrition of Aʔiwa at the time that the authors worked with these rememberers, there is much we cannot know with certainty about the language, and therefore many of the descriptive claims we make in this chapter are tentative. Nonetheless, this description is offered in the belief that this is likely the best work that will be possible to do with this now almost-vanished language.

## 2 Classification, documentation status, and sociolinguistic background

### 2.1 On names applied to the Aʔiwa people in 20<sup>th</sup> century records

A variety of names have been employed in the literature to refer to the language and ethnolinguistic group that we here call Aʔiwa. Our decision to adopt this name is principally motivated by the fact that this is the autonym employed by the two remaining rememberers of the language and their family members, and the fact they do not recognize any of the names that have previously surfaced in the literature.

Significantly, a number of the alternative names for this group have also been used to refer to distinct nearby ethnolinguistic groups, considerably confusing linguists’ and anthropologists’ understanding of the ethnolinguistic landscape of the Curaray and upper Napo River basins, and the relationship of the modern Aʔiwa people and language to groups mentioned in the early colonial literature. This section aims to clarify the history and origins of the names applied this group, which are summarized in Table 1.

The earliest unambiguous mention of the Aʔiwa people and language in the ethnographic and linguistic literature is found in Tessmann (1930), who provides a brief ethnographic description and wordlist. He mostly refers to this group as the *Auischiri* but he also observes that local *mestizos* used a variety of similar names for the group, including “Auishiris, Abijiras, Avigiras, Auxiras, Abiras, Ahuishiri, Ahuisiri, Avixiras”, as well as observing that they were called “Vacacochas” (Tessmann 1930: 475). It is clear from Tessmann’s data that the language he calls ‘Auischiri’ is the same language as Aʔiwa.

Tessmann’s adoption of the name ‘Auischiri’ was unfortunate, since the ethnonyms ‘Aushiri’ or ‘Abijira’, and their numerous orthographic variants, have been applied to at least four wholly different ethnolinguistic

---

\*We would like to express our gratitude to Delia Andi Macahuachi and family, and to María Estrella Clavoy, for their patience and cooperation during our fieldwork visits in 2008 and 2010. We also thank Cabeceras Aid Project for financial support for our fieldwork.

Table 1: Aʔiwa ethnonyms and their published uses

ETHNONYM	WHERE FOUND
A'ëwa	Aguirre 2006
Aʔiwa (other names listed: Vacacocha, Auishiri)	South American Phonological Inventory Database (SAPhon v1.1.3)
Aewa	Glottolog 2.7 (accessed online 14feb2016)
Tekiraka	Campbell 1997 Hammarström 2010 Given as autonym by Tessmann 1930 Kaufman 1994
Vacacocha	Villarejo 1959
Abijira, Abishira, Awishiri, Auischiri, Aushiri (and other orthographic variants)	Fabre 2005 Lewis 2009 Tessmann 1930
Awishira (alternate names: Abigira, Abiquira, Abishira, Agouisiri, Auishiri, Avirxiri, Ixignor, Tekiraka, Tequiraca, Vacacocha)	Ethnologue (2016; 19 <sup>th</sup> edition, accessed online 23feb2016)

groups: the Aʔiwa themselves; an Arabela subgroup of the Curaray River basin; the Waorani of Ecuadorian Amazonia; and during the early colonial period, an unidentified Western Tukanoan group. Although these four groups belong to different linguistic families, their traditional territories all fall within a large region bracketed by the Napo River to the north, and the Curaray River to the south, an area in which ‘Aushiri’ served not as an ethnonym proper (despite having been taken as such by non-indigenous visitors to the area), but rather as a social classification used to denote ‘uncivilized’ groups of the upper Napo River basin.

We find the ethnolinguistic ambiguity of the name in question in the adoption by Dominican priest P. León (1928, 1929) of the name ‘Aushiri (de Shiripuno)’ to refer to a group in the upper Curaray basin then in the early stages of contact with *mestizo* society, at a time roughly contemporaneous to Tessmann’s (1930) adoption of ‘Auischiri’ to refer to the Aʔiwa. León collected a brief wordlist in an encounter with this group, which was reproduced by Granja (1942) (and again by Espinosa (1955: 67)), who visited the same group in 1936. In 1945 P. Ismael Barrio encountered either the same group, or a very similar one, from which he likewise collected a small number of words reproduced in Espinosa (1955), under the the name ‘Ahuishiri-Shiripuno (Auka)’. Both León’s and Barrio’s lists reveal that the group or groups in question were speakers of Arabela (Zaparoan), as amply documented by Rich (1999).

We see the same ethnolinguistic ambiguity surfacing again when interactions between non-indigenous people and Waoranis increased in frequency in the 1950s (see Ch. X, this volume). The name ‘Awishiri’ was at this time also applied to the speakers of Waorani, alternating in that era with the pejorative term ‘Auka’ (from Kichwa ‘savage’), which we can note was also employed by Espinosa for the Arabela subgroup mentioned above. As Peeke (1973: 4) remarks, “[t]he confusion of Auca with Awishiri possibly stems from the local use of both terms to any hostile group,” where Peeke uses ‘Awishiri’ in Tessmann’s sense to refer to the Aʔiwa.<sup>1</sup>

The use of the name ‘Awishiri’ to refer to the Waraoni soon found its way into the academic literature (see, e.g., Fugler and Swanson 1971), in some cases engendering significant confusion, as when Olson (1991), in his ethnohistorical dictionary, conflates the Aʔiwa with the Waorani, leading to a rather puzzling historical narrative. Note that when the authors discussed the term ‘Aushiri’ with our consultant Delia Andi Macahuachi and her family members, they found the term obscure, but thought it might refer to “*bravos*”

<sup>1</sup>Peeke potentially engenders further confusion by classifying ‘Awishiri’/Aʔiwa as Zaparoan, citing Steward and Metraux (1948: 629).

(‘wild ones’) living on the Tiptutini River, which was probably a reference to the Waorani.

We see, then, that in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the term ‘Aushiri’ and its variants did not refer stably to a particular ethnolinguistic group, but rather, as Peeke’s comment above makes clear, were used to refer to so-called ‘uncivilized’ groups who sought to avoid contact with mainstream *mestizo* society by staying in the hinterlands – an important social category in Amazonian frontier regions to this day. Along these lines, it is worth noting that Tessmann (1930: 476) recorded that the ‘civilized’ Aʔiwa with whom he conversed objected quite strongly to being called ‘Auischiri’, a response that would be perplexing if the term were simply an ethnonym. Finally, it is worth mentioning that fieldwork by the authors in Ecuador in 2011 with speakers of Záparo found that they used ‘Awishiri’ as a general indigenous outgroup term, using it to refer to Shuars (Jivaroan), Záparos from the Curaray region, and even to Napo Kichwas, demonstrating again that the term is not an ethnonym, but rather a term to denote social ‘otherness’ in a regionally salient hierarchy of ‘civilizados’ (civilied peoples) and ‘bravos’ (wild, or uncivilized peoples).<sup>2</sup>

The confusion surrounding the use of ‘Aushiri’ and its variants was perhaps compounded by Ribeiro and Wise’s (1978) influential classification of Peruvian ethnolinguistic groups, in which they adopted the ethnonym ‘Abishira’ for the Aʔiwa and ‘Aushiri’ for the Zaparoan group encountered by León, Granja, and Barrio on the Curaray (which Michael and Beier (see Volume 2) identify as an Arabela subgroup), a decision which has served as the basis for the names given for these languages in Ethnologue to the present day (Lewis 2016). Given that ‘Abishira’ and ‘Aushiri’ are variants of the same basic term, their use as ethnyonyms of distinct ethnolinguistic groups is particularly unfortunate, a shortcoming compounded by the fact that this term is pejorative, and not even, strictly speaking, an ethnonym.

Given the confusion surrounding ‘Aushiri’ and its variants, it is not surprising that several authors have opted for entirely different ethnyonyms. Villarejo (1959) employs the ethnyonym ‘Vacacocha’ (lit. ‘Cow Lake’), a name derived from the site of residence of the Aʔiwa of Puerto Elvira prior to falling under the control of the *patrón* Miguel Arévalo. Hammarström (2010) and others have opted for the ethnyonym Tekiraka, based on Tessmann’s (1930: 475) report that his consultants gave *Tekiráka* as an autonym. However, this name surfaces in no other source based on direct contact or fieldwork with Aʔiwawas, and notably not in Espinosa (1955) or Villarejo (1959). Moreover, neither of the rememberers with whom we worked recognized the term ‘Tekiraka’ as an autonym, or even as an Aʔiwa word.

Finally, we observe that the name Aʔiwa, given by our consultants as an autonym, also surfaces in Aguirre (2006) as ‘Aë’wa’, where the source is clearly Juan Marcos Mercier, a celebrated Franciscan priest who worked in the upper Napo region of Peru for over 40 years until his death in 2007, and a highly credible source regarding the peoples of that region.

## 2.2 Identifying the Aʔiwa people in the earliest colonial records

Having discussed the names associated with the Aʔiwa people and language in the 20th century, we now turn to examining more closely the use of the ethnyonym ‘Abijira’ (and its variants) in the early colonial literature in order to clarify our earliest knowledge of the Aʔiwa people.

The name ‘Abijira’ and its variants can be traced back to 17<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit records of the *provincia de Maynas* (Chantre y Herrera 1901, Espinosa 1955: 62-65),<sup>3</sup> where it surfaces frequently in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century descriptions of Jesuit evangelical activity in the lower Curaray River region. Espinosa (1955: 62-69) provides the most extensive discussion of the ethnolinguistic identity of the colonial-era ‘Abijiras’, concluding that they were in fact an ‘Encabellado’ (i.e. Western Tukanoan) subgroup that inhabited the lower reaches of the Curaray during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The modern ethnohistorian Linda Newson (1995: 102-114, *passim*) reaches the same conclusion, as did Beuchat and Rivet (1911: 120-121) in their seminal delimitation of the Tukanoan family (cf. Rival 2002: 33-34; Renard-Casevitz et al. 1988). Espinosa’s detailed arguments are buttressed by the observations of the Jesuit chronicler Francisco Xavier Veigl (2006 [1768]: 140) – to whose work Espinosa apparently did not have access – who observed:

Las naciones del Napo tienen la peculiaridad de hablar la misma lengua con pocas diferencias dialectales; sin embargo, se consideran pueblos diferentes, habiéndose diezmados horriblemente

---

<sup>2</sup>It merits mention that ethnyonymic confusion surrounding the regional use of terms to denote ‘uncivilized’ indigenous peoples has been quite common in Western Amazonia (Michael and Beier (2003)).

