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**INTRODUCTION**

Even a relatively short sketch of the linguistic conditions of a large area should cover such points as: general features—phonetic, morphological, and lexical—that characterize the languages, and the main points in which they differ from languages of other regions; brief digests of the grammar and phonetics of each independent family or at least of the more important ones; a classification of these families in groups according to phonetic and morphological type; a classification of the component languages of each family in their proper subdivisions as dialects, languages, groups, and stocks, according to degree of linguistic relationship; and a reconstruction of linguistic history and migrations. As regards the aboriginal languages of South America it must be understood at the outset that, as comparatively little reliable data are available upon them, none of the above points can be treated with any approach to thoroughness, and on most of them little can be said at present.

South American Indian languages have no uniform or even usual characteristics that differentiate them from North American languages. The same may be said of American languages fundamentally, as opposed to Old World languages. Languages were formerly grouped into categories according to morphological pattern: isolating, agglutinating, polysynthetic, and inflective, with an implication of evolution and betterment toward the inflecting ideal—of course, of

---

1 Under the title of "Status and Problems of Research in the Native Languages of South America" this Introduction, with slight revision, was read at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Cleveland, Ohio, September 15, 1944, as the author's vice-presidential address as incoming chairman of Section H, the section on anthropology. It was later published in Science, vol. 101, No. 2530, pp. 259-264, March 16, 1945.
our own Indo-European languages. However, research has shown that, so far as there has been any evolution, the isolating is the last, not the first stage. American languages were once classed with the polysynthetic, with agglutinative tendencies. No such hard-and-fast distinctions can be made; few languages belong definitely to one or another class, and most of them show traits of several classes. This applies equally well to American and to Old World languages; some show tendencies toward inflection, more toward polysynthesis. It is impossible to give any description that would characterize the majority of American Indian languages or contrast them with Old World languages, either from a morphological or a phonetic point of view. Incorporation (of the nominal or pronominal object) was formerly considered one of the characteristics of American languages; this also is missing in many of them.

A classification of languages according to patterns and types being impossible, the only possible one is genetic, based on relationship, common origin, and linguistic history.\(^2\)

The classification of human groups according to their languages is now accepted as the best system for reconstructing historical connections. Cultural elements are too easily adopted to have much historical value; somatological characteristics, though more permanent than linguistic ones, are less readily identifiable in mixture. On the other hand, a proved relationship of two languages at present widely separated indicates a former close connection or identity of the ancestors of their speakers and thus affords important data on human migration. But proof of linguistic relationship is fraught with innumerable difficulties. It is seldom absolute, but depends on acceptance by scholars; on the other hand, it is impossible to prove that two languages are not related.

Merely to ascertain the connection between two languages is far from sufficient to establish a good historical picture. If we knew no more than that Spanish, Italian, German, and Russian are related it would mean little. All the languages of South America may be related; all those of all America may be; conceivably all languages in the world may eventually be proved to have a common descent. In the same sense, all mammals are related, all animals are related, all life had a common origin. Relationship means little unless we know degree and nearness of relationship.

A direct comparison of two distantly related languages seldom yields convincing proof of their connection. A comparison of Polish and English would probably result in a negative decision; it is only because we know the historical linguistics of the Indo-European lan-

\(^2\) On the classification of languages, and of American Indian languages in particular, see Boas, 1911; Höfler, 1941; Mason, 1940; Voegelin, 1941; and references and bibliographies therein.
guages well, with reconstructed roots of words, that the relationship can be proved. On the other hand, no proof would be needed of the relationship of French, Spanish, and Italian; even if we did not know their descent from Latin, the resemblance is obvious. The relationship of dialects such as Catalan, Provençal, and Gallego is even closer and more evident.

Related languages are grouped in "families" or "stocks," presumed, on present evidence, to be unrelated. These families are then subdivided into divisions, groups, branches, languages, types, dialects, varieties, etc. The terminology is indefinite and there are no established criteria. When families heretofore considered independent are determined to be related, a more inclusive term is required; phylum has been accepted. For instance, if Indo-European, Hamito-Semitic, and Finno-Ugrian are "proved" to be related, as has been posited with considerable ground, they would compose a phylum. Most of the 85-odd "families" of North America, formerly considered independent, are now grouped in relatively few phyla.

Good scientific grammars of South American languages are practically nonexistent, and grammars of any kind, even of the older type based on analogy with Latin grammar, are very few. Comparisons of morphology, one of the important criteria for linguistic connections, are, therefore, in most cases impossible. Most of the classifications are based on lexical grounds, on vocabularies, often short, usually taken by travelers or missionary priests, and generally with the help of interpreters. The recorders were almost always untrained in phonetics and each used the phonetic system of his native language—Spanish, Portuguese, French, German, or English; sometimes Dutch or Swedish. Scientific deductions made on the basis of such material have little claim to acceptance. Yet on many languages, extinct or living, nothing else is available. An independent family should not be posited on the basis of one such vocabulary, no matter how apparently different from any other language. (Cf. Mashubi.)

Of many extinct languages, and even of some living ones, nothing is known; of others there are statements that the natives spoke a language of their own, different from that of their neighbors, but without any suggestion as to how different, or that the language was intelligible or unintelligible or related to that of other groups. Of some, only place and personal names remain; of others, recorded lexical data ranging from a few words to large vocabularies and grammatical sketches.

Owing to the magnitude of the field it has been possible for me to make very few independent studies and comparisons of lexical and morphological data with a view to establishing linguistic connections, and even most of the articles published by others in support of such
relationships have not been critically studied and appraised. The
greater number, and by far the most cogent, of these studies have
been written by the dean of South American linguists, Dr. Paul
Rivet. Similar studies in Macro-Ge languages have been published
by Loukotka. In almost all of them the authors were, unfortunately,
limited to comparing vocabularies collected by others and pregnant
with the faults already herein set forth. Words from lists in one group
of languages are compared with words from languages of another
group. Rarely are the roots or stems isolated or known, and morpho-
logical elements may often be mistaken for parts of stems. Rarely
has it been possible to deduce any rules of sound-shift, the best proof
of linguistic relationship, or the examples given are too few in propor-
tion to the number of comparisons to carry conviction. Few
of these proposed linguistic relationships can be said to be incon-
trovertibly proved; good cases have been made for many, and many
or most of them have been accepted by later authorities, and are
accepted herein. Others are of doubtful validity, and all require
reappraisal, and reworking, especially those in which new data may
later become, or may already have become, available.

It is a truism of linguistic research that, given large enough vocabu-
laries to compare, and making allowances for all possible changes in
the form of a word or stem, as well as in its meaning, a number of
apparent similarities, convincing to the uncritical, can be found
between any two languages. Especially is this true if the comparison
is made between two large groups, each consisting of languages of
admitted relationship. To carry conviction, laws of sound-shift must
be deduced, obeyed by a large proportion of the cases in question, and
a basic similarity in morphological and phonetic pattern must be
shown. Few of the comparative works on South American languages
at tempt such obligations, and almost all suffer from the faults above
listed. There is not a really thorough comparative grammar of any
South American, or for that matter of any American, native linguistic
family, except possibly Algonkian.

One of the pitfalls to be avoided in linguistic comparison is that of
borrowing. Languages easily adopt words from neighboring languages;
these must be discounted in seeking evidence on genetic relationship.
Words for new concepts or new objects are likely to be similar in many
languages; \(^1\) generally their categories and very similar forms betray
their recent origin. Phonetic pattern and morphological traits are also
borrowed, but to a lesser degree. Grammatical pattern is the most
stable element in a language, phonology next; vocabulary is most
subject to change. There are several areas in America where a number

\(^1\) See Nordenskiöld, 1922; Herzog, G. 1941. Such words as those for banana, cow, telegraph, are pertinent.
of languages with little or no lexical resemblance have a relatively uniform phonology, and/or similar morphological peculiarities.

Many American languages, North as well as South, show resemblance in the pronominal system, often \( n \) for the first person, \( m \) or \( p \) for second person. Whether this is the result of common origin, chance, or borrowing has never been proved, but the resemblance should not be used as evidence of genetic connection between any two languages. Many of the languages of central and eastern Brazil are characterized by words ending in vowels, with the stress accent on the ultimate syllable.

In some cases, the amount of borrowed words and elements may be so great as practically to constitute a mixed language. Linguistic students are in disagreement as to whether a true mixed language with multiple origins is possible. Loukotka, in his 1935 classification, considers a language mixed if the foreign elements exceed one-fifth of the 45-word standard vocabulary used by him for comparison. Lesser borrowings he terms “intrusions” and “vestiges.” (See also Loukotka, 1939 a.)

The situation is further complicated by the fact that, in a large number of instances, the same or a very similar name was applied by colonists to several groups of very different linguistic affinities. This may be a descriptive name of European derivation, such as Oréjón, “Big Ears”; Patagón, “Big Feet”; Coroado, “Crowned” or “Tonsured”; Barbados, “Bearded”; Lengua, “Tongue.” Or it may be an Indian word applied to several different groups in the same way that the Mayan Lacandón of Chiapas are locally called “Caribs,” and the rustic natives of Puerto Rico and Cuba “Gíbaros” and “Goajíros,” respectively. Thus, “Tapuya,” the Tupi word for “enemy,” was applied by them to almost all non-Tupi groups, “Botocudo” to wearers of large lip-plugs, etc. Among other names applied to groups of different languages, sometimes with slight variations, are Apiacá, Arard, Caripuna, Chavante, Guaná, Guayaná, Canamari, Carayá, Catawishi, Catukina, Cuníba, Jivaró, Macú, Tapieté, not to mention such easily confused names as Tucano, Tacana and Ticuna. Many mistakes have been made due to confusion of such names. (Cf. especially, Arda.)

America, and especially South America, is probably the region of greatest linguistic diversity in the world, and of greatest ignorance concerning the native languages. On the very probable presumption that each homogeneous group, tribe, band, or village spoke a recognizable variant dialect or variety, there may have been 5,000 such in South America. The index of Rivet (1924 a) lists some 1,240 such groups (including a few synonyms), and this is far from the total. For instance, in the above index, Rivet lists 13 component members of the small and unimportant Timote family of Venezuela; in his
monograph on the Timote (Rivet, 1927 a) he mentions 128 names for local groups, apart from the names of the villages occupied by them. The multitude of languages in America has often been given as an argument for a comparatively great length of time of human occupation of this hemisphere. This concept presupposes that the first immigrants to America had a common speech. This is unlikely; it is more probable that each migrating group had its specific language, and that the number of presumably independent linguistic families may originally have been even greater than at present. Such a reduction has been the linguistic history of the rest of the world. These “families” may either have had a remote common ancestry or multiple unrelated origins; of the origin and early forms of speech we know nothing. All known “primitive” languages are highly complex and evidently have had a long period of development. Of course, the minor dialects and obviously related languages were differentiated in America.

Since the main migration to America is believed to have been via Alaska, we would expect to find in South America languages of older migrations than in North America, the speech of the earliest migrants forced to the peripheries and to cul-de-sacs by later and more aggressive groups, and also small enclaves of moribund independent linguistic families. This applies especially to southernmost and easternmost South America, and to the speech of natives of paleo-American physical type, such as the Ge and the Fuegians.

Regarding extracontinental relationships, many ill-conceived attempts have been made to show connections between South American native languages and Indo-European or Semitic ones; all these are so amateurish that they have been accorded no scientific attention. Dr. Paul Rivet is firmly convinced of the connection between Australian languages and Chon, and between Malayo-Polynesian and Hokan. Instead of by direct trans-Pacific voyages, he believes that the Australian influence came via the Antarctic during a favorable post-glacial period not less than 6,000 years ago.¹ This radical thesis has met with no acceptance among North American anthropologists. The data offered in its support fall short of conviction, but probably have not received sufficient careful consideration.

It is possible that some of the South American languages belong to the great Hokan or Hokan-Siouan family or phylum of North America. (Cf. Yurumangui, Quechua.) Since isolated Hokan enclaves are found as far south as Nicaragua, evidence of migrations across Panamá would not be entirely unexpected. A number of languages from Colombia to the Gran Chaco have Hokan-like morphological patterns. Dr. J. P. Harrington is convinced of the Hokan affiliations of Quechua,

¹ Rivet, 1925 b, and many other articles. (See bibliography in Pericot y Garfa, 1936, p. 432.)
but his published article (1943) fails to carry conviction, and no other argument for Hokan in South America has been presented. Such Hokan migrations, if proved, were probably at a relatively early period.

On the other hand, several of the great South American families have penetrated the southern peripheries of North America. Chibchan languages occupied a solid area, with possibly a few small enclaves of other families or isolated languages, as far as the Nicaraguan border, and the probably affiliated "Misumalpan" (Miskito-Sumo-Matagalpa) would extend this area to cover Nicaragua. Arawak and Carib extended over the Lesser and Greater Antilles, and the former may have had a colony on the Florida coast.

In 1797 the native Carib Indians remaining in the Lesser Antilles, mainly on St. Vincent Island, were transported to Roatan Island off the coast of Honduras. Mixing with the Negro population there, they have spread over much of the coast of Honduras and parts of British Honduras. They now number some 15,000, most of them speaking a Carib jargon.

The trend in the classification of American languages has been quite opposite in North and in South America. In the former, radical scholars believe that all the many languages formerly considered independent may fall into six great phyla: Eskimo, Na-Dene, Algonkian-Mosan, Hokan-Siouan, Macro-Penutian, and Macro-Otomanguean, plus the South American phylum Macro-Chibchan. In South America, on the contrary, the more recent classifications have increased rather than reduced the number of families or groups given independent status. Most of these new ones, it must be admitted, are one-language families, many of them extinct, and generally based on one or a few short vocabularies that show little or no resemblance to any other language with which they have been compared. These should be considered as unclassified rather than as independent families. It is certain that the number will be greatly reduced as the languages become more intensively studied, but doubtful if it will ever reach such relative simplicity as in North America. Almost certainly the linguistic picture will be found to be far more complex than in Europe and Asia.

One of the main reasons for the great difference in the proposed number of linguistic families in North and South America is that the study of South American linguistics is now about in the same stage as that of North American languages thirty years ago. Since that time many trained students, both in the United States and in México, have studied the native languages intensively, largely under the direction
or example of the late Drs. Franz Boas 6 and Edward Sapir. Except for the indefatigable Dr. Paul Rivet and the late Curt Nimuendajú, South America has had few linguistic scholars of wide interests and scientific viewpoint, and until recently very few trained younger men. The North American languages have been grouped into six phyla, mainly on grounds of morphological resemblance and intuition, and in this the students have been aided by the fact that the languages are fewer, and fewer of them extinct, so that such morphological studies could be made. South America suffers not only from lack of students, paucity of grammatical studies, multitudes of languages, extinction of many of them, but also from the practical problems of linguistic research: immense distances, poor transportation, difficulties and expense of expeditions, lack of capable interpreters, and similar handicaps.

The history of attempts to classify the languages of South America was reviewed by Chamberlain in 1907. The earlier classifications, such as those of Adelung and Vater, Balbi, Castelnau, Gilij, Hernás, Ludewig, Von Martius and D'Orbigny, were not considered therein, and need not be here. Modern classification began with Brinton in 1891 (1891 a). With his usual far-seeing good sense, not "curiously enough" as Chamberlain remarks, Brinton refused to enumerate or list his "stocks," but apparently recognized nearly sixty. In many later short articles Brinton continued to alter his groupings. Other lists published in the next few years were McGee, 1903 (56); Chamberlain, [1903] (57); Ehrenreich, 1905 (52). All these differ more than the slight variation in total would suggest. Chamberlain then gave his own list, totalling 83. Later (1913 a) he published a revision of this, which became the standard classification in English for a decade or more. Though the total of 83 stocks is exactly the same as in his earlier list (plus 77a), the number of alterations, deletions, and additions is great.

Since 1922 a number of classifications have appeared. Krickeberg (1922) stressed only the 15 most important families; based on this Jiménez Moreno (1938) published a large distribution map in color. P. W. Schmidt (1926) also wisely did not attempt to enumerate and list every family, but discussed them under 36 families or groups. The late Curt Nimuendajú never attempted a complete linguistic classification of South America, and his unpublished map and index do not include the far north, west and south, but his first-hand knowledge of the rest of the continent is unexcelled. In this restricted region he recognizes 42 stocks, 34 isolated languages, and hundreds of

---

unclassified languages, the latter generally without any known linguistic data.

Two comprehensive classifications of all South American languages have been made in the last 20 years. Paul Rivet (1924a), combining some of Chamberlain's families, separating others, reached a total of 77. Pericot y García (1936) follows Rivet very closely, but not in numerical or alphabetical order. The most recent classification and the most radical—or most conservative, according to the point of view—is that of Loukotka (1935). Dividing more of Rivet's families than he combined, he enumerates 94 families with a total of some 558 languages. Later he revised the details somewhat, but only regarding the languages of Brazil. In this latter article he notes the linguistic sources for each language (Loukotka, 1939a).

In view of the great uncertainty regarding the relationships and classification of the South American native languages, and the great differences of opinion, the example of Brinton, Schmidt, and Krickeberg is herein followed, in not attempting to enumerate and rigidly to separate the genetic families.

The classification of the languages of South America herein given is, therefore, presented without any pretense of finality or even of accuracy; the data are too insufficient. Future research will indicate many errors and change the picture decidedly. It is hoped that the present article incorporates all the accepted revisions since the appearance of other classifications, and improves on the latter. As regards exactitude and finality I can but cite the opinion of a great linguist:

To attempt to make an exact and complete classification of all languages in rigorously defined families is to prove that one has not understood the principles of the genetic classification of languages. [Meillet and Cohen, 1924, p. 10.]

South American linguistic history or philology does not extend before the beginnings of the 16th century with the first words and observations made by European voyagers. No native alphabets had been developed; there were no hieroglyphs, and even pictographs, petroglyphs, and picture-writing seem to be less than in North America. The Peruvian quipus were arithmetical, astrological, divinatory, and mnemonic. There was a tradition among the Quechua at the time of the Conquest that they had once had a system of writing on tree leaves that was later forbidden and forgotten (Montesinos, 1920, chs. 7, 14, 15; Bingham, 1922, ch. 16; 1930, ch. 9.), but this is given little credence by modern scholars, and no trace of it remains. However, it has recently been suggested that painted symbols were employed by some natives of the North Peruvian Coast (Larco Hoyle, 1944). A system of writing has been claimed for the Chibcha also, based, not on tradition, but on the peculiar, and apparently nonpictorial character of many pictographs in Colombia; this
also has received no credence among archeologists. On the other hand, the modern Cuna of Panamá have developed an interesting existent system of mnemonic picture-writing.6

Two of the native languages merit special mention as having become, after the Spanish Conquest, langüas frances of wider extent and use than formerly. The Tupí of the Brazilian coast became the basis of the lingua geral, the medium of communication of priests and traders throughout the Amazon drainage; it is now generally replaced by Portuguese. The Cuzco dialect of Quechua became the culture language of the “Inca” region and extended its area even before the Conquest; after the latter it continued its spread and was adopted as a second language by the Spanish in Perú. Neither language has today, however, the cultural position of the Maya of Yucatán, for instance, though both have added many native terms in the Spanish and Portuguese of their regions, and even throughout the world, such as tapioca, jaguar, llama, and quinine. It has been estimated that 15 percent of the vocabulary of Brazilian Portuguese is of Tupí origin. In Paraguay, Guaraní is considered a culture language, and some newspapers are published in it.

A description of the geographical area occupied by each language would take too much space. The approximate region may be seen by reference to the large linguistic map and to the tribal sections in the other volumes of this Handbook. In this connection, the point of temporal relativity must be taken into consideration. The habitat given is that of earliest record. Great changes in population and migrations took place during the 16th to 18th centuries and even later, and migrations on a lesser or equal scale must have occurred in preceding centuries. These cannot be recorded on the map, but some are noted in the regional articles in Volumes 1 to 4. These changes took place especially in eastern Brazil and in the Andean region.

In the preparation of this article I have received help, great or little, generally information through correspondence, from Messrs. J. Eugenio Garro, Irving Goldman, John P. Harrington, Frederick Johnson, Jacob Bridgens Johnson, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Erwin H. Lauriault, William Lipkind, Alfred S. Métraux, Bernard Mishkin, Eugene A. Nida, Louis Rankin, A. F. Reifsnyder, Paul Rivet, John Howland Rowe, David B. Stout, Harry Tschopik, Jr., and Charles Wagley. My sincere thanks to these and to all others who may have assisted in any way. Two persons deserve especial mention, credit, and thanks: Betty J. Meggers (Mrs. Clifford Evans, Jr.), who helped greatly with the bibliography; and particularly Mrs. Maria Alice Moura Pessoa, who is largely responsible for the linguistic map as well as for much of the bibliography. A large part, possibly the major

part, of the latter was prepared by Works Progress Administration Project No. 18369 in 1939 under the direction of the late Dr. Vladimir J. Fewkes. Mr. Ronald J. Mason also assisted in checking the map.

**SOURCES**

In addition to earlier and outmoded classifications such as those of Gilij (1780–84), Hervás y Panduro (1800), Adelung and Vater (1806–17), Balbi (1826), D’Orbigny (1839), Ludewig (1858), and Martius (1867), about a dozen authors have offered classifications of the South American languages, or of those of large parts of South America. Although their opinions are often mentioned in text, they are generally omitted in the language bibliographies herein because of their constant recurrence, except in those cases, particularly Adelung and Vater (1806–17), Martius (1867), Lehmann, W. (1920), Tessmann (1930), and Jijon y Caamano (1941–43), where they present source material. The more recent classifications, with a brief note on their natures, are as follows:

Alexander Chamberlain, “Linguistic Stocks of South American Indians” (1913 a). This 12-page article is the last of several such by Chamberlain. It enumerates his 84 families with several bibliographical references to each, all of which may be found in the references herein. The accompanying map is small.