<sup>3</sup>The extent of the *provincia de Maynas* corresponds quite closely to the modern Peruvian *departamento de Loreto* (see Grohs 1974)

en luchas entre sí y hostilidades. Los españoles designan toda la nación con el nombre de “Encabellada”, no obstante de dividirse en diversos partidos, es decir, en Abichira, Angutere, Cunchíes, Ycahuate, Payagua. [p. 140]

The nations of the Napo [River] have the characteristic of speaking the same language with few dialectal differences; nevertheless they consider themselves different peoples, having decimated themselves in hostilities and in conflicts among themselves. The Spanish designate the entire nation with the name “Encabellado”, despite the fact that they divide themselves into various groups, that is, as Abichira, Angutere, Cunchíes, Ycahuate, Payagua. [our translation]

The terms *Angutere*, *Ycahuate*, and *Payagua* were all regularly used in the colonial period to refer to Western Tukanoan peoples in the Napo River basin, suggesting that the other names mentioned were likewise used to refer to Western Tukanoans. An observation of Chantre y Herrera (1901: 90) further supports the conclusion that Western Tukanoan peoples lived on the lower Curaray during this era, when he comments on the presence of ‘Encabellados’ on the Curaray, and describes the flight of a group of ‘Icaguates’ (corresponding to the modern Sekoya) to the lower Curaray (ibid.: 326), where they joined another Tukanoan group already living there (ibid.: 329), the ‘Vitogujes’.<sup>4</sup>

It seems certain, then, that Tukanoan peoples inhabited the lower Curaray during this period, and that these people were sometimes called ‘Abijiras’. However there are signs that even in the Jesuit period, the term ‘Abijira’ was also used to refer to non-Tukanoan groups in the Curaray River Basin area. For example, while the above evidence and arguments support a Tukanoan affiliation for the people called ‘Abijiras’, this is contradicted by the fact that the ‘Abijiras’ and ‘Encabellados’ are in fact often *not* grouped together in Jesuit discussions of the peoples of the Napo River Basin. Rather, the ‘Abijiras’ are often mentioned together with another group referred to as the ‘Oas’ (e.g., Chantre Y Herrera 1901: 60, 273), whose identification remains uncertain, but whose name and territory in the Ñushino River basin (Reeve 2002: 116) are suggestive of the Wao (or Waorani). In any case, no authors, colonial-era or otherwise, suggest that the Oas are Tukanoan. Furthermore, the ‘Abijiras’ were sometimes explicitly characterized as distinct from, and ‘opposed’ to, the ‘Encabellados’ by the Jesuit chronicler Pablo Maroni (1988 [1738]: 180-181). Maroni (1988 [1738]: 324) indicates at one point that a group of ‘Encabellados’ had to find an interpreter among the ‘Avijira’ in order to be able to communicate with a larger ‘Avijira’ group.<sup>5</sup>

Some light is shed on this somewhat confusing situation by the fact that Chantre y Herrera (1901: 501) appears to distinguish between ‘Abigiras’ and ‘Abigiras Encabellados’, with the latter having contact with the missions of the upper Napo in Encabellado territory (Chantre y Herrera 1901: 501). If in fact ‘Abigira’ was used to refer to both a Western Tukanoan group and an ethnolinguistically distinct group, we can understand Chantre y Herrera’s distinction as an effort to bring some clarity to the use of ‘Abigira’ by distinguishing a Tukanoan ‘Abigira’ (i.e. ‘Encabellado’) group from a non-Tukanoan ‘Abigira’ group.

Finally, note that Espinosa (1955: 65) remarks that the A?iwas (for him, *ahuishiris*) that he met “considered themselves the descendants of the ancient *avijiras*.” Although the A?iwa rememberers with whom we spoke 60 years later expressed no such belief, Espinosa’s assertion that A?iwas did hold this belief, together with the other facts cited above, casts some significant doubt on the idea that ‘Abijira’ was solely used to refer to a Western Tukanoan group during the colonial period. Although we will probably be unable to fully resolve this question with the resources currently at our disposal, we conclude from the available evidence that the term ‘Abijira’ was ambiguous in early colonial period, serving both to denote Western Tukanoans living on the lower Curaray River, as well as the ancestors of the modern A?iwa, who lived upriver of them. If the term ‘Abijira’ (and its variants) was used in the same way in the early colonial period as it was during the 20th century, i.e. to denote ‘uncivilized’ groups, this ambiguity is unsurprising.

At any rate, from this set of observations we can conclude that the ancestors of the modern A?iwa inhabited the lower Curaray River – as did their 20th century descendants – probably in close proximity to one or more Western Tukanoan groups, with whom they were sometimes lumped or confused by the Jesuits.

<sup>4</sup>The suffix *-guahe* and its cognates are employed in Western Tukanoan languages to derive subgroup names.

<sup>5</sup>Espinosa (1955) addresses these passages by observing that the need for an interpreter could be due to relatively minor dialect differences; and by observing that the fact that ‘Avijiras’ and ‘Encabellados’ were characterized as distinct and opposed ‘nations’ is not conclusive of their being linguistically distinct. While this is true, we observe that Jesuits tended to group peoples with linguistic similarities into ‘nations’ even when profound internecine hostilities separated them (see e.g. Michael and Beier, Volume 2).

Before concluding this section, it merits mention that Renard-Casevitz et al. (1988) proposes a different theory regarding the ethnic identity of the colonial-era ‘Abijiras’ or ‘Abixiras’, arguing that they were the ancestors of the modern-day Waorani. Her argument is essentially that the territory of the colonial-era ‘Abijiras’ and the modern Waorani is roughly similar, and that both groups were noted for being quite hostile to outsiders at some point in their history (Renard-Casevitz et al. 1988:144). While it is entirely possible that the term ‘Abijira’ was extended to the ancestors of the modern Waorani by the Jesuits, it is clearly incorrect to identify the colonial-era ‘Abijira’ exclusively with the modern Waorani.

## 2.3 Classification

Aʔiwa is a linguistic isolate, with no demonstrable relationship to any other South American languages. Stewart and Metraux (1946: 635) are the first to suggest a classification of ‘Awishira’, by which, through their mention of the group being located at ‘Lake Vacacocha’, they clearly mean the language of the group that in this chapter we call Aʔiwa. They tentatively classify the language as Zaparoan, based on a comment by Maroni (1988 [1738]: 324) that the Awishira could understand the ‘Coronado’ and ‘Gae’ languages, both unambiguously Zaparoan languages (see Michael and Beier, Volume 2).<sup>6</sup> Despite having access to Tessman’s (1930) data, they apparently still found a Zaparoan affiliation plausible, although they did call for further data collection to clarify the issue.

Stewart and Metraux’s classification was accepted by a number of subsequent authors, e.g. Peeke (1973) and Renard-Casevitz et al. (1988),<sup>7</sup> but more conservative classifications since, such as Loukotka (1968) and Campbell (1997: 183), treat it as an isolate, and this has come to be the consensus position on the classification of the language. Both Greenberg and Swadesh suggested that Aʔiwa formed a low-level subgroup with the Bolivian isolate Kanichana (as discussed by Kaufman (1994)), but an inspection of lexical data for the two languages does not yield compelling evidence in favor of this hypothesis. In summary, there is no evidence at this point that Aʔiwa is related to any other language, and we consider it an isolate.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Beuchat and Rivet (1911: 120-121), classify ‘Avijira’ as a Tukanoan language, but it is clear from their discussion that they have in mind the Western Tukanoan language mentioned by the Jesuits in the early colonial period that was then spoken in the lower Curaray River basin (see §2.2), and not Aʔiwa proper.

Table 2 compares representative Aʔiwa lexical items with those of a Zaparoan language (Iquito, Glottocode: iqui1243), a Western Tukanoan language (Máihiki, Glottocode: orej1244), and the isolate Waorani (Glottocode: waor1240), to demonstrate the lack of compelling evidence that Aʔiwa is related to any of these genealogical groups in which it has previously been included or with which it has been confused.

## 2.4 Demographics and sociolinguistic background

Due to the confusion surrounding the colonial era ‘Abijira’, it is difficult to know whether specific observations about the peoples so named are about the ancestors of the modern Aʔiwa or not. It is likely that some of them are however, and the earliest mentions of the ‘Abijira’ in the 17<sup>th</sup> century have them occupying a wedge-shaped territory extending from the banks of the lower Curaray River to the Napo River (Maroni 1988 [1738]: 180, Chantre y Herrera 1901: 273). This territory encompasses the last known traditional settlement site of the Aʔiwa people: the shores of Vaca Cocha, an oxbow lake connected to the lower Curaray River, from which the Aʔiwa people were relocated to the settlement of Puerto Elvira (see below) by the *patrón* Miguel Arévalo in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The earliest relatively reliable information that we have about the Aʔiwa people dates to about 1925, when Günther Tessmann carried out a modest quantity of ethnographic and linguistic work with an Aʔiwa consultant. Tessmann (1930: 475-6) characterizes the Aʔiwa people as having been decimated by violent conflicts among themselves and with outsiders, and by the displacements of the Rubber Boom. He also mentions that many Aʔiwas spoke Kichwa at the time, but few spoke Spanish and none spoke it well – including his informant (Tessmann 1930: 485).

<sup>6</sup>As we mention below, the Aʔiwa intermarried with the neighboring Zaparoan Arabela, which makes the presence of individuals in Aʔiwa society who were bilingual in Aʔiwa and Arabela unsurprising.

<sup>7</sup>The fact there is, as discussed above, an Arabela subgroup referred to by this name may have been a contributing factor in the acceptance of this classification.

Table 2: Comparative list for Aʔiwa, Iquito (Michael et al., to appear), Waorani (Borman 1991), and Máihiki (Michael et al. 2013)

GLOSS	Aʔiwa	ZAPAROAN	ISOLATE	WESTERN TUKANOAN
		Iquito	Waorani	Máihiki
tapir	'sahi	pisiki	'titæ	békí
white-lipped peccary	ra'káʔō	anitáaki	'iræ	bírí, bai
collared peccary	i'hara	kaaʔi	'ámū	káókwa
deer	atri'waʔ(a)	ʃik'áaha	ko'wān'ɪ	n'áama, bósá
scarlet macaw	milah'neke	anapa	'æwæ	máá
mosquito	wi'fala	anaaʔi	'gʲijɪ	míte
person, compatriot	a'ʔiwa	árata ijáana	waiʔ'rāni	mái
(my) mother	(kun) 'ama	(kí) niaatíha, ani	'barā	(ji) hako, bíáko
(my) father	(kun) ha	(kí) kaakíha, aki	'mæmpo	(ji) haki, bíáki
(my) husband	(kun) a'ʔap	ahaaha, (kí) níjaaka	nāni'gæŋã	(ji) ʃhí, ʃ
head	'huti	ánaka	i'kabu	tʃóbi
ear	ʃu'rala	túuku	ĩnĩ'mĩŋka	gáhoru
breast	a'kiʃ	ʃipiíha	ʔi'ĩmæ	óhéjo
plantain	a'laʔa	samúkwaati	pæ'æná	óó
corn	su'kala	siikiraha, sakaáruuki	ka'ʔijĩ	béa
pepper (hot or sweet)	a'laha	napiki	'gʲimū	bía
manioc or corn beer	nut'nit	itíniha	'tipæ	gónó
cotton	nui'nui	siwi	'daʃi	ʃí
leaf	i'rapi	íimi, naami	ĩn'abu, id'ĩ	hao
cooking fire	as'kʷáwa	iinami	'gĩŋa	tóa
canoe	at'rewa	íimina	'wipu	jóu
house	at'ku, at'kua	iita	'ĩŋkĩ	wee
firewood	wiru'kawa	háraiki	tĩ'nĩwæ	héka
stone	nuk'lahi	sawiha	'dika	íno, gíno
sun	akre'wak	nunamiha	'næŋkɪ	mái
small	i'fikta	siisanurika	'gʲiijã	jari
no	'tʃahtar	kaa	'wĩ	-má
what.INT	i'kiri	saaka	k'ĩnĩ	íge, íge
where.INT	'nahri	tíiti	æʃi'mĩnĩ	káro
come.IMP	sik, 'sikwas	anímaa	'pũ	dáíma

Tessmann describes a material culture quite typical for the area, with the Aʔiwas living in thatched houses with dirt floors, weaving and using hammocks, and spinning and weaving cotton. He reports them as using rafts but not canoes, which speaks to their interfluvial orientation; and as hunting and fighting with lances but not bows, arrows, blowguns, or clubs, so in this respect, like their former Zaparoan neighbors,

the Iquito.<sup>8</sup> Tessmann also mentions that men traditionally used penis cords and women used woven skirts, and that both sexes wore their hair long.

The last Aʔiwa group of which we are aware lived at Puerto Elvira on the Napo River (2°3'15.63" S, 74°26'10.65" W; see Figure 1), upriver of the mouth of the Curaray River. Tessmann (1930: 475-6) also claimed that a larger group, consisting of some 30 to 50 individuals, relocated to the Tiputini River basin a decade or two prior to his investigations, but it is difficult to know how much confidence to put in this claim. Given that the Tiputini River basin is part of the traditional territory of the Waorani, who like the Aʔiwa have also been called 'Aushiri', Tessmann's claim may have been a result of misunderstanding his consultants. In any case, we have no subsequent reports of Aʔiwa people on the Tiputini, and our consultants indicated that they were not aware of any other Aʔiwa people in that area.

As of the authors' fieldwork in 2008 and 2010, we believe that there are two remaining rememberers of Aʔiwa: Delia Andi Macahuachi (DAM) and María Estrella Clavoy (MEC), the former born in about 1940, and the latter in about 1950. Based on our interviews with DAM, we estimate that the last fluent speakers of Aʔiwa in the Puerto Elvira area died in the 1980s, with language shift being principally to Kichwa. Conversations with the residents of Puerto Elvira suggest that the memory of an Aʔiwa heritage is largely faded at this point for most people, although DAM's eldest son expressed a measure of identification with this heritage.

## 2.5 Fieldwork and sources on Aʔiwa

Existing published resources on the Aʔiwa language are few, with documentation prior to our own fieldwork limited to word lists collected in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by individuals untrained in linguistics. Tessmann (1930) includes 114 lexical items; Barrio (in Espinosa 1955) includes 15 lexical items; and Villarejo (1959) includes 93<sup>9</sup> lexical items.<sup>10</sup> Indications of Aʔiwa's documentation status include the fact that it was one of only four South American languages to make Hammarström's (2010) list of least-documented languages in the world; and the fact that it entirely failed to appear in Solis' (2003) or Wise's (1999) otherwise comprehensive discussions of Peruvian Amazonian languages.

The authors carried out fieldwork in 2008 and 2010 to supplement these few existing sources, seeking out and working with two remaining rememberers, Delia Andi Macahuachi (DAM) and María Estrella Clavoy (MEC). Because this new data set is the largest available, it will be presented in detail in this chapter.

Fieldwork with DAM and MEC was challenging for both them and the authors, as we were effectively asking them to recover very distant and dormant memories. DAM is strongly Kichwa-dominant, having been removed from her family while still a child; when she was returned, she was already an adolescent. The Aʔiwa that she remains able to recall is a combination of her early childhood memories and what she recovered through interactions with an Aʔiwa-dominant uncle after she was returned to her family. It was clear through working with DAM that her memory consists mostly of isolated lexical items and frozen phrases whose exact meaning is sometimes unclear. We nevertheless wish to emphasize the great effort made by DAM in particular to help us document what we could, to be passed on to her family, and to contribute to the knowledge of Amazonian languages.

## 3 Phonology

### 3.1 Phonological inventory

We analyze the Aʔiwa phonological inventory as including 19 consonants, 6 oral vowels, and at least 4 nasal vowels, as shown in Tables 3 and 4. Because of the small size of our dataset, we are unable to provide minimal or near-minimal pairs for most of the phonemes we propose, but we strive to provide forms in which the target segment does not readily yield to an explanation in terms of a conditioning environment (e.g. by

<sup>8</sup>It is interesting, in this regard, that Maroni indicates that at least some *Abijiras* understood the Zaparoan languages 'Coronado' (probably Iquito) and 'Gae' (probably Andoa or Arabela), suggesting a history of substantial interaction between the Aʔiwa and these Zaparoan peoples. This is consistent with a comment made by DAM that Aʔiwes used to intermarry with Arabelas.

<sup>9</sup>Of these 93 items, one is a loan from Quechua, one is a loan from Spanish, and one is illegible.

<sup>10</sup>All these data are presented side by side in §A.

showing nasal vowels in the context of oral consonants). Wherever possible, we provide examples of segments word-initially, word-medially, and word-finally.

Table 3: Aʔiwa consonant inventory

	BILABIAL	ALVEOLAR	POST-ALVEOLAR	PALATAL	VELAR	LABIOVELAR	GLOTTAL
STOP	p	t		k <sup>j</sup>	k	k <sup>w</sup>	ʔ
AFFRICATE		ts	tʃ				
FRICATIVE		s	ʃ				h
NASAL	m	n					
APPROXIMANT				j		w	
TAP		r					
LATERAL APPROXIMANT		l		λ			
COARTICULATED APPROXIMANT	w						

Table 4: Aʔiwa vowel inventory

	FRONT	CENTRAL	BACK
HIGH	i, ĩ	ɨ	u, ũ
MID	e		o, õ
LOW		a, ã	

### 3.1.1 Consonants

Aʔiwa exhibits five amply attested stops, /p/, /t/, /k/, /k<sup>w</sup>/ and /ʔ/, as shown in (1) through (5), respectively; and one stop, /k<sup>j</sup>/, that is attested in only two words, shown in (6). Although the only attested examples of /k<sup>j</sup>/ are found following high vowels, this does not appear to be a conditioning environment for this speech sound, as we find non-palatalized velar stops in the same environments, as shown in (3d) and (28b). Note that if different forms were given the same gloss by our consultant, we distinguish the glosses by appending a number, as in *tu'kut* ‘big.1’.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(1) a. <i>'pari</i><br/>non-indigenous person</p> <p>b. <i>i'rap</i><br/>leaf</p> <p>c. <i>kuh'paw</i><br/>clothing</p> <p>d. <i>a'ʃap</i><br/>husband</p> | <p>b. <i>tu'kut</i><br/>big.1</p> <p>c. <i>'huti</i><br/>head</p> <p>d. <i>nut'nit</i><br/>manioc beer (<i>masato</i>)</p> |
| <p>(2) a. <i>tas'ʔãʔĩ</i><br/>cleared path</p>   | <p>(3) a. <i>kin</i><br/>2nd person pronoun</p> <p>b. <i>kuh'paw</i><br/>clothing</p>                                      |



- |     |   |     |  |
|-----|---|-----|--|
|     | c. <i>makra'lasɨ</i><br>stingray.1  |     | b. <i>hũʔ'ʃũũ</i><br>tinamou sp. ( <i>perdiz</i> )                 |
|     | d. <i>i'kiri</i><br>what.INT  |     | c. <i>si'ʔaʔa</i><br>common squirrel monkey ( <i>mono fraile</i> ) |
| (4) | a. <i>k<sup>w</sup>i'rixi</i><br>saki monkey sp.                            |     | d. <i>aw'ʃaʔ</i><br>brother  |
|     | b. <i>k<sup>w</sup>ã'ʔũli</i><br>smooth-billed ani ( <i>vaca muchacho</i> ) |     |  |
|     | c. <i>as'k<sup>w</sup>ãwa</i><br>cooking fire                               | (6) | a. <i>rũtrũ'k<sup>j</sup>ãwã</i><br>capuchin monkey sp.1           |
| (5) | a. <i>ha'ʔu</i><br>basket   |     | b. <i>ni'k<sup>j</sup>aw</i><br>(no gloss)                         |

We find evidence for two affricates in our data set, /ts/ and /tʃ/. While the former is found in only a single (amply attested) root, given in (7), the latter is amply attested, as shown in (8).