Paul Rivet, “Langues de l’Amérique du Sud et des Antilles” (1924 a)—a 69-page part of Meillet and Cohen’s “Les Langues du Monde” (1924). Under each of his 77 families Rivet briefly notes the component languages in their groupings and with their locations, in text—not in tabular—form. Over a thousand languages (or dialects) and synonyms are mentioned, and the very full index, containing about 1,250 names of South American languages, is most useful. The bibliography consists of only 82 items, all of which are included herein. It is followed by a 4-page article on “L’écriture en Amérique.” Several large folding maps are included.

Čestmir Loukotka, “Clasificación de las Lenguas Sudamericanas” (1935). This is a small and rare pamphlet of 35 pages. In tabular form he lists his 94 families with the component languages (Arawak has 89) in groups or divisions. Extinct languages are so marked. Loukotka notes languages that, in his opinion, are mixed, or that have “intrusions” or “vestiges” of other languages. This is in accord with his comparisons of a 45-word standard vocabulary; the language is “mixed” if it contains more than one-fifth of foreign words, has “intrusions” or “vestiges” if foreign words are few or very few. There is no bibliography and no map.

Schmidt wisely does not enumerate his families but mentions most of the languages with their locations, and has classificatory charts for the larger families. Many references are given in text, some of which may be missing in the bibliography herein. Maps are provided in a separate atlas. The index is large. The second half of the book is devoted to "Die Sprachenkreise und Ihr Verhältnis zu den Kulturkreisen," where the phonologies, grammars, and syntaxes of the languages of the world are compared. To my knowledge, this is the only place where the little that is known about the morphology of South American languages may be found in one work. A digest and critique of Schmidt's *kulturkreis* as it applies to South American languages should have formed a section of the present monograph.

Daniel G. Brinton, "The American Race" (1891 a). Although Brinton covers briefly all phases of American anthropology, his groupings are on a linguistic basis and his linguistic interests very great. He wisely does not enumerate his families but gives tables of the component languages of the principal families, with their locations. To prove relationships he gives comparative vocabularies and considerable linguistic data, comments, and arguments. He was the first to suggest some relationships but naturally much of his work is out of date. The bibliographical references are rather numerous, and probably some are missing in the bibliographies herein. No map is provided.

L. Pericot y García, "América Indígena" (1936). Like Brinton, Pericot covers all phases of the American Indian. He follows Rivet in mentioning very many small groups with their locations, also not in tabular form. He has a section (pp. 94–106) on "Carácteres lingüísticos." Most valuable are his voluminous bibliographical references with digests which, for South America, fill 36 pages (pp. 692–727) of concise data. Probably not all the bibliographical references are included herein. There are many detailed maps of parts of South America.

Walter Krickeberg, "Die Völker Südamerikas" (1922) in Georg Buschan's "Illustrierte Völkerkunde," vol. 1, pp. 217–423 (1922). Krickeberg devotes some pages, especially 219–227, to linguistic features, and other remarks, passim, but gives no classificatory tables or charts. A small map, which formed the basis for the map of Jiménez Moreno (México, 1936), shows most of the families, and the principal component members of each, according to his opinions, which are generally those of consensus. The bibliography is relatively small.

Although not including all of South America, the following four works deserve especial mention for their large and full coverage:

Čestmir Loukotka, "Líenguas Indígenas do Brasil" (1939 a). Like
Loukotka’s pamphlet issued in 1935 (see above) this is a concise table of families and component languages, rigidly restricted to Brazilian territory. The name, locale, and principal references for source material are given for each group. “Intrusions,” “vestiges,” and mixed languages are noted. Symbols denote whether a language is extinct, and if the data on it are poor. A map is included, and 10 of the 28 pages are devoted to a large and excellent bibliography of source material, all of which items are included herein.

Jacinto Jijón y Caamaño, “El Ecuador Interandino y Occidental” (1943). This is volume 3 of Jijón’s monumental work of this title (1941–43). Half of the volume, chapter 30 (pp. 390–654), is devoted to “Las Lenguas del Sur de Centro America y el Norte y Centro del Oeste de Sud-América.” It covers east to longitude 60° (Wapishana-Nambicuara-Ashluslay), and to latitude 30° S. Thus he largely supplements Loukotka (1939 a), though both omit the Araucanian-Patagonian region. He is especially strong in the Colombia-Ecuador-Perú area. Territory and many source references are given for each language, together with arguments regarding their classification. Eight folding maps accompany the volume. Most if not all of the bibliographical references are included herein.

Günter Tessmann, “Die Indianer Nordost-Perus” (1930). Tessmann covers much of eastern Perú and Ecuador most thoroughly. Fifty tribes are considered. His section 76 under each of these gives the known linguistic data, together with vocabularies, known data on morphology, and the most important source references, most of which, naturally, are included herein. A special section (pp. 617–627) is on “Sprachlichs Verwandtschaft” and includes (pp. 624–626) a table giving his radical ideas regarding linguistic classification. The accompanying maps are small.

Walter Lehmann, “Zentral Amerika; Die Sprachen Zentral-Amerikas” (1920). These two large volumes afford a mine of information on the languages from southern México to western Ecuador. All the source material, books, and documents have been studied, mentioned, digested, and much of it reproduced. The bibliography is probably nearly complete to that date. The several very large maps contain much printed information, and cover a wider area than the text, including parts of western Venezuela and Brazil and northern Perú. Many of the bibliographical references are not included herein.

Curt Nimuendajú’s unexcelled first-hand knowledge of the peoples and languages of Brazil was apparently hardly superior to his knowledge of the literature. He had definite ideas on the classification of languages but, unfortunately, never published them. They often disagreed with those of others but, since his opinions were often based on actual acquaintance, they merit careful consideration. He sub-
mitted a very large and very detailed map, an alphabetical list of tribes with references to location on map, and a very complete bibliography. On the map the tribal names were underlined with color in accord with a linguistic family color chart. As a great number of colors were employed, it is possible that occasional errors were made in transferring the familial linguistic affiliation, according to his opinions, from the map to the tribal index. His map did not include the Andean region, or the far south.

See also the following references, which are very incomplete, and mainly relatively recent:

**ADDITIONAL REFERENCES**

**GENERAL**

**Relationships with Old World.**—Anonymous, 1930 d (Basque); Christian, 1932 (Perú-Polynesia); Dangol, 1930 (Quechua-Maori); Ferrario, 1933, 1938 (Altaic); Gancedo, 1922 (Japanese); Imbelloni, 1928 b (Quechua-Oceania); Koppelmann, 1929 (East Asia); Rivet, 1925 a, 1925 b, 1925 c, 1926 a, 1926 b, 1927 b, 1927 c, 1928 (Melaneso-Polynesian, Australian); Tavares-Acosta, 1930 (Asia); Trombetti, 1928 (Asia); Zeballos, 1922 a (Japanese).

**America General.**—Anonymous, 1928 a, 1929; Aza, 1927, 1930 a, 1930 b, 1931; Brinton, 1885 a, 1885 c, 1886 a, 1886 b, 1887, 1889, 1894 a, 1894 b, 1898 e; Castro, A., 1935; Clarke, 1937; Ferrario, 1937; Gorrochotegui, 1918; Mitre, 1909–10; Rivet, 1921 b; Rochereau, 1932; Salas, 1918; Schuller, 1936; Viñaza, 1892.

**South America General.**—Bastian, 1878–89; Brinton, 1884, 1892 a; Chamberlain, [1903], 1907, 1910 a; Ferrario, 1927; Goeje, 1935; Hestermann, 1927 a, 1938; Lafone–Quevedo, 1912 a; Loukotka, 1939 b; Mason, J. A., 1945; Nordenskjöld, 1922; O’Kiefe, 1933, 1934; Penard, T. E., 1926–27; Romero, 1931; Schmidt, W., 1925; Schuller, 1925; Talbot, 1926.

**REGIONAL**

**Antilles.**—Bachiller y Morales, 1883; Goeje, 1939; Penard, T. E., 1927–28.

**Argentina.**—Boman, 1908; Campanella, 1938–39; Constancio, 1939; Díaz and Díaz, 1939; Imbelloni, 1936; Lehmann–Nitsche, 1924; Martínez Orozco, 1938; Portnoy, 1936; Selva, 1922; Serrano, 1941.

**Bolivia.**—Terán, 1917.

**Brazil.**—Borba, 1904; Botelho de Magalhães, 1946; Carvalho, 1929, 1931; Gillin, 1940; Koch–Grünberg, 1922, 1928; Krug, 1925; Loukotka, 1939 a; Martius, 1867; Nimuendajú, 1925, 1931–32, 1932 a, 1935 b; Nimuendajú and Valle Bentes, 1928; Pompeu Sobrinho, 1919, 1933; Santos, N. C. dos, 1935 a, 1935 b; Schuller, 1911 b; Senna, 1932; Snethlage, E. H., 1931; Tastevin, 1924.

**Chile.**—Brand, 1941 c; Cúneo-Vidal, 1916; Latcham, 1939 b; Lenz, 1904–10; Valenzuela, 1918–19.

**Colombia.**—Anonymous, 1934; Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Castellví, 1934 a, 1934 b, 1934 c; Fabo, 1911; Igualada and Castellví, 1940; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43; Lehmann, 1920; Medina, M., 1919–20, 1920–21; Ortiz, 1937, 1938, 1938–39 a; Otero, 1938–39; Pinell, 1928; Rivet, 1912 a; Schuller, 1930 c; Triana, 1907.

**Ecuador.**—Buchwald, 1921, 1924; Grijalva, 1921; Jijón y Caamaño, 1919; León, A. M., 1930 a, 1930 b; Orejuela, 1934; Paz y Niño, 1936–37; Rivet, 1934; Santa Cruz, 1921, 1923 a; Verneau and Rivet, 1912.
THE Meso-American LANGUAGES

In the Meso-American area considered within the scope of this Handbook are found representatives of all four of the great linguistic phyla of México and Central America, the Hokan-Siouan, Macro-Penutian, Macro-Otomanguean, and Macro-Chibchan. The first two are also widespread in the United States. Only a very few of the languages of the first three phyla are here included; none of them extends south of Costa Rica. The Macro-Chibchan phylum is primarily a South American entity and is mainly treated of later herein; it did not extend north of Honduras. These languages, with their appropriate bibliographies, are discussed more fully in J. A. Mason (1940) and Johnson (1940). (See also Johnson, Handbook, vol. 4, pp. 63–67.)

HOKAN-SIOUAN

The two small Meso-American languages belonging to the great Hokan-Siouan phylum are of the Hokaltecan (Hokan-Coahuiltecan) subphylum. There are only a few small and widely separated enclaves of this phylum south of the large groups in northern México. Nevertheless, there are indications of related languages in South America (see especially Yurumangüí, and J. P. Harrington, 1943), and many "families" in a long belt from Colombia to the Gran Chaco seem to have a Hokan type of morphology.

The two languages under consideration are Subtiaba and the tiny enclave Maribichicoca. The true and earlier name for the language is Maribio. They are grouped with the Tlapanec of Guerrero, México, under the name Supanec.

MACRO-PENUTIAN

The Macro-Penutian phylum is a rather hypothetical one, the relationship of the putative components not yet proved to general satisfaction. One probable member, Utaztecan, has languages in the Meso-American area; another, the Mayan, and a less certain member,
the Xincan, abut on this area. Another doubtful component, the Lencan, is included in the region. Two other stocks in this area, Jicaquean and Payan, are also possibly Macro-Penutian but more likely Macro-Chibchan. However, all four, Xinca, Lenca, Jicaque, and Paya, are best considered unclassified for the present.

UTAZTECAN

This stock, of great importance in México, has several enclaves in the Meso-American area. They probably belong to two different migration periods, an older one of Nahuatl languages, including Nicarao, Nahuatlato, Bagace, and Pipil, and a later one of Nahuatl, consisting of a few small isolated enclaves, probably of Aztec traders or colonists, known as Desaguadero and Sigua.

MACRO-OTOMANGUEAN

The Meso-American Macro-Otomanguean languages all belong to the Manguean family. All are on the west coast and all extinct. Three languages are distinguished: Choluteca or Chorotega, Mangue (with the divisions or dialects Diria and Nagrandan), and Orotíña (with the divisions of Orosi and Nicoya).

LENCAN, JICAQUEAN, AND PAYAN

Authorities disagree greatly as to the affinities of these three "families," which consist of one language each, the dialects being negligible. Some see Chibchan elements in all, some Macro-Penutian (Mizocuavean) elements in all. The former are naturally stronger in Paya, the latter stronger in Lenca. All three may be related, but the differences between them, and between each and other languages, are so great that they had best be considered isolated or unclassified for the present.

MACRO-CHIBCHAN

Most of the languages of Panamá and Costa Rica are admittedly Chibchan, and most of those of Nicaragua and southeastern Honduras are Misumalpan, probably of the Macro-Chibchan phylum. These are treated later under Chibchan. The possible relationship of Paya, Jicaque, and Lenca, in descending order of probability, is considered above. Cacaopera is a Matagalpan enclave in Lenca territory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This field is completely covered in Walter Lehmann's "Zentral-Amerika; Die Sprachen Zentral-Amerikas, II" (1920). Lehmann not only gives practically every source until that date but republishes all the lexical material. Only the more important sources, all given in Lehmann, are noted here:

Hokan-Siouan.—Subtiaba: Lehmann, W., 1915; Sapir, 1925; Squier, 1853.
Utaztecan.—(The bibliography of Utaztecan, especially of Nahualt or Aztec, is enormous, but that of the Central American groups is small.) Pipil: Scherzer, 1855. Nikira: Squier, 1853.  
For Central America in general, especially Costa Rica, see: Fernández Guardia, 1892; Gabb, 1875; Gatschet, 1900; Grasserie, 1904; Herzog, W., 1886; Lehmann, W., 1910 a; Sapper, 1901; Scherzer, 1855; Schuller, 1928; Squier, 1852, 1858; Stoll, 1884; Thiel, 1882.  

CHIBCHAN  

Chibchan is one of the stocks of major importance in South America. Its area is extensive, its members many and some of them large, and in former days it probably covered a wider area, especially to the south. Some of the languages have become extinct, a number of them without linguistic record, so that their Chibchan relationships are assumed from indications of geographical position, place names, statements of early sources, etc. The language of highly cultured peoples, among others the Chibcha or Muisea of the Bogotá region, it failed to become a standard language, like Aztec or Quechua, or a lingua franca like Tupí. The Chibchan languages occupy a prominent position in the question of intercontinental relationships, since the family is the only one that extends into North America. The Chibchan languages extended over all Panamá, most of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and may have included the Jicaque and Paya of Honduras. (See preceding section; also Mason, 1940; Johnson, 1940.) They may have come into contact with the Maya. This is important in view of Schuller’s belief in a great phylum that includes Maya, Chibcha, Carib, and Arawak (Schuller, 1919–20 a, 1928).  

The Chibchan “family” seems to be one of those (see Quechua) with a morphology somewhat resembling Hokan, though lexical proof of genetic connection still remains to be advanced. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43), therefore, proposes a great “super-phylum” Hokan-Siouan-Macro-Chibcha. Rivet has been studying a new vocabulary of Yurumanguí (q. v.) and comparing it with Hokan with some favorable results.  

Formerly almost all the languages of highland and coastal Colombia were considered to belong to the Chibchan group, but recent opinion assigns the Chocó 7 and most of the other groups of northern Colombia, except for the Bogotá Chibcha and the Arhuaco region, to the Carib  

7 The Cuna and Chocó are linked culturally, and apparently linguistically, in other sections of this Handbook (vol. 4, pp. 49–51).
This is presumed to be the result of a relatively recent but pre-Columbian migration that supplanted former Chibchan-speaking peoples.

The subdivisions of Chibchan differ very greatly in the former classifications of W. Schmidt (1926), Loukotka (1935), W. Lehmann (1920), Rivet (1924 a), and others, and the latter has changed his opinion greatly. As a tentative basis, therefore, the latest classification, that of the Ecuadorean Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43), who has made a special study of this region, is herewith presented, without implication of definite acceptance as proved.

Jijón y Caamaño places in his Macro-Chibchan phylum a number of languages heretofore considered as independent "families," and divides it into eight primary groups:

A. Paleo-Chibcha (Esmeralda-Yaruró)
B. Chibcha
C. Timote
D. Cofan
E. Murato
F. Mosquito-Xinca
G. Puruhá-Mochica
H. Cholona

Of these, only group B was formerly considered Chibchan, and only that is considered immediately below.

Jijón y Caamaño divides his Chibchan languages into four groups: Archaic or Western, Pacific Intermediate, Inter-Andine Intermediate, and Evolved or Eastern. Each of these is divided into subgroups with numerous languages.

Rivet in his latest Chibcha classification (1943 a) divides the Chibchan languages into 10 groups:

1. Barbacoa
2. Coconuco
3. Páez
4. Chibcha Proper
5. Changina
6. Cuna
7. Guaymí
8. Talamanca
9. Andaquí
10. Guatuso

Many of these represent one of Jijón y Caamaño's subgroups, but there is considerable disagreement.

CHIBCHAN LANGUAGES OF CENTRAL AMERICA

Most of the languages of Panamá and Costa Rica are of recognized Chibchan affinities, and most of those of Nicaragua belong to the

---

“Misumalpan (q. v.) Stock,” a hybrid name proposed by Mason (1940) and Johnson (1940) for the Miskito (Mosquito), Sumo, and Matagalpa families. The Paya and Jicaque families of Honduras may also be related to Chibcha, and members of the “Macro-Chibchan Phylum.”

The true Chibchan languages of Central America are divided into a number of groups. No authors agree upon this point. Mason (1940) and Johnson (1940) propose four groups, Rivet (1943) six. Rama (vide infra) Rivet places in his fourth or Chibcha Proper Group. The other groups he terms “Changina,” “Cuna,” “Guaymi,” and “Talamanca.”

Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) divides the Central American Chibchan languages into five groups. The languages of the Talamanca, Guatuso, and Cuna groups he places with the Barbacoan languages to form his Western or Archaic Group. Jijón y Caamaño does not differentiate Rivet’s Guaymi and Changina groups but puts them together with some western Colombian languages into his second, or Pacific, Group. He agrees with Rivet in separating Rama and Melchora from the others and places them, together with Chibcha Proper, in the Eastern Group of evolved languages. He and Rivet are in relative agreement as regards the component languages of each subgroup.

The Cuna group is often termed “Cueva-Cuna.” The subgroups seem to be:

I. Island
   A. San Blas (Tule or Yule)
   B. Caimanes

II. Mainland
   A. Cuna (Chucunake and Bayano)
   B. Cueva (Corba)

Cueva and Cuna were very closely related, yet separate. Chucunake and Bayano are local names, not dialects. Mandinga is a hybrid negroid group; Secativa is not a dialect.

Cuna is isolating in general character; word order is fundamental in sentences. Reduplication is frequent. Suffixing clearly predominates over prefixing.

Mason’s (1940) Guaymi-Dorasque subfamily is accepted by Jijón y Caamaño, but Rivet (1943) divides it into two, Changina and Guaymi. In the former group, together with Chumulu, Gualaca, and Changina, probably go the extinct Dorasque (Torresque), and probably Burica and Duy. Bukueta is a synonym or dialect of Sabanero; Muite is a dialect in the Guaymi subgroup. W. Lehmann (1920) gives the following divisions of Dorasque: Dolega, Chumulue, Iribolo, Chirilhuo, Suasimi, and Zuri. With Changina apparently belongs Chaliva (Saliba, Soriba, Sariba, Shelaba).

Valiente, Talamanca, Viceíta, Urinama, Tariaca, and Pocosi are probably dialects of Bribri. Tojar, Teshbi, Depso, Lari, and Uren
seem to be dialects of Terraba. Boruca is a synonym of Brunca; apparent dialects of this subgroup are the extinct Kepo, Coto, Burucaca, Turucaca, and Osa. Important languages not mentioned by Rivet that seem to fall in the Talamancan group are Guetar, Voto, and Suerre (Turricia). With Cabecar, according to W. Lehmann (1920), goes Corrhue; and with Tucurrique go Orosi, Cachi, Sakawhuak, and Seche-whuak.

Guatuso, with its variety Corobici or Corbesi, and Rama with its dialect Melchora, are obviously very different from each other and from other Central American Chibchan languages, and Mason (1940) was evidently in error in making a Rama-Corobici subfamily. Both Rivet (1943) and Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) place Rama with the languages of Chibcha proper. Rivet puts Guatuso in a class by itself, and Jijón y Caamaño makes it a subgroup of his Western Group.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

The standard work, reprinting most of the known vocabularies and citing the published work to that date, together with hitherto unpublished material, is W. Lehmann, 1920. Franco, 1882, and Pinart, 1887, also cover most of the languages, as do Thomas, C., and Swanton, 1911. See also Lehmann, W., 1910 a; 1910 b; Sapper, 1905. For Cuna also see: Berengueras, 1934; Cullen, 1851 b, 1866, 1868; Gasso, 1908, 1910-1914; J. P. Harrington, 1925; Holmer, 1946, 1947; Nordenskiöld, 1928, 1928-30 b, 1929 b, 1932, 1938; Pinart, 1890 a; Pinart and Carranza, 1890, 1900; Prince, J. D., 1912, 1913 a, 1913 b; Puydt, 1868, pp. 100-105; Rivet, 1912 a; Stout, 1947; Uhle, 1890, p. 485; Wassén, 1934 a, 1934 b, 1937, 1938. For the other languages see Brinton, 1897 (Guetar); Céspedes Marín, 1923 (Guatuso); Fernández, L., 1884 (Guatuso); Gabb, 1886 (Bribri, Brunca, Terraba, Tiribí); Gagini, 1917 (Bribri, Brunca, Guatuso, Guetar, Terraba); Pinart, 1890 b (Dorosque, Changuina, Chamula, Gualaca), 1892 b (Guaymi, Muoi, Move, Penonomé); Pittier de Fabrega, 1898 (Bribri), 1903 (Terraba); Pittier de Fabrega and Gagini, 1892 (Terraba); Skinner, 1920 (Bribí); Thiel, 1882 (Guatuso), 1886 (Terraba, Brunca, Guatuso); Zeledón, 1918 (Guetar).