- |     |                          |  |                               |
|-----|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| (7) | a. <i>tsuk</i><br>bathe  |  | b. <i>hi'tʃin</i><br>have sex |
| (8) | a. <i>'tʃahtar</i><br>no |  | c. <i>tʃu'luk</i><br>big.3    |

We find evidence for three fricatives, /s/, /ʃ/, and /h/, as shown in (9) through (11), respectively. Crucially, *s* and *ʃ* each appear before both *a* and *u* in word-initial position, demonstrating that *s* and *ʃ* contrast. Note also that *s* does not palatalize before *i*, a phenomenon that is attested in many languages of the region.

- |      |  |      |  |
|------|--|------|--|
| (9)  | a. <i>su'kala</i><br>corn  |      | c. <i>i'fikta</i><br>small, a little bit |
|      | b. <i>si'ʔaʔa</i><br>common squirrel monkey ( <i>mono fraile</i> ) |      | d. <i>a'kiʃ</i><br>breast                |
|      | c. <i>as'k<sup>w</sup>ãwa</i><br>cooking fire                      | (11) | a. <i>ham'ham</i><br>stingray.2          |
|      | d. <i>'sikwas</i><br>come!   |      | b. <i>hi'tʃin</i><br>have sex            |
| (10) | a. <i>ʃak'raɾa</i><br>coati ( <i>achuni</i> )                      |      | c. <i>'tʃahtar</i><br>no                 |
|      | b. <i>aw'ʃaʔ</i><br>brother  |      | d. <i>ni'kih</i><br>know                 |

Aʔiwa exhibits two amply attested nasal consonants, /m/ and /n/, as shown in (12) and (13).

- |      |  |      |   |
|------|--|------|---|
| (12) | a. <i>ma'lahi</i><br>fish poison ( <i>barbasco</i> ) | (13) | a. <i>nui'nui</i><br>cotton               |
|      | b. <i>milah'neke</i><br>scarlet macaw                |      | b. <i>wa'naha</i><br>capuchin monkey sp.2 |
|      | c. <i>am'hala</i><br>caiman sp.                      |      | c. <i>aslanta'nia</i><br>young woman.1    |
|      | d. <i>i'ʃam</i><br>alone, single, one.1              |      | d. <i>kun</i><br>1st person pronoun       |

The liquids /r/ and /l/ are also amply attested in the dataset, and exemplified in (14) and (15). The presence of two liquids is somewhat unusual for Amazonian languages more generally, but not for languages in the circum-Andean periphery, where Aʔiwa is found (Michael, Chang, and Stark 2014). In addition, there is a single form (with multiple tokens) that exhibits the palatalized lateral /λ/, shown in (16).

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| (14) | a. <i>ra'kãʔõ</i><br>white-lipped peccary ( <i>huangana</i> ) | c. <i>hír</i><br>here.2  |
|      | b. <i>atr'i'waʔ(a)</i><br>deer sp.                            | d. <i>'tʃahtar</i><br>no   |
| (15) | a. <i>luk'ʔãk</i><br>ayahuasca                                | d. <i>ahul'taʔ</i><br>earth                                      |
|      | b. <i>ma'lahi</i><br><i>barbasco</i> (fish poison)            |  |
|      | c. <i>a'laha</i><br>pepper                                    | (16) a. <i>asλa'ʔãũ</i><br>tamarin monkey sp. ( <i>pichico</i> ) |

Finally, we find both a palatal glide, /j/, as shown in (17); and a labiovelar glide, /w/, as in (18).

- |      |                                     |      |                                      |
|------|-------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|
| (17) | /j/                                 | (18) | /w/                                  |
|      | a. <i>jan</i><br>3rd person pronoun |      | a. <i>wi'fala</i><br>mosquito        |
|      | b. <i>ja'tuk</i><br>eye.1           |      | b. <i>wah'luk</i><br>rotten thing    |
|      | c. <i>jat'haka</i><br>penis         |      | c. <i>i'wit</i><br>give              |
|      | d. <i>rajwã'ʔãk</i><br>sugarcane    |      | d. <i>isa'rawi</i><br>woodpecker sp. |

### 3.1.2 Vowels

The Aʔiwa vowel inventory includes six oral vowels, /i, i, u, e, o, a/, and at least four nasal vowels, /ĩ, ã, õ, ã/. The vowels /i, i, u, e, a/ are exemplified in (19) through (22) and (24). The back round vowel /o/ appears in only a single form, in (23), but is robust in tokens of that word.

Note that although MEC produced the vowel *i* easily, DAM's pronunciation of this segment varied considerably in terms of how front or central it surfaced. It is plausible that this variability is due to attrition and to DAM's Kichwa dominance.

- |      |  |                                   |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|
| (19) | a. <i>isa'rawi</i><br>woodpecker sp.               | c. <i>i'wit</i><br>give           |
|      | b. <i>i'fam</i><br>alone, single, one.1            | d. <i>pi</i><br>hit               |
|      | c. <i>mi'ala</i><br>jaguar                         | (21) a. <i>nui'nui</i><br>cotton  |
|      | d. <i>nui'nui</i><br>cotton                        | b. <i>hutu'luk</i><br>big head    |
| (20) | a. <i>a'ʔiwa</i><br>person, compatriot, autonym    | c. <i>ku'pinu</i><br>knee         |
|      | b. <i>nut'nit</i><br>manioc beer ( <i>masato</i> ) | d. <i>u'lumu</i><br>chicken, duck |

- (22) a. *ro'ʔele*  
Spix's guan (*pucacunga*)  
b. *alkah'neke*  
blue-and-yellow macaw  
c. *akre'wak*  
sun, moon, God  
d. *at'rewa*  
canoe
- (23) a. *ro'ʔele*  
Spix's guan (*pucacunga*)
- (24) a. *aʃ'pali*  
black-rumped agouti (*añuje*)  
b. *a'laha*  
pepper  
c. *ʃak'rara*  
coati (*achuni*)  
d. *mi'ala*  
jaguar (*tigre*)

Aʔiwa clearly exhibits nasal vowels. In our data set, /ũ/ and /ã/, exemplified in (25) and (26) respectively, are considerably more common than /ĩ/, which is found only in a single form given in (27), and /õ/, which is found only in two forms, given in (28). Note that we did not find nasal counterparts to all oral vowels, but we cannot know whether this reflects their actual absence from the language or the limitations of our dataset.

The extensive spans of nasal vowels found in certain forms are suggestive of nasal harmony, a phonological process characteristic of the Western Tukanoan languages which were Aʔiwa's historical neighbors. Given both the paucity and token-level variability of forms exhibiting nasal vowels in our data, however, it is difficult to generalize about nasal harmony in the language.

- (25) a. *hũhũkũ'pãʔ*  
cat sp. (*tigrillo*)  
b. *ũhũ'rũã*  
eagle sp. (*gavilán*)  
c. *hũʔ'ʃũlũ*  
tinamou sp. (*perdiz*)  
d. *taha'rũʔũ*  
garden (*chacra*)
- (26) a. *as'k<sup>w</sup>ãwa*  
cooking fire  
b. *rajwã'ʔãk*  
sugarcane
- c. *k<sup>w</sup>ã'ʔũli*  
smooth-billed ani (*vaca muchacho*)  
d. *luk'ʔãk*  
ayahuasca
- (27) a. *tas'ʔãʔĩ*  
cleared path
- (28) a. *ra'kãʔõ*  
white-lipped peccary (*huangana*)  
b. *wi'korõ*  
Salvin's currawong (*paujil*)

### 3.2 Phonotactics and Prosody

Attested syllable structures are V, CV, and CVC word initially, medially, and finally, as shown in (29) through (31), respectively; and VC word initially and finally, as shown in (32). The absence of any word initial consonant clusters, together with the prosodic behavior of heavy syllables (see discussion below) in four-syllable forms, lead us to conclude that there are no complex onsets.

- (29) a. *'a.u*  
tree  
b. *su'ka.la*  
corn  
c. *mi'a.la*  
jaguar (*tigre*)  
d. *wa'na.ha*  
capuchin monkey sp.2  
e. *nu.i'nu.i*  
cotton
- (30) a. *'pa.ri*  
non-indigenous person
- (31) a. *hir*  
here.2  
b. *al.kah'ne.ke*  
blue-and-yellow macaw

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
|      | c. <i>nut'nĩt</i><br>manioc beer ( <i>masato</i> ) | b. <i>as'k<sup>w</sup>ã.wa</i><br>cooking fire |
| (32) | a. <i>at'ku.a</i><br>house.2                        | c. <i>a'uk</i><br>go.2                         |

### 3.3 Stress

Our data suggest that Aʔiwa exhibits a quantity-sensitive stress system based on right-aligned disyllabic trochees. Considering words of two to four syllables consisting solely of light syllables, as exemplified in (33) to (35), we find that words bear a single penultimate stress in words of two or three syllables, while words of four syllables exhibit primary stress in penultimate position, and a secondary stress in pre-antepenultimate position, suggesting the footing given in the cited examples. Note that the lack of secondary stresses on the leftmost syllable in three- and five-syllable forms, in (34) and (36) respectively, indicates that Aʔiwa does not permit degenerate feet.

- (33) a. ('sa.hi) 'tapir' (*sachavaca*)  
b. ('i.hu) 'rain'
- (34) a. wi('fa.la) 'mosquito'  
b. a('ha.ku) 'white-bellied spider monkey' (*maquizapa*)
- (35) a. (,ta.ha)(,ru.ʔu) 'garden' (*chacra*)  
b. (,i.sa)(,ra.wi) 'woodpecker'
- (36) a. as(,lan.ta)(,ni.a) 'young woman.1'  
b. sa(,mak.ta)(,ni.a) 'young woman.2'

Quantity sensitivity is evident in shifts from the basic trochaic pattern to an iambic pattern, when the rightmost syllable of the head is heavier than the leftmost, as in (37).

- (37) a. *a'ʃap* 'husband'  
b. *tu'kut* 'big.1'  
c. *rajwã'ʔãk* 'sugarcane'  
d. *a.kre'wak* 'sun, moon, God'

It should be noted that there are a small number of exceptions to the above generalizations, consisting of words in which both syllables of the rightmost foot appear have the same weight, but in which the final syllable bears primary stress, as in (38). Given the circumstances, it is difficult to know if these are cases of lexical stress, or if they constitute evidence that Aʔiwa may have originally exhibited contrastive vowel length, of which these perturbations from the basic trochaic pattern are the only evidence that remains.

- (38) a. *ha'ʔu* 'basket'  
b. *jaw.na'hi* 'potato sp.3'  
c. *ham'ham* 'stingray.2'

## 4 The noun phrase

### 4.1 Pronouns

Our Aʔiwa consultant DAM produced first and second person singular pronouns in both verbal argument and nominal possessor functions, but did not produce any plural pronouns. The first and second person pronouns each exhibit three forms: for first person, *ku*, *kun*, and *kua* as in (39); and for second person, *ki*, *kin*, *kia*, as in (39b-c) and (40).

- (39) a. *kun* *ʃalin=was*.  
1.PRO eat.2=CLITIC  
'I am eating.' ('*Estoy comiendo.*')  
b. *ku* *itak=was* *kin* *atari*.  
1.PRO eat.1=CLITIC 2.POSS.PRO papaya  
'I (will) eat your papaya.' ('*Quiero comer tu papaya.*')  
c. *har* *ku* *isak=was* *ki*.  
right.now 1.PRO stab 2.PRO  
'Now I'm going to stab you.' ('*Yo te voy a picar ya.*')  
d. *har* *isak=was* *kua*.  
right.now stab=CLITIC 1.PRO  
'Now stab me.' ('*Picame si quieres.*')  
e. *ewit* *kua!*  
give 1.PRO  
'Gimme!' ('*Dame!*')
- (40) a. *har* *kin* *tsuk!*  
right.now 2.PRO bathe  
'Bathe right now!' ('*Bañate!*')  
b. *har* *tuhurawak* *ki!*  
right.now sleep 2.PRO  
'Go to sleep right now!' ('*Ya duermes tu!*')  
c. *nahri* *ukajk* *ki?*  
where.INT go.1 2.PRO  
'Where are you going?' ('*A dónde vas?*')

The phonological parallelism between the two sets of pronominal elements suggests that the three different pronouns in each person category are functionally differentiated. The forms *ku* 1.PRO and *ki* 2.PRO overwhelmingly appear as S and A arguments, although there is one counter-example for each pronoun, while *kua* 1.PRO appears only as P, or possibly R (in a notionally ditransitive construction) arguments, as in (39d&e). There are no examples of utterances in which *kia* 2.PRO appears, unfortunately. With suitable caveats regarding the sparseness of the data, this suggests that *ku* 1.PRO and *ki* 2.PRO are nominative forms and *kua* 1.PRO and *kia* 2.PRO are accusative forms. If the final *a* on the accusative forms is an accusative suffix, this would be in line with cross-linguistic tendencies for the accusative to be marked, when only one of the two grammatical relations in a nominative-accusative system is marked.

The nasal-final forms *kun* 1.PRO and *kin* 2.PRO have a somewhat different distribution. For example, it is these forms exclusively that appear in nominal possessor function (see §4.2), as in (39b) and (43). This coda-bearing form also surfaced to express verbal arguments, however, and we believe that in such cases, these pronouns have some marked information structural function. The first piece of evidence for this is that it appears in constructions where pronouns are doubled, with the coda-bearing form appearing at the left edge of the clause, and a non-coda-bearing form appearing post verbally, in what we suggest is a resumptive pronoun function, as in (41).

- (41) *kun* *ʃam* *ku*.  
1.PRO alone 1.PRO  
'I am alone.' ('*Yo solito soy.*')

Further evidence in support of this hypothesis is presented in §6, where we discuss Aʔiwa word order.

DAM did not produce any third person verbal argument pronouns, although she produced ample examples of the third person possessive pronoun *jan* 3.POSS.PRO, as in (42a&b), which is identical to the demonstrative, exemplified in (42c&d). It is possible that Aʔiwa did not exhibit a true third person pronoun, as is the case with other South American language families, such as Tupí-Guaraní.

- (42) a. *jan fu'rala*  
 3.POSS.PRO ear  
 'his/her ear'
- b. *jan at'kua*  
 3.POSS.PRO house.2  
 'his/her house'
- c. *in-ar=was jan aslantania!*  
 VALENCE-look=CLITIC DEM young.woman.1  
 'Look at that young woman!' ('*Mira esa mujercita!*')
- d. *in-ar jan ulumu!*  
 VALENCE-look DEM chicken/duck  
 'Look at that duck!' ('*Mira ese pato!*')

## 4.2 Complex NPs

The two types of complex NP types attested in our data set are possessive phrases and noun phrases exhibiting adjectival modification. Possessors and adjectival modifiers appear before the head noun, as shown in (43) and (44) respectively, unless a noun exhibits both a possessor and an adjectival modifier, in which case the latter appears following the noun, as shown in (45).

- (43) *kun 'huti*  
 1.POSS.PRO head  
 'my head'
- (44) *i'fikta nu'asa*  
 small machete  
 'small machete (knife)'
- (45) a. *kun 'huti i'fikta*  
 1.POSS.PRO head small  
 'my small head'
- b. *kun at'ku tu'kut*  
 1.POSS.PRO house.1 big.1  
 'my big house'

## 5 Bound morphology and clitics

Our data set offers evidence of one one postposition, *-ih*, and one clitic of unknown function, *=was*.

**Postposition *-ih*.** In a number of imperative clauses with the verb *ewit*, 'give', the first person recipient appears as the form *ku<sup>h</sup>*, as shown in (46). Those data lead us to speculate that the form *ku<sup>h</sup>* consists of the first person pronoun *ku* and a dative postposition, *-ih*.

- (46) a. *ewit ku-ih kin wicukawa.*  
 give 1.PRO-POSP 2.POSS.PRO firewood  
 'Give me your firewood.' ('*Dame tu leña.*')
- b. *ewit ku-ih kin atari.*  
 give 1.PRO-POSP 2.POSS.PRO papaya  
 'Give me your papaya.' ('*Dame tu papaya.*')

**Clitic =was.** The element =was is abundant in our data set, appearing as part of a phonological word with nouns, as in (47), adverbs, as in (48), and verbs, as in (49), suggesting that it is a clitic. The presence or absence of this clitic never altered the semantic content of the glosses provided by DAM, suggesting that it has some indexical or discursive function. Note in the examples in (47) that the clitic =was takes the place of the final vowel of its host.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(47) a. <i>ʃurala</i><br/>ear</p> <p>b. <i>ʃural=was</i><br/>ear=CLITIC</p> <p>c. <i>jathaka</i><br/>penis</p> <p>d. <i>jathak=was</i><br/>penis=CLITIC</p> <p>e. <i>aslaneke</i><br/>woman</p> | <p>f. <i>aslaneke=was</i><br/>woman=CLITIC</p>   |
| <p>(48) a. <i>hir=was</i><sup>11</sup><br/>here.1=CLITIC</p> <p>b. <i>hik=was</i><br/>here.2=CLITIC</p>  | <p>(49) a. <i>tsuk=was</i><br/>bathe=CLITIC</p> <p>b. <i>itak=was</i><br/>eat.1=CLITIC</p> |

## 6 Simple clauses

**Basic constituent order.** Many clauses in our dataset lack overt subjects and objects. The majority of simple clauses with overt arguments exhibit SV order, as in (50), and SVO order, as in (51), suggesting that SVO may be the basic constituent order in the language.

- (50) *kun tsuk=was.*  
1.PRO bathe=CLITIC  
'I am bathing.' ('*Estoy bañándome.*')
- (51) *ku isak ki.*  
1.PRO stab 2.PRO  
'I will stab you.' ('*Te voy a picar.*')

At the same time, we cannot dismiss the possibility that SVO order reflects interference from Kichwa, DAM's dominant language, and there is evidence from the distribution of pre-verbal elements that the basic constituent order of the language may in fact be verb-initial. In particular, the presence of pre-verbal subjects is overwhelmingly in complementary distribution with pre-verbal non-subject elements, such as adverbs and negation particles, as reflected by the alternations in (52) and (53), which suggest that these pre-verbal elements are in competition for a single pre-verbal syntactic position.

- (52) a. *kun itak.*  
1.PRO eat.1  
'I will eat.' ('*Voy a comer.*')  
  
b. *ʃahtar itak ku.*  
NEG eat.1 1.PRO  
'I will not eat.' ('*No voy a comer.*')
- (53) a. *kun in-tsuk=was.*  
1.PRO VALENCE=wash=CLITIC  
'I will wash (clothes).' ('*Voy a lavar (ropa).*')

---

<sup>11</sup>Note that the forms *hir* and *hik* rarely appear without the clitic =was in our data set.

- b. *har in-tsuk=was ku.*  
 right.now VALENCE=wash=CLITIC 1.PRO  
 ‘Now I will wash (clothes).’ (‘*Ya voy a lavar (ropa).*’)

Given that the non-argumental elements such as adverbs are unlikely to be competing with arguments for a subject position, the most plausible explanation for the alternation between arguments and non-arguments in pre-verbal position is that this position is an information-structurally marked one, e.g., a focus position, which may be occupied by either arguments or non-argumental elements.

If this reasoning is correct, it suggests that basic constituent order in Aʔiwa is not subject initial, but rather, verb-initial. In this light, it is worth noting that one of the few utterances we were able to collect with two overtly realized non-pronominal arguments exhibits verb-initial order, as in (54).

- (54) *itak=was wahluk tarãʔã.*  
 eat.1=CLITIC rotten.thing vulture  
 ‘Vultures eat rotten things.’