**CHIBCHA PROPER**

The Chibchan languages that have been grouped in the Chibcha Proper group are widely scattered, containing not only some in central Colombia but those of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta and some of Nicaragua. Rivet (1943) lists the following five main languages:

- Muisca or Chibcha (Muisca, Mosca)
- Tunebo or Tame
- Guamaca
- Cágaba (Kòggabo) or Arhuaco (Aruaco, Aruak)
- Rama

Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) also places all of these languages in his Eastern or "Evolved" group, which he divides into three subgroups, Cundinamarca (Muisca-Tunebo), Arhuaco (Cágaba-Guamaca), and Central American (Rama-Melchora).
Other important languages or dialects of the Muisca-Tunebo subgroup are Duit, Sinsiga, Pedrazá, Guasico, Chita, Fusagasuaó, and Morcote. Duit seems to be closely related to Muisca. Pedrazá is claimed to be a Tunebo dialect. Morcote seems to be rather variant. Though Sinsiga is generally considered closely related to Tunebo, W. Lehmann (1920) believes it closer to the Cágaba-Arhuaco group, and to form a connecting link between the latter and the central Chibchan languages.

Languages or dialects of the Cágaba-Arhuaco subgroup are Guamaca, Atanke (Atanque), Bintucua, and Ica (Busintana). Chimila (q. v.) has been placed by some in the Dorasque-Guaymi group. W. Schmidt (1926) places Tunebo, Andaquí, and Betoi in this central Chibchan subgroup.

If the Rama on the border of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, apparently the northernmost of the true Chibchan languages, really belongs in the central subgroup, this has important historical implications. Melchora is apparently a dialect.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chibcha (Muisca).—Acosta Ortegón, 1938; Adam, 1878; Adelung and Vater, 1866–17; Bernal, 1919; Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Forero, 1934, 1939; Grasserie, 1904; Lugo, 1619; Restrepo Canal, 1936; Rivet, 1920 c; Rozo, 1938; Uricoechea, 1854, 1871 (Duit, Sinsiga).

Tunebo.—Rivet, 1924 b; Rivet and Oppenheim, 1943; Rochereau, 1926–27; Anonymous, 1926, 27.

Cágaba.—Anonymous, 1919 e; Bolinder, 1925 (Ica); Celedón, 1886 (Köggaba, Guamaca, Bintukua, Atankez), 1892 a (Atanquez), 1892 b (Bintucua); Isaacs, 1884 (Binticua, Guamaco); Preuss, 1919–27, 1925.

Rama.—Conzemius, 1929 a, 1930 a; Lehmann, W., 1914.

COLOMBIAN SUBGROUP

Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) divides his Pacific Group into an Isthmian subgroup of Central American languages, and a Colombian group. In the latter he places Chimila, Yurumanguí, and possibly a number of unimportant languages: Timba, Lile, Yolo, Jamundi, Yamecú, and Aburrá. None of these is classified by Rivet in 1943. (See separate sections on Yurumanguí, Chimila, and Tairona.)

INTER-ANDINE GROUP

Jijón y Caamaño’s Inter-Andine Group consists of a number of languages that Rivet (1943) divides into two groups, the Coconuco and the Páez. Like Barbacoa, independent Coconucan and Paniquitan (Páez) families were formerly accepted. Some authorities placed all this group in their Barbacoan family. Totoró, Coconuco, Moguex, and Guanaco are the important and generally accepted members of the
Coconuco subgroup. Other probable members are Guambiano, Políndara, and Puben or Pubenaro. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) places in this or a closely related group Popayán (Popayanense), Malvasa, Timbia, and possibly Panzaleo (q. v.) and Quijo (Kijo) (q. v.).

Páez and Paniquitá are apparently closely related, as both Rivet and Jijón y Caamaño agree. Otero (1938-39) calls Paniquitá a subdialect of Páez. W. Lehmann (1920) wrote that the relationship between Páez and Mogueux (Coconucan) is quite evident. Formerly Pijao, Panche, and Patángoro (Palenque) were also placed in this group, but both Rivet and Jijón y Caamaño agree that these belong, together with Chocó, to the Carib family.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Páez and Paniquitá.—Anonymous, 1879; Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Castillo y Orozco, 1877; Lehman, H. 1945; Narváez, 1944; Ortiz, 1938-39 b; Pittier de Fabrega, 1907; Rivet, 1912 a; Uricoechea, 1877.

Mogeux.—Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Donay, 1890; Rivet, 1912 a.

Coconuco.—Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Mosquera, 1866; Rivet, 1912 a, 1941.

Totoró, Guambiano.—Anonymous, 1879; Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Eraso Guerrero, 1944; Ortiz, 1938-39 b; Rivet, 1912 a.

BARBACOA GROUP

Barbacoa was considered a separate stock by Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a), but is now generally accepted as related to Chibcha. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) places the Barbacoa languages with Talamanca, Guatuso, and Cuna to form his Western Group, and divides them into two divisions, Pasto and Caranki-Cayapa-Colorado. Rivet (1943) mentions only Coaiquer (Cuaiker), Cayapa, and Colorado. These seem to be the most important languages, but Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) mentions Nigua in the Cayapa-Colorado branch, and Pasto, Colima, and Muellamusee in the Pasto branch. Rivet (1924 a) thinks that Pasto is Tucano. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) states that Telembi is the same as Coaiquer and that W. Lehmann (1920) was wrong in distinguishing them, but that Cayapa and Iscuande are not the same as Coaiquer, as Barrett (1925) believed. Pichilimbi probably belongs in this group. Other languages placed in this group by some authors but not accepted by either Rivet or Jijón y Caamaño are Manabita and Latacunga. In his 1943 classification, Jijón y Caamaño places Quillacinga (Killacinga) and Sebondoy with his Eastern Group, but in a map (map II) he groups them with the Barbacoa languages. (See Coche.)

The relationship of the Barbacoa languages to the doubtful Esmeralda family and the Yunga-Mochica has been largely discussed;
Esmeralda may well be Chibchan. W. Lehmann (1920) compared Colorado and Mochica and found only three words that hint at affinity.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Barbacoa.**—Beuchat and Rivet, 1910; Rivet, 1912 a; Schuller, 1930 b.


**Colima.**—Suárez de Cepeda, 1923.

**Cayapa.**—Barrett, 1925; Beuchat and Rivet, 1907; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43, 2:289–384; Seler, 1902 b; Verneau and Rivet, 1912; Wilczynski, 1888.

**Colorado.**—Beuchat and Rivet, 1907; Buchwald, 1908 a; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43, 2:119–288; Rivet, 1905; Seler, 1885, 1902 b.

**ANDAKÍ (ANDAQUI)***

The extinct Andaki of the southern Colombian Highlands must not be confused with the living Andoke of the southeastern Colombian forests; the latter are either Witotoan or independent linguistically. The Andaki were also formerly considered independent; following Brinton (1891 a), Chamberlain (1913 a) put them in the Andaquian family. All modern authorities agree that their language was Chibchan, probably of the Chibcha-Arhuaaco subgroup. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) and Schmidt (1926) place the language with the Chibcha Proper Group, Rivet (1924 a) in a class by itself. Loukotka (1935) considers it a mixed idiom and sees vestiges of Mashacali and Caingang in it, a rather unlikely possibility. Igualada (1940) says that no Andaki-speaking Indians were found up to 1940 in the Colombian Caquetá area; the modern Andaki and Agüenunga descendants speak “Inga” (Quechua) and Spanish. (See also Hernández de Alba, Handbook, vol. 2, p. 922.)

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Albis, 1860–61; Igualada and Castellví, 1940; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43; Rivet, 1912 a, 1924 c.

**BETOI GROUP**

The extinct Betoi adjoined the Tucanoan Betoya, from whom the Tucano (q. v.) family was formerly named (Betojan). The Betoi language is now generally believed to have been Chibchan in affinities. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) and Schmidt (1926) place Betoi with the Chibcha Proper languages. With them were probably associated Girara and Lache. W. Lehmann (1920) believes that Caquetío, generally classed as Arawak, was also related. Nimuendajú (index) leaves Lache unclassified. Loukotka (1935) adds Situfa.

---

Bibliography.—Gumilla, 1745.

**Chibcha**

I. Western

A. Talamanca
   1. Guetar
   2. Quepo
   3. Cabecar
   4. Estrella
   5. Chiripó
   6. Tucurrike
   7. Sucre
   8. Bribri
      a. Pocosi,
      b. Tariaca
   9. Terraba
   10. Brunca (Boruca)
   11. Trrtibi
   12. Voto
   13. Coto

B. Barbacoa
   1. Pasto
      a. Pasto(?)
      b. Coaker(?)
      c. Muellamuese
      d. Colima
      e. Patta
      f. Sindagua (Malba)
   2. Cayapa-Colorado
      a. Colorado
      b. Nigua
      c. Cayapa
      d. Caranki

C. Guatuso
   1. Guatuso-Corobici

D. Cuna
   1. Cuna (Coiba, Cueva, San Blas)

II. Pacific

A. Isthmian (Guaymt)
   1. Murire
   2. Muoi
   3. Move
   4. Valiente
   5. Penonomeño
   6. Changuena
   7. Dorasco
   8. Chumula
   9. Gualaca

---

1 Based on Jijón y Caamaño, 1941-43.
II. Pacific—Continued
   B. Colombian
      1. Timba
      2. Lile
      3. Yolo
      4. Jamundí
      5. Yameci
      6. Aburrá

III. Inter-Andine
   A. Páez
      1. Páez
      2. Panikilá
      3. Killa
   B. Coconuco
      1. Totoró
      2. Polindara
      3. Moguer (Guambía)
      4. Coconuco
      5. Guanaco
      6. Pubenaro (?)
   C. Popayanense
      1. Popayán
      2. Puracét

IV. Eastern
   A. Cundinamarca
      1. Chibcha-Muisca
      2. Duit
      3. Sinsigá
      4. Tunebo
   B. Arhuaco
      1. Cágaba
      2. Bintucua
      3. Guamaca
      4. Atankez
      5. Šanha
      6. Ica
   C. Central America
      1. Rama
      2. Melchora

---

2 All of the below are of very questionable affinities. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) also places in this group Chimila and Yurumangüí, on which see separate articles herein.

3 Hernández de Alba (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 922) places the Páez and Coconuco subgroups, together with the Pijao subgroup (see “Chocó and Other Possibly Cariban Languages of Colombia” herewith) in the Tala-
manca-BarbaCos group of Chibcha. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) places in his Inter-Andine group also Panzaleo and Ouina, on which see separate articles herein.

4 Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) also places in this group Andaki and Betoya, on which see separate articles herein, and Ouila, Quillactinga, and Sebondoy-Mocoa, for which see Coche herein.
LANGUAGES PROBABLY OF CHIBCHAN AFFINITIES

Several other extinct languages of western Colombia and Ecuador are generally believed to have been of Chibchan affinities. Among these are:

PANZALEO

Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) believes that Panzaleo was most likely related to Chibcha, though it may have been affiliated with Puruhá-Mochica (Yunga). He places it questionably in his Inter-Andine group, probably most closely related to the Coconuco subgroup. Uhle suggested a relationship with Subtiaba (Hokan). (See Murra, Handbook, vol. 2, p. 795.)

Bibliography.—Jijón y Caamaño, 1941-43, vol. 1, ch. 10; vol. 3, ch. 29.

CARA AND CARANKI

The cultured Cara (Scyri) had apparently given up their original language in favor of Quechua even before the Spanish Conquest. There are some reasons for the opinion that it was of the Barbacoa Group, where it is placed by Rivet (1924 a), but its affiliation will probably never be certainly known. Murra (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 792) states that it was similar to Pasto and Cayapa.

Bibliography.—Buchwald, 1908 b; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941-43, 1:234-285.

KIJO (QUIJO)

The Kijo abandoned their native tongue in favor of Quechua very early, possibly before the Spanish Conquest; its nature is, therefore, very controversial. It is generally placed with Cofán (q. v.), but may have been more closely related to Chibcha. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) places it questionably with Panzaleo in his Inter-Andine Group of Chibcha. (See Steward and Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 652.)


MISUMALPAN

“Misumalpan” was the new hybrid term proposed by Mason (1940) for the group consisting of the former linguistic families Misquitoan (Miskito),10 Suman, and Matagalpan in Nicaragua and southern Honduras. They were there considered to compose a stock of the Macro-Chibchan phylum. Paya and Jicague of southern Honduras may be related more distantly. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) lists them as group F of the phylum. This group he terms “Group Misquito-Xince,” evidently including in it the Xince of San Salvador, and by inference the Lenca of Honduras, two groups considered by

---

10 The earlier term is Mosquito; Mason preferred the more modern form Miskito, but the editors of this volume, the former. Both forms of the word are used therein.
Mason (1940) to be more likely affiliated with the Macro-Penutian phylum of North America.

**Misumalpan**

I. Miskito  
A. Miskito  
1. Tawira  
a. Tawira  
b. Mam  
c. Wanki  
d. Baldam  
e. Cabo  

II. Sumo  
A. Ulva  
1. Ulva  
a. Ulva (Ulua)  
b. Prinsu  
c. Cucra  
B. Yosco  
1. Yosco  
C. Sumo  
1. Tawahca  
a. Tawahca  
b. Lacu  
c. Coco  
d. Wasabane  
e. Pispi  
2. Panamaca  
a. Panamaca  
b. Carawala  
c. Tunki  
3. Boa  
4. Bawahca  

III. Matagalpa  
A. Matagalpa  
1. Matagalpa  
a. Matagalpa  
b. Cacaopera  
c. Chato (?)  
d. Dule (?)  
e. Pantaasma (?)  

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

W. Lehmann (1920) republishes most of the known vocabularies and other original material, and cites most of the published works. See also Thomas and Swanton (1911). Especially important, or of recent date, are the following:

Miskito.—Adam, 1891, 1892; Bell, 1862; Berckenhagen, 1894, 1905, 1906; Brinton, 1891 b; Conzemius, 1929 b, 1932; Cotheal, 1848; Fellechner, Müller, and Hesse, 1845; Heath, G. R., 1913, 1927; Henderson, A., 1846; Henderson, G., 1811, pp. 227–229; Young, T., 1842, pp. 170–172; Zidek, 1894.

Sumo.—Conzemius, 1929 b, 1932; Membreño, 1897.

Matagalpa.—Brinton, 1891 b; Sapper, 1901.

Ulua.—Squier, 1853.
COFÁN (KOFANE)

The extinct Cofán has heretofore been considered by all authorities an independent family, though this is unlikely in view of their small area. The language has probably long been extinct, though there are a few hundred Cofán still living. Both of the principal authorities on this region, Rivet and Jijón y Caamaño, are now convinced that Cofán is related to Chibchan. Rivet has not yet presented his proof or intimated his opinion as to the closeness of the connection. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) makes Cofán one of the eight members of his Macro-Chibchan phylum. He gives no subsidiary languages. Connections with the Barbacoa Group of Chibcha have also been suggested.

Two adjacent groups that have often been considered as Cofán languages are Kijo and Latacunga. These have sometimes been identified with the historical Cara or Syri. Both may be more purely Chibchan. The Kijo (Quijo) (q. v.) were Quechuaized long ago. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) places them in his Inter-Andine group of Chibcha.

Bibliography.—Castellvi, 1938; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43.

LANGUAGES OF DOUBTFUL CHIBCHAN RELATIONSHIPS

COCHE (MOCOA)

Synonyms: Koche, Kotše, Koče, Mocoa, Mokoa, Sebondoy, Sibundo, Kamsá, Ouillacinga, Kilasinga.

The more important historical name Coche seems to have supplanted Mocoa(n), which Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a) gave to this supposedly independent family. Mocoa is retained by a few modern authorities, such as Krickeberg (1922) and Loukotka (1935). Most of them have accepted its independent position, but in his recent thorough study Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) reached the conclusion, occasionally previously suggested, that it is Chibchan, influenced by Carib, closest to Chibcha Proper, to Cágaba, and to Talamancan, in this order. However, Ortiz (1941), the most recent writer, refuses to accept Jijón y Caamaño’s conclusions and insists on the independence of Coche. He believes that the rather extensive Chibchan resemblances are due to borrowing. Rivet has also not yet, to my knowledge, accepted the Chibchan affinities or decided to remove Coche from his list of independent families. The language is sometimes called Camsá; the principal tribe is the Sebondoy; the related Quillacinga and Mocoa are extinct, but there are said to be some 1,700 Sebondoy, though probably not all speaking their native tongue. The Mocoa have adopted Quechua and are now known as Ingano.
Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) does not recognize the Coche as a separate group or mention the name in his classification, but lists the languages Quilla, Quillacinga, and Sebondoy-Mocoa together with the Chibcha Proper languages in his Cundinamarca subgroup of the Eastern Group. In his map II, however, he places them with the Barbacoa subgroup (Western Group).

The lexical data are considerable (see Ortíz, 1941; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43), but grammatical material is badly needed.

Coche (Mocoa)

1. Sebondoy.
2. Quillacinga.
3. Patoco.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buchwald, 1919; Castellví, 1934 a, 1934 b; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 191–192; Ernst, 1891; Igualada and Castellví, 1940; Jijón y Caamaño, 1938, 1939, 1941–43, 1:97–144; Ortíz, 1938, 1941 a; Rivet, 1912 a; Sañudo, 1923.

ESMERALDA

A tiny extinct group of the coast of Ecuador that has been considered as forming an independent family since the classification of Chamberlain (1913 a). The data upon it are very few. Pericot y García (1936) gives Atacame as a synonym; this can have no relation to the Atacama of the Chilean desert region. W. Schmidt (1926) believes that it may belong with the Barbacoa Group of Chibcha, a very probable connection, but it is unlikely that its exact affiliations will ever be proved. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) believes it to be distantly related to Chibcha, forming, with Yaruro, the Paleo-Chibcha, division of his Macro-Chibcha phylum. (See Murra, Handbook, vol. 2, p. 802.)

Bibliography.—Buchwald, 1920, 1922; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43; Rivet, 1912 a; Seler, 1902 a, 1902 b.

TAIRONA AND CHIMILA

The long-extinct Tairona have generally been classified as Chibchan, doubtless because of their close geographical proximity to the Chibchan-speaking Cágaba. The same is true of the living Chimila, sometimes regarded as the modern descendants of the Tairona. Thus Park (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 868) says that the Tairona and Chimila “although linguistically related, are not included in this [i. e., Cágaba-Arhuaco] designation.” Both of these are low-altitude peoples, coast, foothill, or lowland-dwellers, the culture of the Chimila being mainly that of a forest people. The language of the Tairona is utterly un-

11 Hernández de Alba (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 922) places Quilla in the Píez subgroup of the Talamanca-Barbacoa group, but Quillaclinga as a member of the Cochean family.
known; they may well have been Cariban or Arawakan. Reichel-Dolmatoff has recently done work among the Chimila. His linguistic material has not yet been published, but he informs me (personal communication) that Chimila is Arawakan. Arawakan affinities of Tairona would not be unexpected, since they were coterminous with the Arawakan-speaking Goajiro.

Bibliography.—Bolinder, 1924, 1925; Celedón, 1886.

**YURUMANGUI**

This hitherto neglected and almost unknown group and language of the Colombian west coast has recently assumed considerable importance. A manuscript vocabulary was recently discovered in the Archivo Nacional in Bogotá and published. Dr. Paul Rivet has been studying it for some years, finds no resemblances with any nearby language, and believes it to be Hokan and therefore related to Melanesio-Polynesian (Rivet, 1943). Ortiz (1946) does not consider the point as proved, and prefers to consider Yurumanguí as an independent tongue.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Archivo nacional . . ., n. d.; Arcila Robledo, 1940; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43, vol. 3, appendix 2; Ortiz, 1946; Rivet, 1943.

**TIMOTE**

This small group of the Venezuelan highlands has been much more thoroughly investigated than most, but unfortunately the linguistic data are still limited to a few small vocabularies. No running text or grammatical study is known, and one is urgently needed. Rivet (1927 a) has assembled all the information available. Regarding the opinion of Ernst (1885) that Timote is related to Chibcha, Rivet reaches the same conclusion that Brinton (1891 a) did earlier, that there is some lexical resemblance, but not enough for proof, and that Timote had best be considered independent. In this all other authorities agree with him, except Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43), who believes in the relationship and makes Timote Group C of his Macro-Chibcha phylum.

Muku is a synonym for the family. There seem to be two main languages, Timote and Cuica (Kuika). With Timote are probably related Mirripú (Maripú), Mukuchí (Mocochí), Miguirí, Tiguíno, and Escaguey; with Cuica, Tostó, Escuque, and Jajó. However, Brinton (1891 a) lists 29 groups, the names taken from Ernst (1885), and

---

12 I wish here to make public confession and express regret that I identified the Santa Marta archeological culture with the Tairona. In this Handbook (see vol. 2, p. xxix) the Santa Marta archeological culture is considered as one of the few that have been tied up with an historic people. This identification has not yet been proved, but seems probable. A careful study of the original historical sources, a thing I have not yet found time to do, will be the major factor in determining the question.—J. A. M.
Rivet (1927 a), making a more thorough study, compiles a list of names, synonyms, and variations of 99 dialects and 29 varieties, each probably linguistically distinguishable. This is one example of the tremendous complexity of language in South America.