Further evidence that the pre-verbal position is information-structurally marked comes from the distribution of the coda-bearing verbal argument pronominal forms mentioned in §4.1. Although the first and second person pronouns appear both pre-verbally and post-verbally, denoting subject (or object) arguments, there is an asymmetry in the distribution of the variants: the coda-bearing variants *kun* and *kin* are absent in post-verbal position. Since the coda-bearing and codaless variants can both express nominative arguments, it is plausible that the differences among these sets of pronominal forms is an informational structural one, with the more distributionally-restricted, pre-verbal, coda-bearing forms being the informationally structurally marked members of each set.

**Directive Clauses.** Utterances with directive illocutionary force constitute a significant proportion of the multi-word utterances produced by DAM. Utterances directed at second persons consist of clauses lacking subject pronouns, as in (55a); with pre-verbal second person pronouns, as in (55b); or with post-verbal pronouns, as in (55c); or referential nouns, as in (55d).

- (55) a. *itak=was*  
 eat.1=CLITIC  
 ‘Eat!’ (*Coma!*)  
 b. *kin tsuk*  
 2.PRO bathe  
 ‘Bathe!’ (*Bañate!*)  
 c. *har tuhurawak ki!*  
 right.now sleep 2.PRO  
 ‘Go to sleep right now!’ (‘*Ya duermes tu!*’)  
 d. *sik=was kutaʔa*  
 come=CLITIC son  
 ‘Come, son!’ (‘*Ven, hijo!*’)

DAM also produced directive utterances directed at first persons, as in (56), all of which lack any overt subject argument.

- (56) a. *auk!*  
 go.2  
 let’s go!  
 b. *auk kun tasʔaʔi.*  
 go.2 1s.POSS.PRO cleared.path  
 ‘Let’s go via my path.’ (‘*Vamos por mi camino.*’)



- c. *har auk=was!*  
 right.now go.2=CLITIC  
 ‘Let’s go right now!’ (‘*Vamos ya!*’)

**Copula clauses.** Nominal predication constructions appear to have no overt copula, as in (57), where the subject precedes the nominal predicate.

- (57) a. *har ku ifam.*  
 right.now 1.PRO alone.single.one.1  
 ‘Now I am alone.’ (Glossed as both ‘*Estoy solita.*’ and ‘*Yo solita soy.*’ )
- b. *ki ifam.*  
 2.PRO alone.single.one.1  
 ‘You are alone.’ (‘*Estás solito.*’)
- c. *hir=was kun tasʔaʔi.*  
 here.1=CLITIC 1.POSS.PRO cleared.path  
 ‘Here is my path.’ (‘*Aquí está mi camino.*’)
- d. *kun huti ifikta, kin hutuluk.*  
 1.POSS.PRO head small 2.POSS.PRO big.head  
 ‘My head is small, yours is big.’ (‘*Mi cabeza es chica, de tí es grande.*’)

## 6.1 Interrogative Clauses

Two types of interrogative clauses are attested, employing the content interrogatives *nahri*, ‘where’, as in (58) and *ikiri*, ‘what’, as in (59). In all cases, the interrogative word appears in clause-initial position, and the subject, if present, appears post-verbally. We obtained no clear examples of polar interrogatives.

- (58) a. *nahri ukajk ki?*  
 where.INT go.1 2.PRO  
 ‘Where are you going?’ (‘*A dónde vas?*’)
- b. *nahri sik=was ki?*  
 where.INT come=CLITIC 2.PRO  
 ‘From where are you coming?’ (‘*De dónde vienes?*’)
- (59) *ikiri falin=was?*  
 what eat.2=CLITIC  
 ‘What will (I) eat?’ (‘*Qué voy a comer?*’)

## 6.2 Negation

Negation is expressed by a clause-initial free negation element, *tʃahtar*, as shown in (60). In the modest number of examples of negated clauses that we obtained, the subject appears in post-verbal position.

- (60) a. *tʃahtar nikih ku.*  
 NEG know 1.PRO  
 I don’t know. (*No sé yo.*)

- b. *tʃahtar itak ku.*  
 NEG eat.1 1.PRO  
 I will not eat. (*No voy a comer.*)

### 6.3 Adverbial modification

Three adverbial elements are attested: *har*, ‘ya’ (‘right now’ or ‘already’); *hik*, and the locative demonstratives ‘here.1’; and *hir*, ‘here.2’. These are exemplified in (61). Note that most tokens of *hik* and *hir* appear with the clitic =*was*, while the form *har* never appears with =*was* in our data set.

- (61) a. *har auk=was, ja-sik siwaʔa.*  
 right.now go.2=CLITIC 3.IPFV-come cold.rain  
 ‘Let’s go right now, cold rain is coming.’ (*‘Vamos ya, viene la lluvia fría.’*)
- b. *ku hik=was.*  
 1.PRO here.1=CLITIC  
 ‘Here I am.’ (*Aquí estoy.*)
- c. *hir=was kun tasʔaʔi.*  
 here.2=CLITIC 1.POSS.PRO cleared.path  
 ‘Here is my path.’ (*Aquí está mi camino.*)

## 7 Conclusion

This chapter has presented as comprehensive a picture of the Aʔiwa language as possible, bringing together disparate historical records with data from the authors’ own field research in order to clarify the identity and classification of this language, as well as to provide a description of some of its basic characteristics, including its phonological inventory and a small number of basic aspects of its morphology and syntax. In addition, we provide in Appendix A a comprehensive compilation of all Aʔiwa of which we are aware.

Our work substantiates the classification of Aʔiwa as an isolate, identifying it as Tessmann’s (1930) ‘Auschiri’ and Villarejo’s (1959) ‘Vacacocha’ while distinguishing it from the Zaparoan and Western Tukanoan languages also found in the Napo River region, and from the isolate Waorani with which it has been confused by some authors.

## 8 References

- Aguirre, Milagros. 2006. *La utopía de los pumas*. Quito: CICAME.
- Beuchat, Henri and Paul Rivet. 1911. *La famille Betoya ou Tucano*. Paris: Société de Linguistique de Paris.
- Borman, M. B. 1991. *Listas comparativas de palabras en diez idiomas autóctonos ecuatorianos*. *Cuadernos Etnolingüísticos No. 13*. SIL Ecuador. Available at: [www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/17589](http://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/17589).
- Campbell, Lyle. 1997. *American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of Native America*. Oxford University Press.
- Chantre y Herrera, José. 1901. *Historia de las misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañón español*. Madrid: A. Avrial.
- Espinosa, Lucas. 1955. *Contribuciones lingüísticas y etnográficas sobre algunos pueblos indígenas del Amazonas peruano*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Bernardino de Sahagún.

- Fabre, Alain. 2005 [last updated 09/10/09]. *Diccionario etnolingüístico y guía bibliográfica de los pueblos indígenas sudamericanos. AWSHIRI*. Available online only. [www.ling.fi/Entradas%20diccionario/Dic=Awshiri.pdf](http://www.ling.fi/Entradas%20diccionario/Dic=Awshiri.pdf).
- Fugler, Charles and Wallace Swanson. 1971. Biological and Ethnological Observations on the Cofán, Secoya, and Awishiri Indians of Eastern Tropical Ecuador. *Proceedings of the Oklahoma Academy of Science* 51: 106–119.
- Granja, J.C. 1942. *Nuestro Oriente: de unas notas de viaje*. Quito: Imprenta de la Universidad.
- Grohs, Waltraud. 1974. Los indios del alto Amazonas del siglo XVI al XVIII: Poblaciones y migraciones en la antigua provincia de Maynas. Bonn.
- Hammarström, Harald. 2010. The status of the least documented language families in the world. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4: 177–212. <http://nffrc.hawaii.edu/ldc/>.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1994. The native languages of South America. In Christopher Moseley, R.E. Asher, and Mary Tait (eds.), *Atlas of the world's languages*. London: Routledge. pp. 46–76
- León, Agustín M. 1928, 1929. Breve vocabulario de las principales lenguas que se hablan en los diferentes pueblos y jibarias de la Prefectura Apostólica de Canelos y Macas. *El Oriente Dominicano* 1, 2. 87, 21. Quito.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Nineteenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Loukotka, Čestmír; Johannes Wilbert, Ed. 1968. Classification of South American Indian Languages. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Maroni, Pablo. 1988 [1738]. *Noticias auténticas del famoso río Marañón*. Monumenta Amazónica. Iquitos: CETA.
- Michael, Lev and Christine Beier. 2003. Poblaciones indígenas en aislamiento voluntario en la región del Alto Purús. In Renata Leite Pitman, Nigel Pitman, and Patricia Álvarez (eds.), *Alto Purús: Biodiversidad, conservación y manejo*. Center for Tropical Conservation, Duke University. pp. 149–164.
- Michael, Lev, Christine Beier, Jaime Pacaya Inuma, Ema Llona Yareja, Hermenegildo Díaz Cuyasa and Ligia Inuma Inuma. To appear. *Iquito-English Dictionary*. Quito: Abya Yala.
- Michael, Lev, Christine Beier, Stephanie Farmer, Kelsey Neely, Amalia Skilton, Greg Finley, John Sylak, and Grace Neveu. 2013. *Diccionario bilingüe máihiki-castellano y castellano-máihiki*. Manuscript, Máihiki Project document. Available at: [www.cabeceras.org/mai\\_ore\\_diccionario\\_oct\\_2013.pdf](http://www.cabeceras.org/mai_ore_diccionario_oct_2013.pdf)
- Michael, Lev, Will Chang, and Tammy Stark. 2014. Exploring phonological areality in the circum-Andean region using a Naive Bayes Classifier. In Søren Wichmann and Jeff Good (eds.), *Quantifying Language Dynamics*. Brill. pp. 7–66.
- Newson, Linda. 1995. *Life and death in early colonial Ecuador*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Olson, James S. 1991. *The Indians of Central and South America: an ethnohistorical dictionary*. Greenwood Press.
- Osculati, Gaetano. 2003 [1850]. *Exploraciones de las regiones ecuatoriales a lo largo del Napo y del río de las Amazonas*. Monumenta Amazónica. Iquitos: CETA.
- Peeke, M. Catherine. 1973. *Preliminary grammar of Auca*. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.
- Reeve, Mary-Elizabeth. 2002. *Los quichua del Curaray: El proceso de formación de la identidad*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Renard-Casevitz, France-Marie, Thierry Saignes, and Anne Christine Taylor. 1988. *Al este de los Andes: Relaciones entre las sociedades amazónicas y andinas entre los siglos XV y XVII*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Ribeiro, Darcy and Maria Ruth Wise. 1978. *Los Grupos Étnicos de la Amazoná Peruana*. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

- Rich, Roland. 1999. *Diccionario Arabela-Castellano*. SLP 49. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Rival, Laura. 2002. *Trekking through history: The Huaorani of Amazonian Ecuador*. Columbia University Press.
- Solís Fonseca, Gustavo. 2003. *Lenguas en la Amazonía peruana*. Lima: Programa FORTE-PE, Ministerio de Educación.
- Tessmann, Günter. 1930. *Die Indianer Nordost-Perus: Grundlegende Forschungen für eine systematische Kulturkunde*. Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co.
- Tessmann, Günter. 1999 [1930]. *Los indígenas del Perú nororiental: Investigaciones fundamentales para un estudio sistemático de la cultura*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Veigl, Franz Xavier. 2006 [1768]. *Noticias detalladas sobre el estado de la provincia de Maynas en América Meridional hasta el año de 1768*. Monumenta Amazónica. Iquitos: CETA.
- Villarejo, Avencio. 1959. *La selva y el hombre: Estudio antropológico del aborigen amazónico*. Lima: Editorial Ausonia.
- Wiener, Charles, Jules Crevaux, Désiré Charnay, and Édouard François André. 1884. *América pintoresca: Descripción de viajes al nuevo continente*. Barcelona: Montaner y Simon.
- Wise, Mary Ruth. 1999. Small language families and isolates in Peru. In R.M.W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The Amazonian languages*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 307–340.

## A Aʔiwa lexical data

In this section we present all Aʔiwa lexical data gathered by the authors, together with all published data on this language of which we are aware. Note that the data from our own fieldwork is given as uninflected roots. The forms in the first column are transcribed in IPA, and result from the authors’ fieldwork with Delia Andi Macahuasi (DAM) in 2008 and 2010, and from the analysis of audio recordings made with her at these times.<sup>12</sup> The forms in the second column are likewise IPA transcriptions, and include all the data from Michael’s handwritten fieldnotes resulting from working with María Estrella Clavoy (MEC) in 2008. The third column includes all data from Tessmann (1930), while the data in the fourth column includes all the data collected by Barrio and reproduced in Espinosa (1955), and the fifth and final column includes all the Aʔiwa data in Villarejo (1959). The forms in the latter three columns are given in the representation found in the original sources.

Where possible, we provide scientific names for plant and animal species in the list below, together with common their common name in Loreto Spanish and English. If species identification is not possible, we only provide Loreto Spanish and English common names.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
1st person	ku, kun, kua				cua (‘yo’)
1st possessive	kun				cunarui (‘mío’)
2nd person	ki, kin				quia (‘tú’)
2nd possessive	kin				
3rd person	jan				naa (‘él’)
3rd plural					cajieneque (‘ellos’)
abdomen					cutjee
<i>Dasyprocta fuliginosa</i> (Black Agouti, <i>añuje</i> )	af ‘pali	afpále			ashpari
air					ujua
alone, single, one.1	i ‘jam		ismáwa		ishama (‘uno’)
alone, single, one.2	i ‘jamta				

Continued...

<sup>12</sup>These recordings are archived at the California Language Archive (CLA) at the University of California, Berkeley.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
already, now, just now	har				
<i>Myrmecophaga tridactyla</i> (anteater, <i>oso hormiguero</i> )		utwi			
anus			kooláxa		
arm					cunupjawa
arrow					huasricrue
<i>Astrocaryum chambira</i> ( <i>chambira</i> )	ak'ri?i (also trompetero)	akrí?i	akriáu		
<i>Astrocaryum chambira</i> rope			akeriñ		
axe <sup>13</sup>			aksakúka		
ayahuasca	luk'ʔák		aktëwiriki ('Kaapi drink')		anticjuiri
balsa raft			tramünkoráu <sup>14</sup>		
bark			awünakót <sup>15</sup>		
basket	ha'ʔu		haó		
bathe	tsuk				
bean variety		öhöró?ã			
become night	jaw'lak, jawla 'ʔak <sup>16</sup>				
bench, seat		apwe?			
beverage (non-alcoholic)			θiáta <sup>17 18</sup>		
big.1	tu'kut				
big.2	tu'luk				
big.3	tʃu'luk				
big head	hutu'luk				
big tree	'au tu'luk				
eagle ( <i>gavilán</i> )	ũhũ'rũã				
<i>Mitu salvini</i> (Salvin's Currawong, <i>paujil</i> )	wi'korō	wikōṛō			
tinamou sp. ( <i>perdiz</i> )	hũ?'fũũ	hú?fulu			
<i>Penelope jacquacu</i> (Spix's Guan, <i>pucacunga</i> )	ro'ʔele	rú?ele			
<i>Psophia crepitans</i> (Gray-winged Trumpeter, <i>trompetero</i> )	ak'ri?i (also chambira)				
<i>Crotophaga ani</i> (Smooth-billed Ani, <i>vaca muchacho</i> )	k <sup>w</sup> ã'ʔüli				
<i>Bixa orellana</i> ( <i>achiote</i> )			uθlawán		
black			lō'ák <sup>19</sup>		nuaque
blanket (cotton)			uksahúwa (?) <sup>20</sup>		

Continued...

<sup>13</sup>See also 'stone axe'.

<sup>14</sup>Tessmann specifies that the name for balsa raft is the same as the name for bridge.

<sup>15</sup>Same form given for 'house wall'.

<sup>16</sup>Although these forms appear to be prefixed with third person, they are not.

<sup>17</sup>This form is very similar to 'manioc beer' but not identical.

<sup>18</sup>Tessman uses the other Greek theta, but since this symbol is not available for L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X we have used θ.

<sup>19</sup>The apostrophe represents a raised backward half-circle.

<sup>20</sup>The question mark is present in the original.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
blood					araque
boa (Eunectes)			yětmōtkáka		yatnetkake
bracelet (woven)			aríu		
breast	a 'kij				
breath			hūñ		
bridge			tramüñkoráú <sup>21</sup>		
broom			umsíwa		
buttocks			koxíi		
caiman ( <i>lagarto</i> )	am'hala	amhála	atsípa		
canoe	at'rewa	atrewa	- (atréwa) <sup>22</sup>		atrewa
Capuchin monkey sp.1 <sup>23</sup>	rūtrū 'k'āwā	utruhiwa			
Capuchin monkey sp.2	wa'naha				
Carludovica trigona (palm) <sup>24</sup>			río		
cat sp. ( <i>tigrillo</i> ) <sup>25</sup>	hūhūkū 'pā?				
chest					cusarmasi
chicken	u'lumu (also duck)		aā		ajau
chief			wáya ('Hauptling')		hani-cuctani ('curaca')
clay dish			rōxi		
clay jar (tinaja)			yagmunkōwa		yacnuejonren
clay pot		amáhrawa	oθlaláwa		
cleared path	tas'ʔāʔi				tashai
clothing	kuh'paw				
<i>Nasua nasua</i> (coati, <i>achuni</i> )	ʃak'rara				
cohabitante			kokáa		
come	sik				
cooking fire	as'k <sup>w</sup> āwa		yahaōñ		nejun
cooking pot			notapáwa	nutriwa	atuca (but see eye)
corn	su'kala, su'kali	sakala	sukála	sukala	sucala
cotton	nui'nui		taxθoáka		
cotton thread			nokué		
Cyperus piripiri (plant)			nuráxa		
dawn					yarquíán
day					rekiau
Mazama sp. <sup>26</sup> (deer sp., <i>venado</i> )	atri'waʔ(a)	atriwáʔa			atrihua
demon	a'lahi		axdaxé		alaje ('diablo')
digit (finger, toe)					iquiwa
door			alkwaxéri		
duck	u'lumu (also chicken)	ulumu			
ear	ʃu'rala		otoroā	uknoxá	ucnoja
earth	ahul'taʔ		ok'áke <sup>27</sup>		utaque
eat.1	i'tak				atcuñkel

Continued...

<sup>21</sup>Tessmann specifies that the name for bridge is the same as the name for balsa raft.

<sup>22</sup>This is exactly how the datum appears in Tessman's table; in his prose he says "Keine Kanus" ('No canoes').

<sup>23</sup>Although we are unable to determine which term goes with which species, the two Capuchin terms here presumably refer to *Cebus apella* (Brown capuchin monkey, *mono negro*) and *Cebus albifrons* (White-fronted capuchin monkey, *mono blanco*).

<sup>24</sup>Now known as *Evodianthus funifer*.

<sup>25</sup>Probably ocelot (*Leopardus tigrinus*)

<sup>26</sup>Probably *Mazama americana* (Red brocket deer)

<sup>27</sup>The apostrophe represents a raised backward half-circle.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
eat.2	fa'lin				
egg					ate
Euterpe oleracea (cabbage palm)			tōšīwa		
eye.1	ja'tuk		atúka	átuka	atuca (given as 'olla')
eye.1	ut'kuʔ				
fan (chambira)			ũmkiwa		
fan (for fire)			utkurá'wa <sup>28</sup>		
female child					tee
fire drill base			tikíra		
fire drill stick			nutriō		
firewood	wiru'kawa				
fish (generic)				aker grande') ('pez	atsua
Cichla sp. ( <i>bu- jurqui</i> )		aklasi			
Hoplias barbaricus ( <i>huasaco</i> )	ak'sala	aksāla			
Brycon sp. ( <i>sábalo</i> )	a'kere	akéɾɛ			
Erythrinidae sp. ( <i>shuyo</i> )	ahka'rūʔū	áhkarūʔū			
fishhook			osōú		
fishtrap (woven)			mwütáale		
fish poison: bar- basco	ma'lahi				
fish poison: Clibadium			nunáka		
fish poison: Tephrosia			sōkōék <sup>29</sup>		sucuaque (‘cube’)
flute			wāli-wāli		
food					atcunek
foot					cutalma
garden (chacra)	taha'rūʔū				
Genipa ameri- cana ( <i>huito</i> )			wíto (Q loan)		
give	i'wit	atwiʔi (‘dame’)			
go.1	u'kajk				
go.2	a'uk				
God	akre'wak (also sun, moon)				acrocac-ruke
grub		muhuhuj			
<i>Bactris gasipaes</i> (peach palm, <i>pi- fayo</i> ) <sup>30</sup>			ārō		
<i>Bactris gasipaes</i> beer ( <i>chicha de pifayo</i> )		nutnét	aro-θiáta <sup>31</sup>		
gourd bowl			āo'reki <sup>32</sup>		
hammock			úni		uñe
hand			akokíwă		cuespen
hard					ajiri
have sex	hi'tʃin				
head (my head)	'huti (kun 'huti)		awarékě	konxuti	conjuti
here.1	hik				
here.2	hir				
hit	pí				

Continued...