**Timote Family (Venezuela)**

I. **Cuica (Kuika)**
   A. Cuica Proper
   B. Tostó
      1. Tostó Proper
      2. Tirandá
      3. Tomont
   C. Eskuke (Eskukey)
      1. Eskuke Proper
      2. Bombá
      3. Moka
      4. Tirandá
         a. Čobú
         b. Čačike
         c. Čaču
         d. Tirandá Proper
         e. Estiguáte (Estiguati)
   D. Jajó (Jakón, Jayón)
      1. Jajó Proper
      2. Esnijaque
      3. Kikoke (Kikoki)
      4. Mapen (La Vega)
      5. Duri
      6. Mikimboy

II. **Timote (Timoti)**
   A. Timote Proper
      1. Mukurujun
      2. Mukusé
      3. Mokayupu
      4. Mukuuarsé
      5. Ciribuy
      6. Miyoy
      7. Mukumbá
      8. Kindorá
      9. Tafallé
      10. Mukumbají
      11. Čino

---

1 From Rivet, 1927 a, 4137-167. In this article, which includes a large map and bibliography, the Timote Family is divided into two groups: Timote Proper and Cuika. The Cuika he divides into the four groups above noted.

The Timote group is divided into numerous subgroups, of which the only one he names is the Timote Proper. The five groups above: Timote Proper, Chama, Mocochí, Mucutu, and Tapato are distinguished on basis of Rivet's grouping in text into five paragraphs of very different lengths. Names are mine, choosing a name in this group shown on his map, except Chama, which is accepted generic.

Loukotka (1935) makes a fourfold division: (1) Timote; (2) Mokoči; (3) Mipuri; (4) Cuika. His (2) and (3) are included in Rivet's Timote group. Mipuri is probably equivalent to Chama.
TIMOTE FAMILY (VENEZUELA)1—Continued

II. Timote (Timoti)—Continued

B. Čama (Miğuri ?)

1. Mokunče (Mukunče, Mukuneče)
2. Mukurubá (Mokuruguá)
3. Tabay (Mukunutáne, Tabayon ?)
4. Mukurumagua
5. Guake (Guakti)
6. Mukumba
7. Čičuy
8. Mukuñoke (Mukuño, Miğurt ?)
   a. Mukurufluén
   b. Muká
   c. Mukumpí
   d. Mukutírt
   e. Mukusnandá
   f. Mukaikuy
   g. Mukusó, etc.
9. Mukurandá
10. Mukuhúun (Mukupine, Mokoion)
11. Čiguará
12. Insumbí (Insumbi)
13. Eştankes
14. Mukući (Makući, Mokoçiz)
   a. Misantá
   b. Mokao
   c. Mosnaçó
   d. Misikea, etc.
15. Eşkagüey
16. Mukuyún
17. Tatuy (Tatey ?)
18. Mukaria
19. Mukakelá
20. Mukusiri
21. Kapará
22. Jaji (Mukundú)
23. Mukubače (Mirrípú, Mirripuy, Marípú ?)
24. Mukáun (Mukumpú, Lagunillas)
   a. Kasés
   b. Mukuinamo
   c. Arikagua
   d. Tilákuay
   e. Makulare
   f. Mukusumpú
   g. Barbudos
   h. Jamuën, etc.
   i. Kinaró
   j. Tiguíñó
25. Guaruni (Guarurt)

1For footnote 1, see page 189.
Timote Family (Venezuela)\(^1\)—Continued

II. Timote (Timoti)—Continued

C. Mocochí (Mokočí)
   1. Miyuse
   2. Tukani
   3. Mokočí (Torondoy)

D. Mukutu (Escaguey)
   1. Eskaguey
   2. Kanaguá
   3. Kinó
   4. Mokoíno (Mokono)
   5. Mombun
   6. Yarikagua
   7. Arikagua
   8. Mukutuy
   9. Mukupaí
   10. Mukuačí
   11. Trikagua
   12. Mokoto (Mukutu, Mukuti)
      a. Guarake
      b. Bailadores

E. Tapano
   1. Aviamo
   2. Mokombó (Mokobo)
   3. Tapano

III. Unclassified tribes
   A. Kiorá
   B. Mijure
   C. Montun
   D. Iguino

\(^1\) For footnote 1, see page 189.
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CANDOSHI, CHIRINO, AND MURATO

Each of these extinct or little-known languages of western Ecuador has been linked by some recent authority with some other, or others. Rivet (1924 a) considered Chirino as forming an independent family. Loukotka (1935) calls the family Candoshi (Kandoshi), and composes it of two groups, one consisting of the Candoshi and Shapra, the other of the extinct Chirino (Cumbaraja), Sacata, and Rabona. He considers Murato a synonym of Candoshi. Tessmann (1930) makes Shapra and Murato divisions of Candoshi, which language, synonymous with Maina in his opinion, he considers a mixture of Ge, Arawak, and Pano. Rivet thinks that Chinchipe is a synonym of Murato, and Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 615) believe that

Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) regards this group, "Lenguas Muratas," as related to Chibcha, composing Group E of his Macro-Chibcha phylum.

Bibliography.—Anonymous, 1897; León, A. M., 1928–29; Rivet, 1930 b; Tessmann, 1930.

CHOLON

Synonyms: Cholona, Tsolona, Čolón, Tscholón.

Cholon (an) is one of the small families early distinguished (Chamberlain, 1913 a) and universally accepted. According to the majority of authorities, it consists of two languages, the Cholona Proper or Tinganes and the Hıbito (Xibito, Chibito, etc.). Brinton (1891 a) quotes early sources to the effect that the Cholon spoke a different language from the Hıbito. Tessmann (1930) calls it a language mixed with Quechua; he gives a vocabulary of 30 words. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) makes Cholona the last (H) component member of his Macro-Chibchan phylum.

A grammar has been recently published by Fr. Pedro de la Mata (1923); an earlier work on Cholón by Fr. Francisco Gutierrez is mentioned. J. P. Harrington has recently compared Cholón with Quechua and believes them related. His evidence has not been published.

Bibliography.—Beuchat and Rivet, 1909; Brinton, 1892 a; Chamberlain, 1910 a; Mata, 1923; Tessmann, 1930.

HİBITO

The extinct Hıbito (Chibito, Xibito, Jibito, Zibito, İbito, etc.) is classed with Cholon(a) by most authorities. Brinton (1891 a) quotes the old sources to the effect that the Cholon spoke a different idiom from the Hıbito. Tessmann (1930) 13 calls it a mixed language (Pano-Ge), while Cholon he considers mixed with Quechua. He gives a 33-word vocabulary. Loukotka (1935) also believes it mixed with Panoan. It became extinct about 1825. A grammar was written by Fr. José de Araujo.

Bibliography.—Izaguirre, 1927–29; Tessmann, 1930.

COPALLÉN

Apparently only four words are known of the extinct Copallén, of Copallén, Llanque, Ecuador. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43), who has made a most thorough study of the languages of western Ecuador,

13 Pages 458-459. This was unfortunately omitted from his Table of Contents.
discriminates it with a word, but accords it independent position in his
final classification (1943). The data on which Loukotka (1935)
assigns it to an independent family must, therefore, be very slight;
it had better be left unclassified. It seems to be ignored by all other
authorities.

Bibliography.—Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43.

ACONIPA (AKONIPA)

Aconipa is one of the almost unknown languages considered as an
independent family by Loukotka (1935) and apparently mentioned
by no other compiler. In his recent exhaustive study of pre-Columbian
western Ecuador, Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) merely mentions it as
one of the languages of Ecuador; he leaves it independent in his
final (1943) classification. Extinct, the data on it are very few, and
insufficient to warrant its classification, at any rate as a distinct family.

Bibliography.—Jiménez de la Espada, 1897, p. 32.

YUNCA-PURUHÁN

If the validity of the group of languages under consideration were
established, "Yuncahá" would be proposed as a cogent hybrid term.
The classification of the extinct coastal languages of Ecuador and
northern Perú has always been—and may always be—uncertain and
controversial. The "family" consists of the five groups that were
given independent status by Rivet (1924 a) under the names Atalán,
Cañari, Puruhá, Sek, and Yunca. Yunca and Cañari are families
of long standing, at least since the classification of Chamberlain
(1913 a); Sek is proposed by Rivet alone (1924 a). Jijón y Caamaño
(1941–43) comes to the conclusion, as a result of his exhaustive studies
of pre-Columbian western Ecuador, that Puruhá, Canyari, and
Manteña (Manabita) are closely related and go with Yunca to form
an independent family. He claims that all these differ hardly more
than dialectically. As all these "families" and their component
languages are extinct with practically no lexical data, except for
Yunca, and as Jijón y Caamaño reaches these conclusions mainly
on the basis of proper names, the degree of relationship will probably
never be proved. The family also includes, in his opinion, Huancavilca,
by which he apparently implies Rivet's Atalán family. He proposes
the name Puruhá-Mochica for this family, which he considers a major
division (G) of his Macro-Chibcha phylum.

Jijón y Caamaño is by no means the first or only one to propose
such a consolidation. W. Schmidt's (1926) Yunca-Huancavilca
Group consists of Huancavilca (Atalán), Tallán and Sechura (Sec),
and Yunca, Mochica-Chanco, Chimú, and Eten (Yunca); he does not
mention Puruhá or Cañari. Loukotka (1935) establishes a Chimu family with a Yuncan southern division, and a Puruhá-Cañari northern division.

YUNCA

Synonyms: Yunga, Mochica, Chimu.

The Yunca, Mochica, or Chimu language of the Northern Coast of Perú is fairly well known through De la Carrera’s grammar (1644). It is practically extinct, but a few words are said still to be used by some of the Coast fishermen. A relationship to Chibcha (Barbacoa, Colorado) has been suspected, but W. Lehmann (1920) compared Mochica with Colorado without any result. Uhle has suggested a relationship with Uro (q. v.). Chamberlain (1913 a) and Brinton (1891 a) both posited a Yunca(n) family.

The former extent of the Yunca languages to the south and inland is much disputed. Some authorities believe it extended south to Ica, including practically the entire Perú Coast. According to Jijón y Caamaño (1941–45), it reached to south of Lima. He also believes that it included the North Perú Highlands, including the provinces of Cajamarca and Ancachs, a region ordinarily ascribed to Quechua, and impinged on the Híbito and Cholona of the Montaña to the east. These deductions are drawn from study of place names and traditions, since these regions were Quechuaized in very early, probably pre-Conquest, days.

The following regions or ethnic groups are thus of uncertain original language and are left unclassified on the linguistic map: Ayavaca, Huancapampa, Huambo, Chachapoya, Cajamarca, Huamachico, Conchucu, Huarachucu, Huayla, Pisco, Ocro, Huamalí, Huanuco, Cajatampo, Atavillo, Chinchaycocha, Tarma, and Yavyo.

Dr. J. P. Harrington, after a study of De la Carrera’s grammar (personal communication), reports that the phonetics are almost identical with Quechua, and that there are many vocables and other features like Quechua. Most nouns, and also most verbs, are monosyllabic, generally ending in a vowel. The morphological mechanism is generally by suffixes.

Less acceptable is the opinion of Zeballos Quiñones that the place names of the region show Maya and Zapotec resemblances, and present proof of Central American influences in the Chimu region.
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PURUHÁ

A small group, established as an independent family by Rivet (1924 a) and accepted as such by a few others. It became extinct about the close of the 17th century. There is general agreement that it is related to Cañari. (See Murra, Handbook, vol. 2, p. 797.)


CAÑARI (CANYARI)

Also a small group, but one of longer standing as an independent family, since at least the time of Chamberlain (1913 a). No linguistic subdivisions have been suggested. (See Murra, Handbook, vol. 2, p. 799.)

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a; Cordero Palacios, 1924; Jijón y Caamaño, 1921, 1941–43, 2: 3–78, 3:5–140; Moreno-Mora, 1922; Rivet, 1912 a.

ATALÁN

Apparently Atalán and Tallán must be distinguished, although the languages are adjacent in coastal Ecuador. Confusion and disagreement are great. The linguistic data on both are so slight that their true affiliations will probably never be certainly known. Atalán was first proposed as an independent family by Rivet (1924 a), consisting of the languages Manta, Huancavilca, Puna, and Tumbez. It is one of four language groups that Loukotka (1935), with unusual reticence, left unclassified. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) after thorough study placed the group with his Puruhá-Mochica group of Macro-Chibchan, a classification provisionally accepted herein. It is uncertain whether the Caraca group goes with the Atalán Manta or with the Barbacoan Cara. Dialects of Atalán seem to be Apichiquí, Cancebi, Charapoto, Pichote, Pichoasac, Pichunsi, Manabí, Jarahusa, and Jipijapa.

Bibliography.—Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43.

YUNCA-PURUHÁ

I. Yunca-Puruhá (Yunca-Wancavilca, Puruhá-Mochica)

A. Yunca

1. North Group (Puruhá-Cañari)
   a. Puruhá
   b. Canari (Cañari)
   c. Manabí (Manenya)

2. South Group (Yunca)
   a. Yunga
   b. Morrope
   c. Eten (?)
   d. Chimú
   e. Mochica (Chincha)
   f. Chanco
YUNCA-PURUHÁ—Continued

I. Yunca-Puruhá (Yunca-Wancavilca, Puruhá-Mochica)—Continued

B. Atalán

1. Wancavilca(Huancavilca) ¹

a. Manta ²
b. Tumbez ³
c. Puná ¹
d. Carake: Apichiki, Cancebi


SEC, SECHURA, OR TALLÁN

The small Sec “family” of restricted area in westernmost Ecuador was first proposed by Rivet (1924 a). Loukotka (1935) accepts the proposed family and calls it Sechura (Sechura). W. Schmidt (1926) puts it in his Yunca-Huancavilca group, together with several others of Rivet’s “independent” families in this region. Brinton (1891 a) also grouped it with Yunca. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) who, in his very complete study of pre-Columbian western Ecuador, accepts the Yunca-Huancavilca group under his proposed alternative name Puruhá-Mochica, passes Sec off with the brief note that it was a language of Tallana, Ecuador, extinct in the last century, implying that not enough is known of it to classify it with any degree of finality; this is probably true at present. In his final classification (1941-43), Jijón y Caamaño makes Tallán a separate phylum.

The extinct languages Tallán, Chira (Lachira), Colan, Piura, and Sechura are generally classed with Sec. The Catacoo, a little further inland, are said still to speak their presumably related language; their investigation is a great desideratum. There is an ipso facto presumption of connection between Tallán and the extinct Atalán “family” just to the north, but the differentiation must be kept in mind. The linguistic data seem to be limited to 40 words collected by Spruce and published in Markham (1864 a).

Bibliography.—Markham, 1864 a.

KECHUMARAN

“Kechumaran” is a hybrid term here proposed for the first time to designate the yet unproved but highly probable subphylum consisting of Quechua and Aymara. It has long been believed that Aymara and Quechua have linguistic as well as cultural relations. The extent of this relationship still awaits study. Phonetics and morphology show a relatively common pattern and many close similarities, but the lexical roots seem to have little in common except a large number, possibly
as much as a quarter of the whole, obviously related and probably borrowed by one or the other language. They have been in close contact for probably several thousand years. Aymara is generally termed the "older" language, that is, that of wider extent in pre-Inca days, and one that has yielded ground to the Quechua. The two will probably eventually be found to be members of a large phylum; the Hokan-like traits that have been claimed for Quechua probably apply also to Aymara.

Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) presents cogent arguments for his adoption of a Quechua–Aymara phylum. Both may possibly be members of Hokan-Siouan, one of the great phyla of North America; J. P. Harrington (1943) is convinced of the connection. This would not be entirely unexpected since scattered Hokan enclaves are found as far south as Nicaragua (Subtiaba), and Rivet has considered the possibility that Yurumanguí (q. v.) may also be Hokan.

QUECHUA

Quechua (Kechua, Quichua, Keshwa, etc.) is the South American analogue of Aztec. That is, it was the language of a relatively small group, the so-called Inca, who established a great military empire, conquered surrounding peoples, and to some extent imposed their language upon the latter. In Colonial days it became a lingua franca over an even wider area, displacing still other aboriginal languages, and this process has continued until the present. Today probably several millions of Indians in Perú, southwestern Ecuador, western Bolivia, and northwestern Argentina speak Quechua, and most of them nothing else. As many Peruvians speak Quechua as Spanish. Practically the entire population of the provinces of Cuzco and Ayacucho can speak Quechua. Of course, it is slowly losing ground to Spanish.

Quechua probably occupied a comparatively small area in the upper Apurimac and Urubamba drainage until the era of the great Inca conquests under Pachacutí about 1450; it was then merely one of many possibly unrelated languages in the Andean region. It overwhelmed and supplanted many of these other languages, which probably survived in local use until after the Spanish Conquest and then became extinct during the Colonial Period. (Personal letter from John Rowe; see also Handbook, vol. 2, pp. 183–470.)

In 1530, although Inca military sway extended from Ecuador to Chile and Argentina, the native languages had not yet been replaced by Quechua, which apparently occupied only a small region in the Cuzco region, represented by the groups Cavina, Cuzco, Chilque, Lare, Quechua, Paucartampo, Vilcapampa, and Yanahuara (see Handbook, vol. 2, map 3, facing p. 185). In a few years, however, Quechua
replaced the native languages throughout the northern highlands to Ecuador and even to southern Colombia, those of the central and southern coasts, and those of a considerable part of the highlands to the south. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) believes and presents some evidence that the former languages of the northern highlands and the coast were related to Yanca (q. v.). The Quechua dialects that replaced these are known as Chinchaistuyo, the autochthonous dialects of the Cuzco region as Tahuantisuyo. The Huancas seem to have been a group apart. To the south, Quechua replaced many Aymara groups. The extension of Quechua to the central coast was apparently a rather early one and many authorities accord it some littoral in earliest days.

The following regions or groups in the Peruvian highlands speak or spoke (at least in part) Quechua at some post-Conquest period but were presumably originally of other linguistic affiliations, possibly many of them Yunga, and are, therefore, left unclassified on the linguistic map: Calca, Ayavaca, Huancapampa, Huambo, Chachapoya, Cajamarca, Huamachuco, Conchucu, Huacraruchuco, Huayla, Pincu, Huamalí, Ocro, Huanuco, Cajatampo, Chinchaycocha, Atavillo, Tarma, Yavuyo, Huanco, Angará, Chocoreo, Choclococha, Vilcas, Rucana, Chanca, Sora, Parinacocha, Aymara (distinguish from Aymara family), Contisuyo, Omasuyo (distinguish from Aymara Omasuyo, Cotapampa, Cavana, Chumpívileca, and Arequipa; also Cochapampa and Yampa to the east, and Chicha and Lipe to the south.

The Quechua languages do not differ greatly, and none varies much from the norm—additional evidence of the relatively recent spread. There are a great number of dialects, probably a slightly variant one for each of the many Quechua-speaking villages, and these form regional groups, but probably none is absolutely unintelligible to any other. That of Cuzco was and is the standard. Those of the Ayacucho group are the most diversified, individualized, and in some respects most archaic.

The list of Quechua-speaking tribes and groups depends greatly on the temporal period; ever since about 1450, Indian groups on the peripheries of the Quechua region in Ecuador, Perú, Bolivia, and Argentina have been abandoning their native languages in favor of Quechua. This presumably produces somewhat mixed languages but not true dialects. Among these Quechuaized groups the most prominent are the Cara or Quito (Kito) of Ecuador, the Chicha and Lipe of Bolivia, the Allentiac, the Sanavíron, and the Vilela-Chulupí of Argentina. (See also Handbook, vol. 2, map 3.)

The Quechua dialects are known only by the names of the villages where they are spoken; the groups of dialects, by the names of the provinces in which they center.
MODERN QUECHUA CLASSIFICATION

I. Northern (Chinchaysuyu)
   A. Ayacucho
   B. Junín
   C. Huánuco
   D. Ancash
   E. Huamachuco (Cajamarca)
   F. Chaclapoya

II. Southern (Tahuantisuyu)
   A. Cuzco
   B. Puno

III. Coastal
   A. Arequipa

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Like that of Aztec, the bibliography of Quechua is very large, both early and recent. The best grammar seems to be that of Middendorf (1890).

Adam, 1878; Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Aguilar, 1939; Anchorena, 1874; Anonymous, 1905 (Chinchaysuyu), 1914, 1919 c, 1919 d, 1927 b, 1928 c; Astete, 1936–37, 1937 a; Azpilcueta, 1938; Barcena, MS.; Barranca, S., 1876 (Cauki); Barranca, J. S., 1915–20; Berrios, 1919 a, 1919 b; Brinton, 1892 a, pp. 52–88; Cordero Palacios, 1924; Cúneo-Vidal, 1914, 1915 a, 1915 b, 1915 c, 1920 a, 1920 b, 1922; Dangel, 1931 a, 1931 b; Dijour, 1931–32; Dorsey, 1898; Durand, 1915–18, 1921; Farfán, 1939, 1941–42, 1943; Ferrario, 1934; Figueroa, 1701; Fuhrmann, 1922; Garro, 1939, 1942; González Holguín, 1607, 1608, 1901; Grigórief, 1935; Guzmán, 1920 a, 1920 b; Harrington, J. P., 1943; Harrington, J. P., and Valcárcel, 1941; Herrera, 1941 b; Jáuregui Rosquellas, 1937; León, A. M., 1939; Lizondo Borda, 1927; Markham, 1864 a; Martínez, B. T., 1917; Martius, 1867, 2: 289–296; Medina, J. T., 1930 a; Middendorf, 1890; Navarro, 1903; Ortiz, 1940 c; Paris, 1924; Paz Soldán, 1877; Pérez Guerrerro, 1934; Pulgar Vidal, 1937; Rivet, 1912 a (Lama); Rodríguez, M. C., 1921; Rowe and Escobar, 1943; Sala, G., 1905–06; Santo Tomás, 1891; Steinthal, 1890; Swadesh, 1939; Tello, 1931; Tessmann, 1930, p. 221 (Lamisto), p. 235 ff. (Chasutino); Torres Rubio, 1603, 1619, 1754; Tschudi, 1853, 1884; Valcárcel, 1933.