<sup>28</sup>The apostrophe represents a raised backward half-circle.

<sup>29</sup>Tessmann specifies that this is cultivated.

<sup>30</sup>Tessmann uses the now outdated *Guilelma* genus term.

<sup>31</sup>Compare to *Guilelma* above; the form is similar but not identical.

<sup>32</sup>The apostrophe represents a raised backward half-circle.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
house	at'ku, at'kua	atwá?u, atku?a	atkúa	atku	atcu
house: my big house	kun at'ku tu'kut				
house: my house	kun at'kua <sup>33</sup>				
house support			haráwi		
house wall			awúnakót <sup>34</sup>		
hurt	ih				
husband	a'jap	a'japa			
hut			haikiráwě		
illegitimate child			yaěšáro		
Iquito-Cahuarano people			atáú		
<i>Panthera onca</i> (jaguar, tigre)	mi'ala	miiá?ja	miyálě	miala	miara
Kichwa people			aθaākě		
kin: aunt	e'ʔetu (or nephew)	atéto, e'ʔetu			
kin: brother	aw'ja?				arima
kin: daughter.1	ku'kat				
kin: daughter.2	kuta'tuna	kutatuna			
kin: daughter-in-law		kutwa?, utwa?			
kin: father (my father)	ha (kun ha)	kínhaa			cuntjee
kin: grand-daughter	ku'kata	kukaata			
kin: grandfather		aitu, aweto			
kin: grandmother		aéta, aita			
kin: grandson	ku'katikta	a'ʔetu, kukát			
kin: mother (my mother)	'ama (kun 'ama)				ama
kin: nephew	e'ʔetu (or aunt)				
kin: niece	ak'asi	akási			
kin: sister	a'lun (or niece)	a'ʔitu, atuwá?a			aritu
kin: son	ku'ta?a	kuta?a			ca??? (illegible)
kin: uncle		atφio			
knee	ku'pinu				
know	ni'kih				
lake		lukatwahi			
lance		awási	axyakókě		
lazy, idle	ah'lu?(u)				
leaf	i'rapí	iirapí			aunée
leg					atacapa
<i>Lepidocaryum tessmannii</i> (irapay)			aḥunōñ		
lightning bolt					jiujiwe
look	in'ar				
<i>Ara ararauna</i> (Blue-and-Yellow Macaw, <i>guacamayo amarillo</i> )	alkah'neke				
<i>Ara macao</i> (Scarlet Macaw, <i>guacamayo rojo</i> )	milah'neke				
machete	nu'asa	nuása			

Continued...

<sup>33</sup>Although DAM produced both 'atku' and 'atkua' for 'house', the possessed form was always 'atkua'.

<sup>34</sup>Same form given for 'bark'.



	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
makabo [sic] <sup>35</sup>			á̇sa		
man			kunasápě		achapa
<i>Trichechus inunguis</i> (manatee, <i>vaca marina</i> )		jakapili			
manioc (sweet)		kasáʔa	kasáa		acruc
manioc beer ( <i>masato</i> )	nut 'nit	iiʔata, ijata	kasaáka, ʃiáta <sup>36</sup>		jiata
<i>Mauritia flexuosa</i> (moriche palm, <i>aguaje</i> )					luka'aque
<i>Mauritia flexuosa</i> drink			lukaák; al'ási <sup>37</sup>		
<i>Pithecia</i> sp. (Saki monkey sp., <i>huapo</i> )	k'wi' riri				
moon	akre'wak (also sun, God)		ō̇sa	esa	ranae
morning					racon
mortar (grinding)			yakenúa		
mosquito	wi'fala	wifála			
mouth					araje
night					lennee
no	'tʃahtar	tʃáha			canonorituc
non-indigenous person	'pari		wüirákütš <sup>38</sup>		
nose					sucalo
<i>Oenocarpus bataua</i> ( <i>ungurahui</i> ) drink			háku		
old					yantatnec
orphan	arikta'nia	arita			
papaya	atari	atáari			
parrot		aʃise			araiwa
<i>Tayassu tajacu</i> (collared peccary, <i>sajino</i> )	i'hara	ihára			
<i>Tayassu pecari</i> (white-lipped peccary, <i>huan-gana</i> )	ra'káʔō	ʔakáʔū			
penis	jat'haka		kōʃáka		
pepper (hot or sweet)	a'laha	hiʔo, hijoi	ofúwa	akrakwi	aorawi
person, compatriot, autonym	a'ʔiwa	aʔiwa, aʔiwi	těkiráka (ethnonym)		achuan ('gente')
pestle			atréba		
pineapple		atfuri, tfuraka			
Pioché (Sekoya) people			aunátšuruk		
plantain	a'laʔa	aláʔa, alaáha	ađáa	alaa	alaha
plantain, sweet			waskiáka <sup>39</sup>		
pot-bellied person	a'ruh tʃu'luk				
potato sp.1 (big)	'haku, haku 'ruku				

Continued...

<sup>35</sup>Presumably, *Theobroma bicolor* (*macambo*).

<sup>36</sup>Elsewhere, Tessmann gives a similar form for 'non-alcoholic beverage'.

<sup>37</sup>The apostrophe represents a raised backward half-circle.

<sup>38</sup>This form is borrowed from the Quechuan 'viracocha'.

<sup>39</sup>Tessmann's term is 'Banane', not 'plátano maduro'.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
potato sp.2 (yellow)	suk'luhi				
potato sp.3 (huge)	jawna'hi				
rain	'ihu				iju
rain, cold	si'waʔa				
red			taxékiã		sauna
<i>Alouatta seniculus</i> (Red Howler Monkey, <i>monocoto</i> )	ah'lua	ahlúʔã			
ripe plantain wine			aɖaáka		
river		awihi			
river dolphin		atʃúntapala			
roof beams			yǎn'unkôwa <sup>40</sup>		
roof support			yawarékě		
rotten thing	wah'luk				
salt					cachi (Q loan)
say	ut'ku				
see	u'ar				
shaman, witch ('brujo')			örkaniθéke		arkanicuaje
sick					jijislike
skin					utcu
skirt			uksakúwa		
sleep	tuhra'wak, tuhura'wak				atcoraque
small machete, knife	i'fikta nu'asa				
small, a little bit	i'fikta				
snake (general)	aw'ʔek(e)	awiki			awike
snap trap			notsôo		
snare			wíłtsáwa		
soft					roiki
Solanacea with edible fruits			θãe		
soul, spirit			axlékéké		
<i>Ateles belzebuth</i> (White-bellied Spider Monkey, <i>maquizapa</i> )	a'haku	aháku			
spindle			axiakökö		
<i>Saimiri sciureus</i> (Common Squirrel Monkey, <i>mono fraile</i> )	si'ʔaʔa				
stab	i'sak				
star					yatuca
stingray.1	makra'lasi	makɾálasí			
stingray.2	ham'ham				
stone	nuk'lahi	nuklári	noklôãxe		nucraje
stone axe		asi	nukuláxi		
sugarcane	rajwã'ʔák	takraʔ	uskiwãã		
sun	akre'wak (also moon, God)	akroák	akroák	akroake	acruaque
sweet potato			kasa-tai ('Süßkartoffel')		
<i>Sanguinus</i> sp. (Tamarin Monkey sp., <i>pichico</i> )	asla'ʔãũ				

Continued...

<sup>40</sup>The apostrophe represents a raised backward half-circle.

	DAM	MEC	Tessmann	Barrio	Villarejo
<i>Tapirus ter-</i> <i>restris</i> (tapir, <i>sachavaca</i> )	'sahi	saahi	sáxě		saji
<i>Eira barbara</i> (Tayra, <i>manco</i> )	a'ʔilu				
three			akúwa		aacua
<i>Callicebus</i> <i>moloch cupreus</i> (Dusky Titi Monkey, <i>tocón</i> )	su'kali	sukaáli			
tobacco		ahuu	—		tawác (SP loan)
tongue			axlíu		anuamasi
tooth, teeth			áka	kukwa ('diente')	atcunquiwa ('di- entes')
tree	'au		áwa		ahua
trench			nótkása		
tumpline			utnakówǎ		
turtle sp. (motelo)	a'wi	aaʔwi			
two			kisnáō		quisnau
umbilical cord			amáru		
urinate					cusharara
vagina	aʔui				
vulture	ta'ráʔǎ				
vulva			košói		
want	an'tet				
water	aʔwa (Sp. loan?)		wáē	kwái	yahuakeke
what.INT	i'kiri				
where.INT	'nahri				
white			sukéē		transae
widow			hankainík		
widower			hankainíċ		
woman	asla'nek(e)	aslaneke (‘mujercita’) aluunuas (‘mujer grande’)	aslané	kukaa	aslaneque
woman, young.1	aslanta'nia				
woman, young.2	samakta'nia				
woodpecker	isa'rawi				
<i>Lagothrix</i> <i>lagothricha</i> (Common Woolly mon- key, <i>mono</i> <i>choro</i> )	aʔluku	aʔlúuku			
yam			tǎi ('ñame')		
Yanamuca L. (plant)			kónāu		
year					huelete
yes	ha'ʔǎʔǎ				jaa
(no gloss)	ni'kʔaw				
(no gloss)	was'nat				