Also: Agüero, 1929; Anonymous, 1917, 1918–19, 1925, 1930 b, 1936; Barranca, S., 1868; Barranca, J. S., 1922; Basadre, J., 1939; Brüning, 1913; Christian, 1932; Chiquiwanqa, 1928; Cook, O. F., 1916: Cosio, 1916, 1919, 1923, 1924; Cúneo-Vidal, 1930 a, 1930 b; Dangel, 1930; Englert, 1934; Espinoza, 1938; Farfán, 1942, 1944; Feijoo Reyna, 1924; Ferrario, 1933; Gonzáles Suárez, 1904; Guerrerro y Sosa, 1932; Herrera, 1916, 1919, 1923, 1933, 1933–34, 1939 a, 1939 b, 1941 a; Hoquart, 1916; Imbelloni, 1928 b; Jiménez Borja, 1937; Jorge, 1924; Lemos, 1920; León, A. M., 1922, 1927, 1928–29, 1929, 1929–31, 1932–33, 1939–40; Lizondo Borda, 1928; Macedo y Pastor, 1931–35, 1936, 1939; Matto de Turner, 1926; Mercante, 1924; Morales, 1929; Mossi, 1916; Mostajo, 1923; Murrieta, 1936; Ollanta, 1878; Palavecino, 1926, 1928; Patrón, 1918; Patrón and Romero, 1923; Rojas, 1942; Ruiz Palazuela, 1927; Schuller, 1917–18; Soliz Rodríguez, 1926; Suárez, 1930; Talbot, 1931–32; Tascón, 1934; Tola Mendoza, 1939; Torres, A. M., 1931; Tuleán, 1934 a, 1934 b; Vara Cadillo, 1931; Vázquez, 1921–24; Velazco Aragón, 1923; Wechsler, 1917.
AYMARA

Aymara is one of the great living languages of South America; there may be half a million speakers in Bolivia and Peru. A number of Aymara "dialects" are distinguished. The differentiation of the modern ones is apparently not great, and none seems to vary greatly from the norm. Those most different are around Lake Titicaca. No suggestions have been made of the grouping of these dialects into major divisions. The most important ones are apparently Collao and Lupaca.

The Aymara region was certainly originally larger than at present, and probably many Aymara dialects in addition to the few recorded have been replaced by Quechua. In many towns Aymara and Quechua are both spoken, and occasionally Aymara enclaves have been left in a present-day Quechua-speaking region. Similarly Uro groups are surrounded by Aymara. Apparently, however, Aymara was always limited to the Highlands of Bolivia and Peru, and its former extension to the Pacific seaboard in the Tacna-Arica-Arequipa region is no longer credited, nor the Aymara affinities of the Cauki (Cauqui, Huarochiri) group in the neighborhood of Lima, Peru.

Aymara is spoken today by the historic subtribes Colla, Collagua, Cana, Canchi, Ubina, and parts of the Charca and Collahuaya (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 503). The Caranga, Lupaca, Quillaca, Omasuyo, Pacasa, Paria, and Sicasica have given it up in favor of Quechua or Spanish. It was also spoken, together with Quechua, in Sora, Chanca, Arequipa, Chicha, Lipe, Chumpivilca, and Vilcas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
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CHIQUITOAN

The Chiquito (Chikito) form a solid small group in southeastern Bolivia. This Spanish word, meaning "very small," has always been applied to the family; Tarapecosi may be a synonym. It has been accepted as independent since earliest writers, but not unlikely may later be found to tie with other groups into a major phylum. Lafone-Quevedo (1910) notes many resemblances to Guaycurú (q. v.) and believes them related, Mbayá being the closest of the Guaycurú languages to Chiquito both geographically and pronominally. He
notes resemblances also with many other important families: Quechua, Mataco, Macá, Araucanian, Tupi-Guarani, Arawak, and Carib, and apparently believes that all these and others are related. As his deductions are based mainly on resemblances in the pronominal systems they cannot be accepted as more than suggestions at present. A connection with Bororo has also been suggested.

Hervás y Panduro (1800) gives the names of some 35 Chiquito bands divided into 4 dialects; most of these are presumably extinct. (See Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 383.) Modern writers mention up to seven groups in two main divisions. There is general agreement regarding the modern divisions. Loukotka (1935) and Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) place the Sansimoniano, generally regarded as Carib, with Chiquito; Rivet calls it Chapacuran. Of the extinct Manacica, Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 388) says that Lucas Caballero (1933) identifies them with Tapacura and Quitemoca, which, if true, would make them Chapacuran.

**Chiquito**

I. North: Chiquito
   A. Manasi (Manacica)
   B. Penoki (Penokikia)
   C. Pinyoca:
      1. Kusikia 1
   D. Tao:
      1. Tabica 2

II. South: Churapa

1 Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 383) says that D’Orbigny (1839) reported that the Kusikia dialects were full of foreign words, mainly Arawakan Paiconeca.
2 Possibly the same as the Tapii, who also may have spoken either Zamucan or Otukean.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Adam and Henry, 1880; Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Caballero, 1933; Cardus, 1886; Lafone-Quevedo, 1910 (1912); Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 114-120; Mitre, 1909-10, 2: 279-280; Nordenskiöld, 1911 b, pp. 231-241 (Churapa); Pauly, 1928, pp. 184-185 (Churapa); Tagliavini, 1928.

**MACRO-GUAICURUAN**

*Macro-Guaicurú* is a name here proposed for the first time for a phylum that includes several families, heretofore considered independent, in the general region of the Gran Chaco. As at present constituted it consists of Mataco, Macá (Enimagá, Cochaboth) (see Mataco-Macá), and Guaicurú. The latter, probably the most important of the three, has been taken as the basis for the name. Doubtless other families in this region, at present regarded as independent, will eventually be joined to it; one of the first may be Chiquito (Lafone-Quevedo, 1910); Lule-Vilela is a possibility. Evidence for the connections will be given in the family articles. That for Mataco-Macá is mainly
lexical; that for Guaicurú (and Chiquito) morphological. The morphologies have a Hokan-like aspect.

**MATACO-MACÁ**

Matako-Maká was first suggested as a name for the combined Mataco-Mataguayo and Enimagá (Cochaboth, Makká) “families” by Métraux (1942 b). No thorough linguistic proof of this connection has yet been presented, but it is herein accepted as probable, though not as certain or proved.

A comparison of Vejöz and Towothli vocabularies shows a large number of correspondencies, many of them practically identical, but not a large proportion of the entire vocabularies. The possibility of extensive borrowing cannot be discounted, but the resemblances are mainly in common and fundamental words. No sound-shifts were noted with enough examples to warrant any suggestion of rules, but a number of cases of Vejöz j to Towothli k, ch to k, s to ts, e to ai, e to i, u to o were noted. At the same time vocabularies of Suhin-Chunupí and Choroti were compared. These seem to be about equidistant from Vejöz (Mataco) and from Towothli (Macá), a little closer, as would be expected, to Vejöz.

**MATACO**

This family has always been accepted as independent under the name Mataco or Mataco-Mataguayo. It is herein considered a member of the Macro-Guaicurú (q. v.) phylum, which includes also Macá (q. v.; also Mataco-Macá) and Guaicurú. The evidence of the relationship of Mataco and Guaicurú is outlined by Henry (1939), who stated that the grammatical structures of Ashluslay and Pilagá are so similar that an ancient historical relationship should be posited. He decided, however, not to place Ashluslay in the Guaicurú stock since the lexical difference is so great. There seem to be no doubts of the Mataco affinities of Ashluslay. Suggestions of relationships between Mataco and Guaicurú had previously been made by D’Orbigny (1839), Lafone-Quevedo (1893), Hunt (1913 a), and W. B. Grubb (1913), but had not met with general acceptance.

Several Mataco languages are still spoken by considerable numbers of Indians in the Gran Chaco; others are extinct.

Mataco is considered by some 14 the oldest linguistic family in the Chaco, and as having had great influence on “newer” groups. Lafone-Quevedo thought it a very mixed language, with grammar from one stock and lexicon from another.

14 Brinton, 1891 a; Hunt, 1915 b.
There is no great disagreement regarding the component languages of the family. All the Mataguayo are now known as Vejoz. The northwest Mataco were called Nocten in the 18th century. The Pilcomayo Mataco are known as Guisnay today. Probably each of the bands mentioned by Lozano (1941, p. 81) had a slightly divergent and characteristic dialect; their names are not repeated here. The Ashluslay have many synonyms, some of which must be distinguished from similar names of other groups; one, Chunupí or Choropi may be confused with the Lule-Vilela Chunupí; they are also incorrectly given the Tupí name Tapiete.

Loukotka (1935) puts the extinct Guentuse with Mataco; most authorities place them with Macá (Enimagá). W. Schmidt (1926) includes the extinct Matará (Amulalá) (q. v.) and Matbalá; Rivet (1924 a) agrees as to the latter, but Matará he considers Lule-Vilela; Métraux (Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 231–232) and Nimuendajú (map and index) think it best to consider both of uncertain affiliation. The Matará were related to and understood Tonocote (q. v.), which also W. Schmidt (1926) and Nimuendajú (map and index) place with Mataco. Brinton (1891 a) adds Akssek, a group nowhere else mentioned.

**MACÁ (ENIMAGÁ, COCHABOTH)**

Macá is herein postulated as a member of the Mataco-Macá family of the Macro-Guaicurú phylum (q. v.). The history of the stock and of its nomenclature is most confusing. It was first called Guaná, causing confusion with Arawak Guaná. Later it was termed Ennimá or Enimagá, but most of the languages included therein differed greatly from Enimagá proper. Rivet (1924 a) split these off to form his Mascó family, retaining the name Enimagá for the present group. Probably to avoid this confusion, W. Schmidt (1926) adopted the term Cochabot, the Enimagá self-name, which is preferred also by Métraux herein; most of the others stick to Enimagá. Of recent years the name Macá or Makká has had some vogue. Max Schmidt (1936 a) demonstrated that the modern Macá or Towothli speak a language related to the old Enimagá and are probably the descendants of the latter (Enimagá-Macá). Nimuendajú (map and index), however, although admitting an Enimagá family, puts Macá with Mataco, Toosle (Towothli) with Enimagá. Much of the confusion is due to the Lengua, a name applied to several different groups. The “old” Lengua are Cochaboth; the “new,” Lengua Mascó. (See fuller discussion in Métraux, Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 236–237.)
Mataco-Maca

I. Mataco
   A. Mataco-Mataquayo
      1. Mataco
         a. Guisnay
         b. Nocten (Octenai)
      2. Mataguayo
         a. Northern: Hueshuo, Pesatupe, Abucheta
         b. Southern: Vejoz
   B. Chorotl-Ashluslay
      1. Choroti (Yofuaha)
      2. Ashluslay (Chulupi, Chonopi, Suhin, Sotiagay, Tapiete)

II. Macá (Enimagá, Cochaboth, Guaná, Lengua)
   A. Enimagá
      1. Macá (Towothli, Toosle)
   B. Guentusé
   C. Cochaboth-Lengua

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mataco.—Anonymous, 1919 b (Vejoz), 1930 c, 1931, 1933 b, 1933 c (Vejoz); Brinton, 1898 a; Cardus, 1886, pp. 390–391; Grubb, W. B., 1913; Hunt, 1913 a, 1913 b (Veroz), 1937, 1940; Huonder, 1902; Kersten, 1905; Lafone-Quevedo, 1893, 1895 b (Noclen), 1896 a, 1896 b (Vejoz), 1910; Lehmann-Nitsche, 1926; Métraux, 1942 b; Nusser-Asport, 1897; Orbigny, 1839; 1896 (Vejoz); Pelleschi, 1881, pp. 359–423, 1896; Remedi, 1896, 1904; Schmidt, M, 1937 a (Guisnay); Schuller, 1906.


Macá.—Belaieff, 1931–34, 1940; Brinton, 1898 a (Enimagá); Hunt, 1915 b (Towothli); Huonder, 1902 (Enimagá); Kersten, 1905 (Lengua, Enimagá, Guentuse); Koch-Grünberg, 1902 b (Enimagá); Kysela, 1931; Métraux, 1942 b; Schmidt, M., 1936 a, 1937 b.

GUAICURÚ (WAICURÚ)

Guaicurú was an important linguistic family of the Chaco region, but most of the languages are now extinct, and the surviving groups reduced to three or four with relatively few speakers.

The family has always been accepted as independent, though several arguments for wider relationships have been made. When more careful linguistic studies are made it is not unlikely that Guaicurú and Mataco will fall together into a larger phylum to which Chiquito may also be added. This is the opinion of Lafone-Quevedo (1910), who considers Mataco a subgroup of Guaicurú, and both related to Chiquito; he also believes Quechua related to Guaicurú. All these languages have a superficial Hokan-like aspect which is not borne out by a
hasty comparison of vocabularies; phonetics, morphology, and pro-
nominal systems are somewhat similar.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{Guaicurú}, of course, must be distinguished from the Baja California
language of identical or similar name. The languages fall into two,
possibly into three, main groups. There is little disagreement among
the various authorities regarding the relationships, and the adjoined
table, compiled from these, varies little from any. Names of small
groups or bands, ignored here, may be found elsewhere (Lozano,
1941, p. 62). The affinities between the various “dialects” are said
to be very close.

Possible or doubtful members of the family are:

\textbf{Guachi.}—Traditionally included but of doubtful affiliation. They
may originally have had their own language, later abandoned for
\textit{Mbayá}. Loukotka (1935) considers it a language mixed with \textit{Chiquito}.
Omitted by W. Schmidt (1926).

\textbf{Layaná.}—Generally considered \textit{Arawak}, but placed by Nimuendajú
(map and index) in \textit{Guaicurú}.

\textbf{Juri} (Suri).—Perhaps \textit{Guaicurú}, probably sedentary \textit{Tonocoté}.

\textbf{Querandí} (q. v.).—Placed by Rivet (1924 a) in \textit{Guaicurú} without
any certainty. Others include \textit{Charrúa} (q. v.).

\textbf{Mahoma or Hohoma.}—Judging by linguistic position, according to
Metraux (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 225), they may have been related
to \textit{Toba} or \textit{Mocoví}.

The relationships of \textit{Aguilot} and of \textit{Cocolot} are based on historical,
not on linguistic, evidence.

Brinton (1891 a, p. 315) adds to his \textit{Guaicurú} Family: \textit{Chica},
\textit{Orejón}, \textit{Churumata}, \textit{Malbalai}, \textit{Matagayo-Churumata}, \textit{Quiniquinaux},
\textit{Tereno}, and \textit{Yapitilagua} or \textit{Pitilaga}. Some of these are probably
synonyms, others generally placed in other families. Loukotka
(1935) lists the language \textit{Karraim}, apparently mentioned by no other
of the authorities consulted.

A number of the tribes in this region seem to have adopted \textit{Guaicurú}
relatively recently. Prominent among these are the \textit{Tereno}, \textit{Kini-
kinao}, \textit{Layaná}, and some of the scattered groups of \textit{Guand} (q. v.),
who apparently originally spoke \textit{Arawakan}. They might therefore
be classified in either of these “families,” and are often differently
classified by different authorities. On the accompanying linguistic
map they are given as \textit{Arawakan}.

\textsuperscript{15} See especially J. P. Harrington's opinions (1913) on \textit{Quechua}.
Guaicurú

I. Guaicurú
   A. Northern
      1. Mbayá-Guaicurú
         a. West: Caduveo (Cadiguegodi), Guetiadegodi (Guetiadebo)
         b. East: Apacachodegodi (Mbaya Mirim), Lichagotegodi (Icachodeguo?), Eyibogogedi, Gotocogogedi (Ocoteguebo?)
         c. Payaguá (Lengua):
            a. North: Sarigué (Cadigue)
            b. South: Magach (Agacé, Stacuás, Tacumbú)

II. Frentones
   A. Middle
      1. Toba (Tocowit)
         a. Toba: Guazú, Komlék, Michí (Mirt), Cocolot, Lanyagachek, Mogosma, Chirokina, Natíca
         b. Pilagá
         c. Aguilot
   B. South
      1. Abipón (Callaga)
         a. Mapenuss (Yaukanigd)
         b. Mepene
         c. Gulgaissen (Kilvasa)
      2. Mocovi (Mbocobi)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Guaicurú.—Brinton, 1898 a; Hermann, 1908; Huonder, 1902; Imbelloni, 1936; Koch-Grüngberg, 1902 b; Lafone-Quevedo, 1910 (1912); Lozano, 1941; Martius, 1867, 2:127-129; Schuller, 1906.

Mbaya—Caduvero—Payagua.—Adam, 1899; Aguirre, 1898, pp. 490-501 (Lengua); Boggiani, 1895, 1900; Castelnu, 1852, pp. 280-282; Gili, 1780-84, pp. 367-371; Kersten, 1905; Koch-Grüngberg, 1903, pp. 45-70; Lafone-Quevedo, 1892 b, 1896 c, 1897 b; Loukotka, 1929-30, pp. 99-106, 1933; Sánchez Labrador, 1896; Vellard, 1937; Vellard and Osuna, 1934.

Toba.—Adam, 1899; Aguirre, 1898; Anonymous, 1933 a; Barcena, 1893; Cardus, 1886, p. 321; Ducci, 1904, 1905, 1911-12; Karsten, 1923, 1932, pp. 127-223, Kersten, 1905 (Toba, Pilagá, Aguilot); Koch-Grüngberg, 1903, pp. 70-82; Lafone-Quevedo, 1893; Lehmann-Nitsche, 1925 a; Loukotka, 1929-30 (Toba, Pilagá); Nusser-Asport, 1897; Palavecino, 1931-33 (Pilagá); Tebboth, 1943.

Abipón—Mocovi.—Adam, 1899; Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Aguirre, 1898, pp. 491-504; Dobrizhoffer, 1784; Ducci, 1911-12; Kersten, 1905; Lafone-Quevedo, 1892 a, 1892 b, 1892-93, 1893 a, 1893 b, 1896-97; Larrañaga, 1924 a; Tavolini, 1856.

Guachi.—Castelnu, 1852, pp. 278-280; Kersten, 1905; Martius, 1867, 2:131-133.

Tereno.—Baldus, 1937.

LULE-VILELAN

“Lulela” would be a good mellifluous hybrid term for this “family” if its validity is finally definitely established. The two groups have been linked in classifications since earliest days, but Loukotka (1935) separates them into two families. This suggests that they differ
greatly, with a possibility of nonrelationship. The terms applied to the joint group, however, have been many: Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a) called it Lule, Nimuendajú (map, index) prefers Vilela; Loukotka (1935) uses both Lule and Vilela. Rivet (1924 a) and Pericot (1936) term it Vilela-Chunupí; W. Schmidt (1926) and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 227) prefer Lule-Vilela, here adopted.

Though it may be possible that a few Vilela-speaking Indians remain, the languages of the group are practically extinct. The linguistic data are relatively few. There is so much disagreement regarding the affiliations of languages in this region that it is not unlikely that many “families” will eventually be found to be related. Métraux suggests that a careful comparison with Mataco might prove significant. Other possible distant relatives are Diaguita, Macá, Sanavirón, Comechingón, Charrúa, etc.

Even for this region there is an unusual amount of disagreement and question regarding the component languages of the group. Some authorities place Tonocoté (q. v.) with Lule; others put this language under Diaguita, but most consider it related to Mataco. There were two groups of Lule; the sedentary mountain Lule, the Lule of Barcena, spoke Quechua, Tonocoté, and Diaguita; the Lule of Machoni spoke Lule-Vilela. The Lule-Vilelan Chunupí (Chulupí, Sunupí) of the Bermejo River must be distinguished from the Mataco Chunupí (Choropí) of the Pilcomayo River. Loukotka (1935) includes Cacán (Diaguita) and Sanavirón (q. v.) with Vilela; Jijón y Caamaño includes Sanavirón. Nimuendajú (map and index) apparently includes Güenoa, which all others consider as Charrúa. Possible members of the family, according to Métraux, are Matará (q. v.) (Rivet, 1924 a: Vilela-Chunupí; Nimuendajú: unclassified), who were probably related to the Tonocoté (q. v.); Malhald (Rivet, 1924 a: Mataco; Nimuendajú: unclassified), who were associated with the Vilela; Palomo.

**Lule-Vilela**

I. Lule  
A. Great Lule (of Miraflores, of Machoni)  
B. Small Lule  
1. Isistiné  
2. Tokistiné  
3. Oristiné  

II. Vilela  
A. Atalalá  
B. Chunupí (Sinipé, Chulupí)  
1. Yoo (Yoo, Wamalca)  
2. Ocolé  
3. Yeconita
II. Vilela—Continued
   C. Pasain (Pazaine)
   D. Omoampa (Umupa)
   E. Vacaa
   F. Vilela
   G. Ipa
   H. Takete
   I. Yoconoampa (Yecunampa)
   J. Wamalca
   (K. Malbalá ?)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lule.—Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Brinton, 1898 a; Calandrelli, 1896;
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TONOCOTÉ, MATARÁ, AND GUACARÁ

These three extinct languages had best be left unclassified. All
may be related. Rivet (1924 a) places them under Vilela-Chunupí,
others with Mataco. Tonocoté is especially in dispute. Métraux
(Handbook, vol. 1, p. 232) believes that the Matará spoke Tonocoté,
which is included in the Lule region in the linguistic map herewith.
Nimuendajú places Tonocoté with Mataco; the resemblance between
the terms Tonocoté and Nocten is suggestive. They might also have
been related to Diaguita, as Schmidt (1926) suggests. (See also

Bibliography.—Calandrelli, 1896; Lizondo Borda, 1938; Machoni de Cerdeña,
1732.

ARAWAKAN

Arawak is probably the largest and most important linguistic
family in South America, both in extent and in number of component
languages and dialects. It extends, or extended, from Cuba and
the Bahamas, perhaps even from Florida, to the Gran Chaco and the
sources of the Xingú, possibly even to Uruguay (Chand), and from
the mouth of the Amazon to the eastern foothills of the Andes, possibly
to the highlands (Uru), or even to the Pacific (Chango). In various
groups, sometimes continuous, sometimes isolated, it ranges through-
out this area. The distribution is very similar to that of the other
great family of the tropical lowlands, the Carib. The original home
and point of distribution is supposed to have been the Orinoco and
Rio Negro region of the borders of Guiana, Venezuela, and Brazil. If
the Uru-Puquina languages are actually related to Arawak, that may
have been the first migration. *Arawak* languages seem to have been supplanted in places by *Carib* tongues, in other parts by Highland languages, *Aymara* and *Quechua*. The numbers of *Arawak*-speaking peoples are rapidly diminishing, and many tribes and languages are now extinct.

Other names applied to the family have been *Maipure* (Gilij, 1780–84) and *Nu-Aruac* (Steinen, 1886). Several suggestions for wider relations have been made. If *Arawak* is ever linked in a phylum with other recognized families other than with small groups of present questionable independence, it will probably be with the *Carib*. A suggested tie-up with *Tupi* is less likely. Schuller (1919–20 a, 1928) believes in a great phylum including at least *Arawak*, *Carib*, *Chibcha*, and *Maya*, but he never presented cogent proof; his opinion has been accorded little consideration.

A typical *Arawakan* language (*Campa*) shows absence of nominal incorporation. The pronominal subject is prefixed, the object suffixed. There are temporal suffixes and modal prefixes. Verbal suffixes precede the pronominal object. The nominal plural is expressed by a suffix. The same stem is generally employed for verb, noun, and adjective, the distinctions made by affixes. *Arawakan* languages generally have gender distinctions. The first person pronoun is usually *nu*, whence the generic name *Nu-Arawak*; the second person is generally *p* or *pi*.

The correct grouping of the hundred-odd *Arawak* languages is an impossible task. Many of the extinct ones will never be classified with certainty, and the data on most of the living tongues are insufficient. No comprehensive classification on a linguistic basis accompanied by evidence has ever been attempted.\(^{16}\)

Probably because of the large number of *Arawak* languages, and the poverty, both quantitative and qualitative, of the data upon them, no comparative *Arawak* grammar has yet been published. Rivet (1924 a), W. Schmidt (1926), and Loukotka (1935) have presented classifications. These vary greatly; each contains certain languages considered independent by the others. Schmidt’s is the most detailed, with 7 main divisions and 16 subgroups. Loukotka has 14, 4 of which consist of a single “mixed” language. Rivet makes seven principal divisions. The main points of difference are: One of Schmidt’s groups is the *Jívaro* (q. v.), generally accepted as independent. Loukotka makes an independent family, the *Arawá*, of some of the languages of the *Arawá* or *Jurud-Purús* group. Schmidt considers the *Tacana* group as an independent family. Loukotka includes the *Chamicuro*, generally considered as *Pano* or *Aguano*. Rivet links the *Goajiro* and the languages of the *Orinoco* and the

\(^{16}\) One may be expected in one of the promised volumes by Perea y Alonso (1942 et seq.).
northern branches of the Amazon to those of the upper Xingú and the Paressí and Saraveca of Bolivia. In another division he joins the Arua group of the Juruá-Purús region with the Guaná Group of the Paraguayan Gran Chaco. Since Rivet seems not to have presented the evidence for these unexpected groupings, and since they were not accepted in the later classifications of Schmidt and Loukotka, the more common geographical grouping has been herein accepted as the basis for classification, using the more detailed and less radical divisions of Schmidt as a base. There is general, but far from complete, agreement on the composition of the minor subdivisions.

Arawakan Classification

I. Northern
   A. Insular
      1. Lesser Antilles
         a. Ignerí
         b. Cabre
      2. Greater Antilles
         a. Taino
         b. Sub-Taino
         c. Ciquayo
         d. Lucayo
   B. Northwestern
      1. Goajiro
         a. Goajiro: Cosina(?), Gobuzegual, Gimbuzequal
         b. Guanebucan
         c. Parauhano: Toa, Alile
         d. Tairona(?)
         e. Chimila(?)
      2. Caquetio
         a. Caquetio: Guaicari
         b. Achaqua: Tayaga, Yaguai, Chucuna, Amarizana, Caouri
         c. Tecua(?)
         d. Molín of Catatumbo and Rio de Oro (?)
      3. Guayupé
         a. Guayupé
         b. Eperigua
         c. Sae

1 Rivet (1924 a, pp. 249–250) does not mention this group in his classification of Arawak languages.
2 Probably identical with the Cabré or Cabrere of the Orinoco.
3 Rivet puts Goajiro, Paressi, and Saraveca of Bolivia, the languages of the upper Xingú, and those of the Orinoco and northern Amazon in the same group.
4 Reichel-Dolmatoff (personal communication) says that, although located in the middle of the Goajira Peninsula, surrounded by Goajiros and always considered as Goajiran, the Cosina are not Goajiro and do not speak Arawakan.
5 See separate article on “Tairona and Chimila” in the Chibchan section. Reichel-Dolmatoff (personal communication) believes that the Chimila are Arawakan; if so, the Tairona probably were also.
6 W. Lehmann (1920) considers Caquetio as Chibchan, related to Betoi.
7 W. Schmidt (1926) classifies Amarizana as Carib.
8 Reichel-Dolmatoff (personal communication) says that, although the Molín of the Sierra de Perijá are pure Cariban, those of Catatumbo and Rio de Oro are very different and seem to be Arawakan, though the linguistic materials are very scarce.
Arawakan Classification—Continued

I. Northern—Continued

B. Northwestern—Continued

4. Piapoco (Dzase)
   a. Piapoco
   b. Cabre (Caberre)
   c. Mitua

II. Northern Amazon

A. Arawak
   1. Arawak
   2. Araua

B. Palicur
   1. Palicur
   2. Marawan

C. Rio Branco
   1. Wapishana (Wapiana, Wapityan)
      a. Wapishana
      b. Amariba
   2. Atorat (Dauri)
      a. Atorat
      b. Mapidian (Mayopityan)

D. Orinoco Group

1. Guinau (Quinhao, Inao)
   a. Guaniare

2. Maipure
3. Mawacuá
4. Yanitera (Paraene, Yavita)

E. Indeterminate Group

1. Baniva
   a. Avani
   b. Quirruba

2. Baré
   a. Baré
   b. Baraúna

3. Arekena (Warekena)
4. Cariaya

---

9 Related to and probably identical with the Cabre of the Insular Group.
10 Most of the languages below are listed by Gillin (Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 801-804). A few are added from other sources. Quite a number given by Gillin are here omitted. Turumé and Parasien are considered later herein. In addition to those that Gillin admits to be of questionable Arawak affinities—Apirua, Aramisho, Macapa, Marourioux, Pinó, Purui, Tucayen—other authorities doubt three more. Nimuendajú leaves Arekena unclassified, Rivet considers Parauana as Cariban, and Nimuendajú believes Parauana to be Cariben.
12 This group contains only those languages that Rivet (1924 a) and W. Schmidt (1926) place in their Orinoco Group and Loukotka (1935) in his Guiana Group, except for Guinau which Loukotka places in the present Group C, the Rio Branco languages.
13 Gilij (1780-84) applied the name Maipure to the Arawak family.
14 Consisting of languages placed by Schmidt (1926) in his Orinoco Group, by Rivet (1924 a) in his Northern Amazon Group.
15 Baníca is a generic term employed for all Arawak-speaking groups in the Northwest Amazon region. The larger number of so-called Baníca languages are listed in the Rio Negro Group and the entire bibliography is therein.
16 Distinguish Baré from Bolivian Bauré.
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Arawakan Classification—Continued

II. Northern Amazon—Continued

F. Rio Negro Group

1. Izaneni (Baniva) Division
   b. Catapolitani (Kadaupuritana)
   c. Cawu-Tapuya (Maulieni)
   d. Cuati (Costi-Tapuya, Capité-Minanei)
   e. Huhuteni (Hohodene)
   f. Mapanai (Ira-Tapuya)
   g. Moriwene (Sucuriu-Tapuya)
   h. Payualiene (Payaorini, Pacú-Tapuya)
   i. Siusi (Walipéri-Tapuya): Ipeca-Tapuya (Cumata-Minanei)
   j. tapiira

2. Miriliparaná Division
   a. Cawayari (Karyarl)
   b. Matapi
   c. Yucuna
   d. Menimehe

3. Mawaca Division
   a. Adzaneni (Tatu-Tapuya)
   b. Mandawaca
   c. Masaco
   d. Yabaana

4. Tariana Division
   a. Tariana
   b. Itayaine (Iyaine)

5. Yapurá Division A
   a. Wainumá (Uainumá)
   b. Mariaté

6. Yapurá Division B 17
   a. Cayuishana (Cawishana)
   b. Pasé (Passé)
   c. Yumana (Chimana)
   d. Manao
   e. Aruaki

7. Wiriná 18 (Uirína)

III. Pre-Andine 19

A. Amazonian

1. Marawa 20

2. Waraciú (Araiku, Uraicu, Wareku)

17 Loukotka (1935) separates the Yapura Group as generally accepted, and places the last three languages in a separate group as “Languages mixed with Macú.”
18 * W. Schmidt (1926) distinguishes between the Pre-Andine (Montaña) and the Juruá-Purus languages, but his division of these is greatly at variance from that of Métraux and Steward (q. v.) generally accepted herein. Loukotka (1935) considers them all as Pre-Andine. The division is probably purely a geographical one, with border-line instances; linguistically probably all fall together. The Pre-Andine languages are said to differ little from those of the North Amazon. (See Rivet and Tastevin, 1919-24.)
20 Distinguish from Marawan of Guiana.
III. Pre-Andine—Continued

B. Cutinana Group
1. Cutinana
2. Cuniba
3. Cujisenayeri (Cujigeneri, Cushtineri)

C. Jurua-Purus
1. Canamari
2. Catukina
3. Catiana
4. Inapari
5. Ipurinã (Hypurina)
   a. Cangutu
   b. Casharã
6. Maniteneri
7. Wainamari (Uainamari)

D. Montaña (Chuncho)
1. Campa
   a. Anti
   b. Antaniri (Unconino)
   c. Camatica
   d. Campa (Atiri)
   e. Catongo
   f. Chicheren
   g. Chonta
   h. Kimbiri
   i. Kirinairi
   j. Pangoa
   k. Tampa
   l. Ugunichiri
   m. Unini
2. Piro
   a. Manatinavo
   b. Chontakiro
   c. Simirinch
   d. Upatarinavo
3. Machiguenga (Amachengué)
4. Masco
5. Sirineri
6. Wachipairi (Huachipari)
7. Puncuri
8. Pucpacuri

IV. South
A. Bolivia
1. Bolivia
   a. Mojo (Mozo): Muchojeone
   b. Bauré
2. Chiquito
   a. Paiconeca, Paunaca

---

**Footnotes:**

11 Distinguish from Panoan Conibo.
12 Distinguish from Panoan and from Cutukin Canamari or Canamare.
13 Distinguish from Cutukina “family.”
14 Formerly considered an independent family by Chamberlain (1913 a) and Brinton (1891 a).
15 Aza (1935) writes of the “Arasaire or Masheo.” The former are generally regarded as Panoan.
Arawakan Classification—Continued

IV. South—Continued

B. Paresi 26 (Arití)

1. Cashinití
   a. Waimaré

2. Iranké 27
   a. Sacuríu-iná
   b. Tahuru-iná
   c. Timaltíá

3. Cozárini
   a. Wild Cabishi
   b. Paresí-Cabishi
   c. Mahibarez

C. Saraveca

D. Paraná 28

1. East: Guana 29 (Chuala, Chaná)
   a. Layaná (Niguecademígi)
   b. Tereno
   c. Echoaladi (Echenoana, Chararana)
   d. Kinikinao (Equiniquino)

2. West: Chané 30
   a. Izocoño

E. Xingú

1. Xingú
   a. Mehinacú
   b. Yaulapiti (Jaulapiti)
   c. Custenau (Kustenahú)
   d. Waurú (Uaure)

26 Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 349, ftn. 1) says that Paresí is closer to Mehinacú than to Moju.
28 Many of these groups, such as the Layaná, Tereno, Kinikinao, and probably some others have abandoned their former Arawak speech and now speak Guaiçurú. They are, therefore, properly placed under Guaiçurú in some classificatory systems.
30 See following article on “Chané and Chaná.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General and unidentified.—Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Brinton, 1869 a, 1871; Chamberlain, 1913 b; Farabee, 1918 b; Goeje, 1928 b, 1929-30; Gumilla, 1745; Koch-Grünberg, 1911, pp. 33-153, 203-282; Perea y Alonso, 1937, 1938 a, 1942; Quandt, 1807, 1900; Roth, 1924; Schmidt, M., 1917; Schuller, 1919-20 a; Schultz, 1850 T.; 1850; Tello, 1913 b; Williams, J., 1924.

Insular.—Adelung and Vater, 1806-17 (Haiti); Goeje, 1939; Martius, 1867, 2:314-319 (Cuba, Haiti); Tastevin, 1919.

Goajiro.—Candelier, 1893; Celedón, 1878; Isaacs, 1884; Jahn, 1914, 1927, pp. 355-376; Marcano, 1890 b; Oramas, 1913 a, 1918 a; Tello, 1913 b; Uteaga, 1895.

Parauhano.—Jahn, 1914, 1927, pp. 190-197; Oramas, 1918 a, 1918 b.

Caquetio.—Jahn, 1927, pp. 199-223.

Achagua.—Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Alemany y Bolufer, 1929 a, 1929 b; Gilij, 1780-84, p. 346; Jahn, 1927, pp. 377-378; Oramas, 1916.

Piapoco.—Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 242-249; Koch-Grünberg, 1928, pp. 287-301; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 85-95.

Cabre.—Gumilla, 1745; Roth, 1924.
Arawak.—Brinton, 1871; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882; Ferreira-Penna, 1881 (Aruan); Goede, 1928 a; Martius, 1867, 2:307-311; Mordini, 1935 (Aur'an); Penard, T. E., 1926-27; Stahel, 1944; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 333-335.

Palicur-Marawán.—Martius, 1867, 2:324; Nimuendajú, 1926; Rivet and Reuburg, 1921.


Yavitero and Orinoco Group.—Adelung and Vater, 1806-17 (Maipure); Chaffanjon, 1889 (Guinao); Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882; Gilij, 1780-84, pp. 185-90, 202-13, 375-82 (Maipure); Koch-Grunberg, 1909-10, 1928 (Guinao); Loukotka, 1929-30, p. 85; Martius, 1867, 2:312-313 (Guinao); Montolie, 1882, pp. 251-254; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 63-74.

Baré Group.—Chaffanjon, 1889, pp. 330-333; Chamberlain, 1910 a (Cariaya); Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 251-252; Koch-Grunberg, 1909-10, pp. 56-153 (Baré, Warekena), 1913, p. 455 (Arcuana), 1928, pp. 246-257 (Arcuana), pp. 272-278; Martius, 1867, 2:230-231, 285-286, 231-232 (Cariay); Montolie, 1882, 1895; Nimuendajú, 1931-32, pp. 592-595 (Baré, Warekena); Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 63-84 (Baré, Warekena); Tello, 1913 b.

Baniva.—Chaffanjon, 1889, pp. 337-341; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 253-255; Gumilla, 1745; Koch-Grunberg, 1909-10; La Grasserie, 1892; Martius, 1867, 2: 261-263; Montolie, 1882, pp. 276-280; Nimuendajú, 1931-32, pp. 590-592; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 53-62.

Baniva-Tapuya Group.—Cardona Puiz, 1945 (Karro); Koch-Grunberg, 1909-10, 1911, pp. 56-153, 203 (Carutana, Katapolitani, Siusi); Nimuendajú, 1931-32, pp. 596-618 (Karitana, Kadaupuritana, Moriwene, Walleri-Dakenai, Hohodene, Mapanaï, Mailieni, Payualiene, Kumada-Mnanei, Kapiti-Mnanei); Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 76-84 (Karitana); Wallace, 1853.


Wainumá-Mariaté.—Martius, 1867, 2: 245-249, 266-268; Wallace, 1853.

Yapura Group.—Brinton, 1892 a (Manao); Martius, 1867, 2: 221-222 (Manao), 229 (Uirina), 250-252 (Jumana), 254-256 (Passé), 257-260 (Cauizana).

Marawa-Waracú.—Martius, 1867, 2: 223-225, 233-234.


Jurú-Purús.—Chandler, 1866 (Canamari, Maniteneni); Martius, 1867, 2: 161-163 (Catukina), 235-268 (Canamari); Rivet, 1920 b (Catukina); Rivet and Taste-vin, 1919-24; Stiglich, 1908 (Inapari).

Ipuríná.—Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 188; Chandler, 1866, p. 118; Ehrenreich, 1897 b; Koch-Grunberg, 1914-19; Nuñaser-Aspot, 1890, p. 795; Polak, 1894; Steere, 1903, pp. 378-380; Tello, 1913 b.

Campa-Antí.—Adam, 1890 b; Cardus, 1886, p. 325; Carrasco, 1901, pp. 205-211; Castelnaul, 1852, pp. 290-291; Delgado, E., 1890-97; Farabee, 1922, pp. 21-52; Mareoy, 1875, 1: 548; Pauly, 1928, p. 151; Reich, 1903, p. 135; Sala, G., 1905-06; Steine, 1906; Tello, 1913 b; Tessmann, 1930, p. 83; Touchaux, 1908; Weiner, 1880.

Machiguenga.—Anonymous, 1933 d; Aza, 1923, 1924 a, 1924 b, 1924 c, 1933 a; Rosell, 1916.

Masco.—Aza, 1935; Farabee, 1922, pp. 77–78.

Mojo-Bauré.—Adam and Leclerc, 1880 (Baurét); Adelung and Vater, 1806–17 (Mojo); Cardus, 1886, pp. 317–318; Magio, 1880 (Baurét); Marban, 1894 (Mojo); Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 51–50; Pauly, 1928, pp. 157–158; Tello, 1913 b.

Paiconeca-Paunaca.—Cardus, 1886, pp. 319–320, 327; Pauly, 1928, pp. 164–166.


Saraveca.—Cardus, 1886, p. 327; Pauly, 1928, pp. 164–166; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 c.

Paraná Region.—Bach, 1916; Baldus, 1937 (both Tereno); Boggiani, 1896; Castelnau, 1852, pp. 274–276; Martius, 1867, 2: 129–131; Schmidt, M., 1903 (all Guaná); Taunay, 1866, pp. 131–148.

Xingú Group.—Steinen, 1886, pp. 357–360 (Custenau); 1894, pp. 523–532 (Mehinacú, Yaulapiti, Custenau Waura).

CHANÉ AND CHANÁ

The name Chané is applied especially to several small isolated enclaves of Arawak-speaking peoples, the southernmost Arawak groups. It is, however, unfortunately, frequently confused with Chaná. Thus Brinton (1891 a) lists the Chané among the Charrúa (q. v.) tribes of Uruguay; these are today known as Chaná (q. v.). It was probably this analogy that led Perea y Alonso (1942) to claim the Charrúa to be Arawak. On the other hand, certain Arawak groups, especially the Layáná, seem to be known as Chaná. Guaná is probably a term related to Chaná.

LANGUAGES OF PROBABLE ARAWAKAN AFFINITIES

ARAUÁ GROUP

The nature and composition of the group of Arauá languages are much disputed. Brinton (1891 a, p. 293) made an Arauá stock, composed of Arauá, Pama, Pammary, and Purupurú. Loukotka, in his 1935 classification, also proposed an Arauá family, but made it composed of Arauá, Yamamadí, and Pammari; however, in 1939 he put the group back under Arawak and added the languages Kulina and Madiha. Nimuendajú (map) accepts Yamamadí, Pammary-Purupurú, Yuberí, and Kulina as Arawak but refuses to classify Arauá, Sewacu, Pama, and Pamana. Rivet (1924 a) includes all these in his Arauá group of Arawak, and considers the languages to fall with

---

17 The Arawakan Arauá must be distinguished from a small Panoan group on the Madre de Dios River and from several other groups with somewhat similar names.
the Guand-Tereno-Layaná group of Paraguay. The following classification is, therefore, very tentative:

Arauá Group

1. Arauá
2. Culino
   a. Culina
   b. Curia
   c. Curiana
   d. Culiña
3. Pama
   a. Pama
   b. Panama
4. Yamamadi
   a. Yamamadi: Capaná, Capinamari, Colo
   b. Purupurú: Paumari (Pammari)
   c. Yuberi
5. Madihá
6. Sevacu
7. Sipó

Bibliography.—Carvalho, 1929, 1931, pp. 246–248 (Culina); Chandlees, 1866, p. 118 (Paumari), 1869, p. 311 (Arauá); Ehrenreich, 1897 b (Pammari, Yamamadi); Rivet and Tastevin, 1938–40; Steere, 1903, pp. 386–387 (Yamamadi), 390–393 (Paumari).

APOLISTA OR LAPACHU

Chamberlain (1910 a) established an independent Apolistan family, based on early data. Crequi-Montfort and Rivet (1913 d) joined this to the Pre-Andine group of Arawak, mainly on the basis of a small vocabulary collected by Nordenskiöld from one of the last speakers. This classification has been accepted by all recent authorities. Loukotka (1935) finds vestiges of Leco in the language which was known as Lapachu (Lapaču, Lapatšu) and has now been replaced by Quechua. The Apolista may be descendants of the Aguachile (Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 506).

Bibliography.—Cardus, 1886; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 179–180; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 d; Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 29–30; Nordenskiöld, 1905; d’Orbigny, 1839, pp. 173–174.

AMUESHA


The Arawak affiliations of Amuesha are questioned. Chamberlain (1913 a) considered it an independent family, the Lorenzan. Tello (1913 b) first suggested its Arawak affinities, but despite this Rivet (1924 a) preferred to classify it as independent. Loukotka (1935) places Amoiše with the Pre-Andine Arawak; Tessman (1930) sees Tupí elements in a mainly Arawakan language. Jijón y Caamaño
(1941–43) gives it independent status as a phylum. Steward and Métraux herein (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 536) call the Amuesha "linguistically similar to the Campa"; this statement does not seem to be borne out by the evidence. Mr. Louis Rankin writes (personal correspondence) from personal acquaintance, that, "The Amuesha to the west of the Campa are said to be a subtribe, but their language is quite different." They have for some time spoken Quechua. The Lorenzo and Panatawa are, or were probably related.

**Bibliography.**—Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 191 (Lorenzan); Farabee, 1922; Izaiguirre, 1927–29; Sala, G., 1897, 1905–06; Tello, 1913 b; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 367–368, 617.

**TUCUNA** (Tikuna)

Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 713) advances arguments for his opinion that, following Chamberlain (1910 a) and Tessmann (1930), Tucuna should be considered independent or isolated, not placed under Arawak, following Rivet (1912 b, 1924 a), who thinks it a very altered Arawakan tongue. However, W. Schmidt (1926), Krickeberg (1922), Loukotka (1935), and Igualada and Castellvi (1940) accept the Arawakan connection. Loukotka thinks it is mixed with Mura and Tucano.

**Bibliography.**—Brinton, 1892 a, pp. 7–20; Castelnau, 1852, pp. 298–299; Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 198; Marcoy, 1875, p. 379; Martius, 1867, 2:159–161 (Tecuna); Nimuendajú, 1931–32, pp. 573–580 (Tikuna); Rivet, 1912 b; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 564–565, 617 (Tikuna).

**TARUMÁ**

Tarumá has been generally classed as an Arawakan language (Rivet, 1924 a; Loukotka, 1935; W. Schmidt, 1926; Gillin, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 803), but Nimuendajú (map) places it among his isolated languages; this opinion is apparently based on no new published data. If Arawakan, it is apparently an unusually variant form, since Loukotka (1935) puts it in a subgroup of its own as a mixed language (other element not stated), and with vestiges of Camacán; the latter is most doubtful. Rivet (1924 a) states that it was related to the extinct Paravien.

**Bibliography.**—Farabee, 1918 b, pp. 135–138, 277–283.

**TACANA**

Synonyms: Takana, Tecand.

There are three linguistic groups in northwestern South America known by variations of the *t-k-n* phonetic combination; with the inevitable vowel modifications they are, therefore, liable to confusion. The standard spellings of these three tribes are Tacana, Tucuna or
Tikuna, and Tucano; each has been formerly accorded independent position.

The linguistic position of the Tacana group is a most uncertain and controversial question, and one that will require much intensive study for a definitive opinion. Tacana was accorded independent status by the early authorities, Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a). As a result of an exhaustive comparative study, Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1921–23) put it under Arawak, in which opinion they are followed by Rivet (1924 a), Pericot y García (1936), and Loukotka (1935). W. Schmidt (1926), Krickeberg (1922), K. G. Grubb (1927), and the authors of the monographs in this Handbook wisely prefer to leave it as independent, or at least unclassified and doubtful.

Coterminous with both Panoan and Arawakan languages, the Tacanan languages show resemblances to both; the resemblance to one should be genetic, to the other the result of borrowing. Morphologically, the resemblance is much greater with Panoan, a fact that should carry great weight for genetic connection. Some 65 of the 101 words compared by Rivet are either identical or very similar in Tacanan and Panoan, so similar that the presumption is for recent borrowing, although the words are mainly basic ones, and few are in modernistic categories. Of the 101 words compared, 60 occur in only one language, or in one small group of languages, either Panoan or Tacanan, and are, therefore, presumably not original in these stocks; another 17 seem to be common also to Arawakan, leaving only 24 really pertinent cases.

Regarding the Arawakan resemblances, since 25 Tacanan vocabularies are compared with 65 Arawakan ones, a large number of fortuitous apparent resemblances would be expected; many of them occur in only one language; in many others the meaning is greatly changed. Of the 178 examples only a dozen or so would qualify as apparent certainties, and half of these are of domesticated plants or animals, such as dog, cotton, maize, manioc, and tobacco. No rules of sound change are suggested and none are apparent. The genetic relationship of Tacanan to Arawakan requires much more careful study before it can be accepted. Tacanan has also many words in common with Aymara and Quechua, but these are almost certainly borrowings, mainly from Aymara.

Armentia (1902) gives the names of some 40 subtribes or dialects of Araona, some of which are also found in the table below. Araona and Caviña are inextricably mixed, but some groups are pure Araona, and some pure Caviña. Caviña and Caviñeño are not synonymous, according to Rivet, and the latter not a subdivision of Araona. Rivet also does not group Guacanagua, Sapibocona, or Maropa with any other languages. He distinguishes between Toromona and Turamona, the
latter a Tacana subgroup. There are no data on Guacanahua, but the Tacana affinities are vouched for by Cardus (1886) and Nordenskiöld (1905). The extinct Sapibocona are probably the same as the Maropa. Rivet considers Chiragua a subgroup of Tacana. Some of the Arasa speak Tacanan, but the group is really Southwestern Pano (Arasaire), and is also classified under Pano; the habitat is the same. Nordenskiöld’s (1905) Arasa vocabulary is Tacanan; Llosa’s (1906) Arasaire vocabulary, Pano.

Brinton (1891 a) also gives as subtribes Equari, Samachuane, Carangue, Hucumano, and Torococy, which Rivet claims cannot with certainty be identified with Tacanan, as being extinct without recorded data, or known by other names.

No one has attempted to subdivide the Tacana group or to classify the component languages on a scientific linguistic basis. The following table incorporates the opinions of all authorities consulted, and greatly contravenes none.

### Tacana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Araona Arauna, Arahuna)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Capachene (Kapaheni)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caviña (Kavina)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cavineño</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mabenaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Machui (Machuvi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Arasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Chirigua (Chiriba, Tširigua, Tširiba)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chumana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maropa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sapibocona (Sapiboka)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Guariza (Guaziza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Tacana (Takana, Tucana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ayaychuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Babayana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chiliwo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chivamona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Idiama, Isiama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Paimaino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pasaramona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sapuruna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sitiama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tumapasa or Maracani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Turamona (Toromona)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Uchupiamona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Yabaypura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Yubamona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Tiatinagua (Tambopata-Guarayo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Guacanahua (Guanacanahua, Guarayo ¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Distinguish from Tupi-Guarani Guarayo (Huaraya, Guaraya, etc.; some of the bibliographical references there noted possibly apply here instead, or vice versa).
Tacana—Continued

F. Tiatinagua (Tambopata-Guarayo)—Continued

2. Chama
3. Baguaja (Baguajairi)
4. Chunchu
5. Echoja
6. Huanayo
7. Kinaki
8. Mohino

G. Yamaluba

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(For full bibliography to that date, see Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1921-23.)

Adelung and Vater, 1806-17 (Sapibocona); Armentia, 1888, 1902, 1904; Aza, 1928, 1930-32 (Huaraya); Brinton, 1892 a, pp. 7-21; Cardus, 1886, pp. 311 (Tacana), 414-415 (Maropa); Farabee, 1922, pp. 154-161 (Tiatinagua), 163-164 (Mabenaro); Giacone, 1939; Gilij, 1902; Groeteken, 1907; Heath, E., 1883 (Tacana, Maropa); Hoeller, 1932 a, 1932 b (Guarayo); Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 30-45; Nordenskiöld, 1905, pp. 275-276 (Arasa), 1911 b, pp. 235-239 (Maropa); Pauly, 1928, pp. 121-124 (Tacana), 130-131 (Maropa), 133-134 (Cavina), 147 (Guacanagua); Schuller, 1933; Teza, 1868, pp. 117-143 (Guarisa).

LANGUAGES OF POSSIBLE ARAWAKAN RELATIONSHIPS

TUYUNERI

The most recent compilers, Nimuendajú (map and index) and Loukotka (1935), prefer the spelling Tuyoneri to the standard Tuyuneri. This group is of later and less generally accepted standing than Itonama, Canichana, Cayuwana, Movima, and Yurucare (q. v.) in this region, and distant from them; it was discovered by Nordenskiöld (1906) in the early years of this century. Tuyumiri, assigned by Brinton (1891 a) to Tacanan, is probably an orthographical error; it is not mentioned by Chamberlain (1910 a, 1913 a). Markham (1910) identifies the Tuyuneri with the Chunchos, a generic name for Indians of the Montaña and hence a meaningless association. Rivet (1924 a), Pericot y García (1936), Loukotka (1935), and Nimuendajú (map and index) accept it as an independent family or as isolated; Loukotka sees vestiges of Panoan in it. However, Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 541) place it unequivocally among the Arawakan groups.

Bibliography.—Nordenskiöld, 1905, pp. 275-276.

JIRAJARA

Not mentioned by earlier writers, Jirajara has been accorded independent position by Rivet (1924 a), Loukotka (1935), and some other recent authorities. W. Schmidt (1926) follows Oramas (1916) in considering it related to Arawak, which may well be found to be
the case when more scientific studies are made on its vocabulary and grammar. Hernández de Alba (Handbook, vol. 4, p. 469) dogmatically states that "the Jirajara ... speak an Arawakan language (Oramas, 1916)." The most recent opinion, however, that of Febres Cordero (1942) is that it is not Arawakan, though containing many Arawak words, probably borrowed. Also about 10 percent of the words seem to show Chibchan connections. The Ajágua, given as a component language, may be synonymous with the Acharsa, generally considered as Arawak. They may, however, be a separate group. The Cuiba, probably distinct from the Guahibo group of the same name, may be an Ajagua dialect.

Jirajara

1. Gayón (Cayon)
2. Ayomán
3. Xagua
   a. Cuiba (?)
4. Jirajara


Jívaro

The Jívaro family has always been known by orthographic variants of this name, such as Xívaro and Chiwaro; it is probably a corruption of Shuara or Shiwora, their own term. The resemblance to the name of a neighboring family, Záparo, may be significant, but no genetic relationship with the latter has been suggested. The name apparently became used to imply a wild rustic person and is applied in Puerto Rico to the native countryfolk of the interior mountains. They must be distinguished from the Cawapanan Chébero (Xébero) and from the Híbito. The language is still spoken by some thousands of Indians, but several groups have adopted Quechua.

Except for a few borrowed words, Jívaro seems to have nothing in common with Quechua, Tupían, Cawapanan, Záparoan, or Panoan. There are, however, a large number of apparent correspondences with Arawakan, the resemblance with Campa being especially strong. This may possibly be due to borrowing, especially since there are some important morphological differences. Beuchat and Rivet (1909–10) hesitatingly decided to place Jívaro in the Arawakan family, but in his later classification (1924 a) Rivet again gave it independent status, in which he has been followed by all other authorities except W. Schmidt (1926). J. P. Harrington (personal correspondence), however, believes that the Arawak resemblances are genetic and that Jívaro is a very divergent form of Arawak.

Jívaro is said to be clear and harmonious. The phonetic pattern is more like that of Amazonian than that of Andean languages. There
is a quasi-inflection, that is, terminal changes or suffixes for person and tense. Mechanism for pluralization is absent, and there is no trace of gender. Both classificatory prefixes and suffixes are found, and postpositions. Monosyllables are rare, and accent unimportant.

There may be said to be but one Jivaro language, relatively homogeneous, but very many dialects. Apparently no attempt has ever been made to subdivide the language, or to group the dialects. The subdivisions as generally given are presumably political and geographic, but the presumption is that the linguistic division would be roughly similar.

**Jívaro**

I. **Jívaro**

A. **Shuara**

1. Aguaruna
   a. Alapico
   b. Indanza
   c. Iransa
   d. Maranza
   e. Santiago
   f. Patocuma
   g. Chiguasa
   h. Yuganza

2. Wambisa
   a. Uambisa
   b. Cherembo
   c. Chirapa
   d. Chivando
   e. Candoa
   f. Cangaima
   g. Mangosisa

3. Achuale
   a. Capawari
   b. Copatasia
   c. Machine
   d. Pindu
   e. Wampoya

4. Antipa

5. Maca
   a. Walakisa
   b. Zamora
   c. Pintuc
   d. Ayuli
   e. Morona
   f. Miazal

6. Upano

7. Bolona

8. Bracamoro (Pacamuru)

B. **Palla**

1. Malacata

---

BIBLIOGRAPHY
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URU-CIPAYA-PUKINA

The relationship of Uru (Uro) and Pukina (Puquina) to Arawakan is quite illogical. The Uru-Puquina inhabit the region of Lakes Titicaca and Poopó in Bolivia, about the highest, coldest, and most inhospitable area in South America; the majority of the Arawak languages are in the Tropic lowland forested regions. The evidence advanced for the affiliation (Tello, 1913 b; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1921, 1925-27) falls far short of proof, but it has been accepted by practically all the recent authorities on classification: W. Schmidt (1926), Pericot y García (1936), Loukotka (1935), Jijón y Caamaño (1943), etc. The relationship was first suggested by Tello (1913 b), the data for proof presented by Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1925-27). Several of the “Handbook” authors (see La Barre, Handbook, vol. 2, p. 575), including the present one, consider the evidence advanced insufficient, doubt the connection, and think that the data should be reviewed. Dr. J. P. Harrington, however, is convinced of its validity. Uhle (1896) suggested a relationship to Yunca-Mochica, and Loukotka (1935) calls them mixed languages, with vestiges of Pano and Mose-tene. Many writers believe that the present Uru group is but a tiny remnant of a very early or autochthonous population that once occupied a much larger region, extending to, and including a large area on, the Pacific Coast. (See Jijón y Caamaño, 1941-43, map 3.) If the result of an Arawak migration, it was probably the first of these.

Three languages, Uru, Pukina, and Chipaya, are ordinarily placed in this group. The published vocabularies, however, show such differentiation that even the interrelationship of these is not beyond question. Uhle (1896), Polo (1901), and Boman (1908) believed Pukina and Uru distinct, and Chamberlain (1910 a, 1913 a) distinguished Puquinan and Uran families. Posnansky (1915) considers Chipayan an independent family distinct from the others. La Barre (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 575) says that the Uru “call their language
Puquina,” but that the Uru language “is not the same as the Puquina-Uro of La Granserie (1894).”

The data on the Uru group of languages seem to be exclusively lexical; grammatical material is a great desideratum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Bacarreza, 1910, pp. 477-480; Barcena, MS. Basadre, M., 1884, pp. 196-205; Brinton, 1890 (all Puquina); Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 196-197, 200, 1910 b; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1921, 1925-27; Franco Inojosa, 1937; La Granserie, 1894 (Puquina); Métraux, 1936 a, 1936 b; Polo, 1901, p. 456; Posnansky, 1915, 1918 (both Chipaya), 1931, 1934; Tello, 1913 b; Uhle, 1896.

OCHOSUMA

Ochosuma or Uchuzuma may be a dialect of Uru, but had best be left with the unclassified languages.

CHANGO AND COAST URU

Insufficient data are available to classify Chango, an extinct language of miserable fishermen on the Chilean coast. As probable remnants of an early archaic population, an independent language is not unlikely, but this possibility is insufficient to justify the establishment of a separate family for them as Chamberlain (1913 a) did. The only data seem to be place and personal names, and the statement that they spoke a language different from their neighbors. Different opinions have placed them with the Atacameño, Chono, and Alacaluf. The most recent and thorough studies link them with the Uru (q.v.) of the Bolivian lakes, which linguistic group Rivet believes to be of Arawakan affinities. The argument is apparently based mainly on the fact that some groups adjacent to the Chango were known as Uru, and on a comparison of Chango names with Bolivian Uru. It is probable that the name Uru was applied to a number of nonrelated linguistic groups, just as the Lacandon in Chiapas are locally called “Caribs,” and Puerto Rican countryfolk “Jivaros,” and the existence of a group of true Uru on the Chilean coast is unlikely. At any rate the sources do not equate Chango and Uru. The suggestion that the Bolivian Uru had seasonal fishing colonies on the coast is improbable. Brand (1941 c) distinguishes between the Northern Chango or Uru, whom he believes to be linguistically Uran, and the Southern or True Chango, sometimes wrongly termed Uru, who were of unknown language. (See Handbook, vol. 2, pp. 575, 595-597.)

Bibliography.—Boman, 1908; Brand, 1941 c; Chamberlain, 1910 a; Cúneo Vidal, 1913; Garcilaso de la Vega, 1723; Knoche, 1931; Latcham, 1910; Lozano-Machuca, 1885; Santa Cruz, 1913.
CARIBAN

The Carib is one of the great linguistic families of South America, both in number of component languages and dialects and in extent, which is only less than that of the Arawak and Tupi. Carib languages are (or were) found from the Greater Antilles to central Mato Grosso, and from eastern Perú to central Pará. Cariban and Arawakan groups have much the same distribution, but isolated Carib groups are much fewer. The great mass of the Cariban are north of the Amazon, occupying a great area that includes much of the Guianas, Venezuela, northern Brazil, and lowland Colombia. Nevertheless, the point of origin and dispersion is claimed to have been the region between the upper Xingú and the Tapajóz.

Suggestions have been made that Carib and Arawak may eventually be tied up in one great phylum. Schuller (1919-20 a, 1928) proposed the further inclusion of Chibcha and Maya. Though comparative studies on the Carib languages have been made by Adam (1893) and De Goeje (1910), the classification of the many Carib languages is still to be done on a thorough linguistic basis, and those proposed are mainly arranged geographically. Rivet (1924 a), W. Schmidt (1926), Loukotka (1935), and Simpson (1940) have offered such classifications, with major and minor subdivisions. Those of Schmidt and Simpson are the most detailed and have been here adopted as a basis, incorporating also some of the opinions of the others as well as those of Gillin and the other Handbook authors. Disagreements are, on the whole, few and minor.

In addition to many languages, mostly extinct, on which data are insufficient and the classification, therefore, in doubt, there are several large groups whose Carib affiliation is questioned. One such is the Yagua-Peba group (q. v.), long considered independent and so still regarded by Loukotka (1935) and Nimuendajú (index) but accepted as Cariban by W. Schmidt (1926) and Simpson (1940) on the basis of Rivet (1911 b). Rivet (1943) has also presented cogent arguments for the inclusion of Chocó (q. v.) and many other languages of Colombia formerly considered as affiliated with Chibcha (q. v.).

In the Guiana-Venezuela region, Gillin (Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 804–813) lists some 80 tribes—and presumably dialects—that he considers of Cariban affinity, as well as some 30 more, probably all extinct, that are unquestionably Carib. Most of these are small groups, many of them mentioned by no other authority except Nimuendajú, who includes them on his map. Not all of these groups will be listed here again. Among those considered as Cariban by Gillin, and this affiliation not disputed by others, are:

Acuria, Cashuena, Chikena, Cuacua (Mapoyo), Gabinairi, Heurá, Kirikiripec, Panare, Paraviyana, Puricoto (Catawian), Saluma, Terecumá, Tivericoto, Tonayena, Waivai.
Other Cariban groups of undisputed relationship mentioned by Nimuendajú, Loukotka, and others, but not by Gillin, are:

Azumara, Carib of Maturin, Mutuan, Wayewe, Zurumata.

A number of Guiana groups, considered as Cariban by Gillin and others, are left unclassified by Nimuendajú, probably for lack of sufficient linguistic data. Among these are:

Acokwa, Aracaret (Racalef), Ichu, Nourage (Norak), Parikt, Piriio (Apouroui), Pishauco, Sapai (Suppaye), Taira, Wai (Ouaye), Waikeri (Guaiqueri), Wayaculé (Oyaricoulet, Amibouane (?)), and Yapaoye.

The Carib affinities of the following groups are disputed, mainly by Nimuendajú:

Attaraya.—Given by Gillin both as Cariban and as a synonym of Arawakan Atorai.

Asepangong.—Nimuendajú apparently considers Arawakan.

Cariniac. — Remarks same as for Serecong.

Pavishana (Paushiana).—Cariban according to Nimuendajú and Loukotka; Arawakan according to Gillin and Rivet.

Serecong.—Arawakan according to Nimuendajú; generally considered Cariban.

Yao.—Cariban according to most; Nimuendajú believes Arawakan or unclassified.


CARIB CLASSIFICATION

I. Northern

A. Coastal

1. Insular

Carib, Calino

2. Mainland

a. Carib: Caribisi, Calinya, Galibi
b. Cumanagoto
c. Palank (Palenque, Guarine)
d. Pariagoto (Paria, Guayuno)
e. Oyana (Upurui, Wayana): Rucuyen, Urucuiana
f. Chacopata
g. Piritu
h. Cunewara
i. Shiparicot, Chipa
j. Core
k. Chaima (Sayma, Warapiche): Tagare, Cuaga
l. Carinapagoto

B. Central

1. Roraima Group

a. Acawai: Patamona
b. Purucoto (Porocoto)
c. Arecura (Jaricuna, Pemon): Camaracoto, Taulipang

---

1 Loukotka (1939 a) distinguishes Parukatu from Purukoto.
2 Nimuendajú lists an Arawakan Areuna in the same region.

10 Loukotka distinguishes Wayewe, Wayaway, and Vayamar.
Carib Classification—Continued

I. Northern—Continued

B. Central—Continued

1. Roraima Group—Continued
   d. Arinagoto
   e. Macushi (Macusi): Teweya
   f. Waica
   g. Ingarićó
   h. Sapará
   i. Wayumará
   j. Paraviyana
   k. Kenóloco
   l. Monoicó
   m. Azumara
   n. Paushiana
   o. Mapoyo
   p. Taparito

2. Ventuari Group
   a. Makiritare: Yecuaná (Mayongong), Maitsi, Ihuruaná, Decuaná (Wainungomo), Cunuaná
   b. Yabarana: Curasticana, Wokiare

C. Amazon

1. Eastern
   a. Pianocotó
   b. Apalai: Aracuayu
   c. Waiwai (Ouayeoni)
   d. Pauzi
   e. Trio
   f. Diau
   g. Shikiana (Chikena)
   h. Tivericoto
   i. Catavian (Parucutu)
   j. Cumayena
   k. Urucuena

2. Western
   a. Carijona (Umawa, Omagua): Hianacoto, Guake, Tsahatsa (Saha), Guagua, Riama (?), Caicushana, Mahotdyana, Yacaoyana (?)

D. Bonari

1. Bonari
2. Yauaperí (Crishand)
   a. Atroahy
3. Waimiry
4. Mutuan

1 Distinguish from Shiriand Waica.
2 Rivet (1924 a) believes that the Apalai are identical with the extinct Aracuajú, but the language of the latter seems to be mixed with Tupí, and Loukotka (1935) has put it in an independent subgroup for that reason.
3 Distinguish from Tupian Omagua.
CARIB CLASSIFICATION—Continued

II. Southern

A. South

1. Arara
   a. Arara (Ajujure) 6
   b. Apiacá (Apingui) 7
   c. Pariri (Timirem)

B. Xingú

1. Bacaiirá
2. Nahucua (Anauqua)
   a. Guicurú (Cuicutl)
   b. Apalakiri (Calapala)
   c. Mariape-Nahuqua
   d. Naranute
   e. Yarumá
   f. Yamarikuma
   g. Akuku

III. Northwestern

A. Maracaibo-Magdalena

1. "Motilones" 8
   a. Chaké: Macoa, Tucuco, Pariri, Chaké
   b. Mapé: Macoa, Macoita, Manastara, Yasa, Chapara, Sicacao, Tucuco, Cunaguasata, Maraca, Aguas Blancas, Aricuaisá, Catatumbo, Irapeno
   c. Carale
   d. Zapara 9

2. Bubure (Coronado)

3. Yarigui
   a. QUIRÍQUIRE (KIRIKIRE): Topocoro, Topoya, Chiracota, Araya, Guamaca, Tholomeo

4. Opón

5. Carare 10
   a. Colima (Tapas): Murca, Marpapi, Curipa
   b. Naura
   c. Nauracoto

6. Muso (Muzo)

7. Burede

8. Guanao

9. Pemeno

10. Patagón

11. Camaniba

Distinguish between Panoan, Chapacuran, and Cariban Arara. Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 214) states that the speech of the Arara is very close to that of the Yarumá (vide infra).

Distinguish from Tupian Apiacá of the Tapsjáž.

Motilón classification according to Jahn, 1927, p. 80. Reichel-Dolmatoff (personal communication) states that the Motilón of Perija, of Bolinder and de Bocay, are pure Cariban of the Chaima-Cumanagoto group, but those of Catatumbo and Rio de Oro are very different and seem to be Arawakan, though the linguistic data are scarce.

Hernández de Alba (Handbook, vol. 4, p. 469) calls Zapara Cariban; Rivet (1924 a) considers it Arawakan.

Nimuendajú (map) leaves Carare unclassified. W. Schmidt (1926) places Amarizano in this Northwestern Group; most other authorities consider this language Arawakan (q. v.).
Carib Classification—Continued

B. Chocó
1. Chocó
   a. North
      a. Empera: Funucuná, Dabeibe,11 Urubá
   b. South
      a. Nonamá (Noanumá): Chanco

2. Cenu
   a. Nutabare (Nutabé): Tahamí
   b. Cenufana

3. Cauca
   a. Quimbaya: Quimbaya, Carrapa, Picara, Paucura
   b. Ancerma: Ancerma, Caramanta, Cartama, Nori, Guaca
   c. Antioquia: Antioquia, Buritica, Corome, Eúéjico
   d. Arma: Arma, Pozo

C. Southwest
1. Gorrón
2. Buga
3. Chanco

D. Southeast
1. Arvi
2. Patángoro (Palenque): 12
   a. Tamana
   b. Guarino
   c. Guagua
   d. Zamana
   e. Doyma
3. Panche
   a. Guazquia
   b. Guali
   c. Marqueton
4. Pijao
   a. Quindío
   b. Cutilba
   c. Irico
   d. Toche
   e. Cacataima

11 Rivet, 1943, excludes these from his Chocó group.
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Lehmann, 1920; Rat, 1897–98; Rochefort, 1658 (1667), pp. 652–680; Sapper, 1897; Stoll, 1884, pp. 35–36; Taylor, 1938, 1946.

Coastal Mainland.—Adelung and Vater, 1806–17 (Tamarindo); Coudreau, H., 1887, 2:491–492 (Rucuyen); Coudreau, O., 1903 a (Ouayana, Rucuyen); Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882 (Rucuyen, Galibi); Gilij, 1780–84, pp. 375–389 (Tamanaco); Goeje, 1906 (Upurut); Martius, 1867, 2:327–370 (Galibi); Tavera-Acosta, 1919 (Galibi); Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 325–332, 1921–22 (Tamanaco, Palenque, Guaykeri, Chaima, Chacopata, Piritu).

Cumanagoto.—Platzmann, 1888; Ruiz Blanco, 1888 a, 1888 b, 1892, 7:161–168, 191–228; Tapia, D., 1888; Tauste, 1888 (Chayma, Core, Paría); Yangues, 1888.

Roraima group.—Adam, 1905 (Acawai); Armellada, 1936; Armellada and Matallana, 1942 (Arecuna, Pemon); Barboza-Rodriguez, 1885 (Purucoco); Farabee, 1924 (Purucoco, Azumara); Koch-Grünberg, 1913, 1915, 1928 (Purucoco, Taupi-pang, Ingarico, Sapara, Wayumara); Martius, 1867, 2:227–228 (Paraviyana); Salathel, 1931–32 (Paushiana, Carime); Simpson, 1940 (Camaracoto); Tavera-Acosta, 1907, 1921–22 (Mapoyo, Arecuna, Waiaca).


Eastern Amazon.—Coudreau, H., 1887, pp. 491–492 (Uayeue); Coudreau, O., 1901, pp. 165–168 (Pianacoto); Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 39–40 (Trio); Farabee, 1924 (Waiwai, Urucuena, Trio, Diau, Chikena, Cumayena, Catavian–Parucutu); Martius, 1867, 2:17–18 (Aracayu), 312–313 (Pianacoto, Waiwai, Tivericoto).

Apalai (Aparia, Yauapiri).—Coudreau, H., 1887, 1892, pp. 60–75; Coudreau, O, 1903 b, pp. 41–51; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 32–34; Farabee, 1924, pp. 229–241; Hübener, 1907; Payer, 1906; Rice, 1931.

Western Amazon.—Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 35–38 (Carijona); Koch-Grünberg, 1906 c, p. 203 (Carijona), 1908 c, 1909 (Hianacoto-Umaua).

Bonari group.—Barboza-Rodriguez, 1885, pp. 247–260 (Crishana); Brinton, 1892 a, p. 44 (Bonari); Hübner, 1907, pp. 238–246 (Yauaperi); Payer, 1906, p. 222 (Waimirty); Pompeu Sobrinho, 1936 (Mutuan); Souza, A, 1916 a, pp. 77–78 (Bonari).


Xingú group.—Abreu, 1895, 1938 a (Bacairí); Krause, 1936 (Bacairí, Nahucua, Yaruma); Souza, A, 1916 b, pp. 71–73 (Bacairí); Steinen, 1892, pp. 1–160 (Bacairí), 1994, pp. 524–527 (Nahucua).


Jahn, 1927 (Kirikire, Bubure); Jiménez de la Espada, 1897, pp. 28–30 (Patagón); Lengerke, 1878 a (Opón), 1878 b (Carare); Oramas, 1918 a (Kirikiro).

LANGUAGES OF PROBABLE CARIBAN AFFILIATIONS

Naturally, Cariban relationships have been proposed for several other important linguistic groups and smaller languages by certain
scholars, whose opinions have been accepted by some of their colleagues, rejected by others. Among these are the large Chococan and Peba-Yagua groups, and the smaller languages Yuma, Palmella, Yuri, Pimenteira, and Ochucayana. For discussion of Ochucayana or Tarairiú, see "Small Unclassified Languages of the Pernambuco Region."

**CHOCÓ AND CARIBAN OF COLOMBIA**

Recent researches of Rivet (1943, 1944) and Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) have advanced considerable evidence that many of the languages of Colombia formerly considered as Chibchan are (or were, since many of them are extinct) actually Cariban. These include Chocó and Pijao. They form a relatively solid group in north-western Colombia, separated from the main mass of Carib in eastern Venezuela and Guiana by belts of Arawakan and Caribian peoples paralleling the cordillera to the Caribbean Sea. Rivet divides these into Eastern (Motilón, etc.) and Western (Chocó-Quimbaya) groups, separated by the Pijao-Panche-Patángora. The Cariban affinities of Motilón (q. v.) have always been accepted. The Carib migration here is presumed to have been relatively late and to have supplanted former peoples of Chibchan speech.

The Cariban affinities of Chocó are apparently more obvious and generally accepted than those of the Pijao-Panche-Patángoran, and the Quimbaya. Hernández de Alba (Handbook, vol. 2, p. 922) places the Pijao, Panche, Quimbaya, and Patángora in the Páez subgroup, Talamanca-Barbacoa group of Chibchan. He also states (ibid., p. 923) that the "dialects of Pijao, Páez, Timana, and Yaléón were classed together." Reichel-Dolmatoff (personal communication) considers the Cariban relationship of Chocó (Chami, Catío, Nonoama) as proved, but is less convinced of those of Pijao, Quimbaya, and the other former inhabitants of the Magdalena and Cauca Valleys.

**Cuna** and Chocó are linked culturally and by inference linguistically in the Handbook (vol. 4, pp. 257–276).

Chocó has generally been considered an independent family (Brinton, 1891 a; Chamberlain, 1913 a; Loukotka, 1935; Pericot y García, 1936; Rivet, 1924 a; Ortíz, 1940 b). Mainly on account of the large number of Chibcha words, W. Lehmann (1920), followed by W. Schmidt (1926), believed it to be related to Chibcha. W. Lehmann (1920) thought it intermediate between the Barbacoan and the Central American groups of Chibcha. Jiménez Moreno (map, 1936) left it unclassified.

The various dialects seem to be slightly differentiated. Chocó has adopted a large number of words from Chibcha and, like many Carib languages, from Arawak.
Chocó languages or dialects mentioned by authorities, other than those given on the preceding chart, are Citard, Andagueda, Bandó, Chamí, and Tadó or Tado. Cholo, Paparo, and Tucura are placed by some in the Citard subgroup. Other groups mentioned by only one writer, Brinton (1891 a) in particular, are Cañasgordas, Chiamu (Chocamú), Chochama, Murindo, Necodade, Pato, Río Verde, and Sambo.

In the accompanying linguistic map the following groups appear in the area that is presumably Colombian Carib, probably Chocó or Senú: Caramari, Fincenú, Guamoco, Malambo, Mompox, Pacabneye, Pancenú, Tamalamequi, Tolú, Turbaco, Yamicí, Zamba, and Zondagua.

Other Pijao subtribes given by Rivet are Aype, Paloma, Ambéina, Amoya, Tumbo, Coyaíma, Poina (Yaporoge), Mayto (Maito, Marto), Mola, Atayma (Otaima), Tuamo, Bulira, Ocaíma, Behuni (Beuní, Biuni), Ombecho, Anaitoma, Totumo, Natagaima, Pana (Pamao), Guarro, Hamay, Zeraco, Lucira, and Tonuro.
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PEBA-YAGUA

The classification of the Yagua or Peba group, generally agreed to consist of Yagua, Peba, and Yameo, has seen a recent return to belief in its independence. Hervás y Panduro (1800) had proposed a Yamea family, composed of Amaono, Nahuapo, Napeano, and Masamae. Brinton (1891 a) called the family Peban, the component languages Caumari, Cauwachi, Pacaya, Peba, and Yagua. Rivet (1911 b) then published his thesis that the group is affiliated with Carib; this opinion has been accepted in the classifications of Pericot y García (1936), Krickeberg (1922), W. Schmidt (1926), Simpson (1940), and Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43). Much earlier, however, Chamberlain (1913 a) decided that more proof of this relationship is needed, and continued the use of Peban as an independent family. The more recent authori-
ties agree with this conclusion; Nimuendajú (map), Loukotka (1935) and Igualada and Castellví (1940) accord it independent family status, the first terming it Peba, the second Yagua. Métraux also doubts the Carib affinities. Loukotka (1935) calls Yagua (Yegua, Yahua) a “pure” language, Peba mixed with Carib, Yameo mixed with Arawak and Carib. Tessmann (1930) calls them both “mixed-stem languages,” Yagua mixed Pano-Carib, Yameo mixed Arawak-Pano; Peba he seems to consider a synonym of Yagua. The group had best be left unclassified until further linguistic researches are made upon it.

A number of component languages and subdivisions of Peba-Yagua are mentioned in literature. Most of these are probably extinct, and the whole Yameo group is on the verge of extinction if not already gone.

A. Yagua
   1. Yagua
   2. Peba
      a. Cauwachi
      b. Caumari
      c. Pacaya

B. Yameo
   1. Yameo
      a. Napeano
      b. Masamai
      c. Nahuapo
      d. Amaona
      e. Mikeano
      f. Parrano
      g. Yarrapo
      h. Alabono
      i. San Regino (?)
      j. Mazan (?)
      k. Camuchivo (?)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Peba-Yagua.—Castelnau, 1852, pp. 296–298; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 195, 200–201; Fejos, 1943; Marcoy, 1867, pp. 131–132; Martius, 1867, 2:296–297, 300–301; Orton, 1871; Rivet, 1911 b, 1912 a; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 459, 577–580.


ARDA

Arda was accepted as an independent linguistic family by all authorities from 1858 to 1924, including Rivet (1924 a) and Schmidt (1926). This opinion was based upon a Doctrina in a language of this name, the Lord’s Prayer of which was published by Ludewig in 1858. This obviously bore no relationship whatever to any adjacent language. Paul Rivet (1925 e) examined the original manuscript in Madrid and found that it made no reference to the country in which Arda was
spoken. Following some suspicions, he compared the words with modern Dahomean in Africa and determined their close relationship, especially to the Popo dialect. The text was evidently taken in the Slave Coast Kingdom of Arda, and the language has therefore no relation to that of the Arda tribe of southeastern Colombia, an extinct group probably related to the Peba, Yagua, and Yameo. Nimuendajú (map) continues to regard Arda as an isolated language.

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a; Ludewig, 1858; Rivet, 1912 a, 1925 e.

YUMA

The Yuma, with one relatively large group and a small enclave in the state of Amazonas, are rather isolated from any other Carib groups. Accepted as of Carib affiliation by all other authorities, Nimuendajú leaves them unclassified, a conservative opinion herein followed.

PALMELLA

No authority, not even Nimuendajú, doubts the Carib affinity of Palmella, but as the linguistic data are very poor, as the Palmella are a tiny group, and far removed from any other Carib people, even much farther south than the doubtfully Carib Yuma (q. v.), they might well be left unclassified. If of Carib affiliation, they form the southwesternmost Carib group, near the Brazil-Bolivia border.


YURI (JURI)

Opinions regarding the relationship of the small Yuri (Chamberlain, 1913 a, and W. Schmidt, 1926, prefer the spelling Juri) group are very contradictory. Markham (1910) claimed a linguistic connection with the Arawakan Passé; Brinton (1891 a) accepted this classification. Loukotka (1935) and Igualada and Castellví (1940) consider it Carib. The more conservative recent opinions, Rivet (1924 a), Nimuendajú (map), W. Schmidt (1926), Tessmann (1930), Krickeberg (1922), follow Chamberlain’s (1913 a) classification as independent or isolated. Possibly several Juri or Yuri languages are here confused. Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 708) describes one as one of the “Arawakan tribes of the left middle Amazon.” The data seem to be limited to the vocabulary in Martius (1867). There is apparently only one language, but there are said to have been 10 dialects. As the language is almost extinct, spoken today by a very few individuals, a modern grammar of Yuri is a great desideratum. It is a reasonable guess that if such a grammar is ever prepared, Yuri will be found to fall with either Arawak or with Carib. This Yuri must not be con-
fused with an unclassified Jurí or Suri language of the Gran Chaco region.

Bibliography.—Cabrera, P., 1924; Chamberlain, 1910 a; Martius, 1867, 2:268-272; Rivet and Tastevin, 1921; Tessmann, 1930, p. 584; Wallace, 1853, pp. 528-529.

PIMENTEIRA

All the older standard authorities consider Pimenteira a Cariban language. Nimuendajú (map) places it with Botocudo (q. v.) and Lowie (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 381) calls it a separate family. It is far to the east of any other Carib group.

Bibliography.—Martius, 1867, 2:219-220.

MACRO-TUPI-GUARANIAN

A Macro-Tupí-Guaraní phylum is here diffidently proposed for the first time. It consists of Tupí-Guaraní, Miranya (Bora), Witoto, Záparo, and a number of less important languages which are generally placed in one or another of these "families." It is not advanced with any claim to certainty or with any evidence of proof, but as a result of opinions, deductions, and intuitions of the several authorities and of the present writer, plus the fact that there is great difference of opinion concerning into which of these families many of the small languages fall. Rivet (1911 a) has presented evidence for the inclusion of Miranya (Bora) in Tupí-Guaraní. This has been accepted by some, rejected by others. Dr. J. P. Harrington is convinced that Witoto also belongs with Tupí-Guaraní. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) establishes a Witoto-Bora-Záparo phylum separate from Tupí-Guaraní. Záparo is the most doubtful member of the phylum. Nimuendajú (map) and Loukotka (1935) keep all separate. As these families are contiguous a genetic connection is not unreasonable.

TUPI-GUARANIAN

Tupí-Guaraní, like Arawak and Carib, is one of the great widespread linguistic families of South America. The languages were, or are, spoken from easternmost Brazil to the foot of the Andes in Perú, and from Guiana to Uruguay. Though in many isolated groups, the bulk is in eastern Brazil. The distribution is mainly fluvial and maritime, most of the groups restricted to the coast or the river valleys. The original home seems to have been in the region of the Paraguay-Paraná, from which they spread, following the rivers. Soon after the time of the Conquest they held the entire Brazilian coast from the Amazon nearly to Buenos Aires. Much of this migration was recent and probably even post-Conquest, and largely during the sixteenth century. Other migrations up to and including the present century are of historical record. (See Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 97-99.) Many of these migrations were at the expense of Ge groups, especially on the Brazilian coast. The distribution of languages at the time
of the Conquest is, therefore, most difficult to determine; branches of the same group, sometimes bearing the same or similar names, are found in very widely separated regions, and present geographical propinquity carries no presumption of close linguistic relationship. Tribes of other linguistic affinities frequently adopted Tupí-Guaraní tongues, especially after the Conquest. Northern Tupí, Tupí Proper or Nhengatu, was adopted by the Spanish missionaries and traders as the lingua geral, which aided its spread and vogue. The use was probably largely due to the fact that it is said to be a relatively simple language morphologically, and easy to learn.

Though Tupí-Guaraní may eventually form the body of one of the great phyla into which South American languages may be grouped, it is unlikely that it will be found to be related to any of the other major families.

No documented study of the divisions of Tupí-Guaraní on a linguistic basis has ever been made. Rivet (1924 a) lists them geographically. W. Schmidt (1926) and Loukotka (1935) group them into subdivisions with geographic terminologies, but with great mutual disagreement, since many isolated intermediate groups may be placed in any one of several subdivisions. The present classification is based on all of them, modified by opinions of more recent observers regarding the relationship of certain groups. It makes no claim to correctness or finality, and will doubtless be modified greatly by future researches. The two main divisions are into Tupí and Guarani, but, even in these, apparently the relationship is relatively not very distant.

**Tupí-Guaraní Classification**

I. Guarani

A. Paraná

1. Guarani (Carijó, Carió, Chandule)
   a. Arechane, Itatín, Tapé, Tobatíne, Guarambaré, Taíoba
2. Caingua (Kaiguá, Montese)
   a. Apapocuva, Cainguá, Carima, Chiripá, Guayaná,¹
      Mbya² (Mbúká, Apiteré, Baticola, Boaberá),
      Oguana (Oguaiuva), Pan', Tanyguá, Tarumá,³
      Cheiru, Avahuguáí, Paiguaçu, Yvytyiguá, Avachiripá,
      Catandua Jatalhy

3. Paraná
4. Guayaki⁴
5. Aré (Setá, Ivaparé, Shodleng, Notobotocudo,⁵ Pihladyovac)

¹ Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 69) uses Cainguá to distinguish the modern primitive from the civilized Guarani. Distinguish from two other Guayaná in the same general region, one Ge and one unclassified, according to Nimnanda (map). (See Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 70-71.)
² Distinguish from Guaiurú Mbyá.
³ Distinguish from Arawak (?) Tarumá.
⁴ Closely related to Guarani linguistically, according to Métraux and Baldus (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 435). Most modern authorities agree, but a few consider it independent or refuse to classify it.
⁵ The Aré or Setá are erroneously called Botocudo or Notobotocudo, but have no connection with Botocudo proper (Macro-Ge).
I. Guarani—Continued

B. Bolivia

1. Chiriguano (Aba, Camba, Tsembeta)
   a. Guarayú
      a. Pauzerna: Ititin, Carabere, Araibayba, Moterequoa (Moperacoa), Varai, Pirlaguari (Pitaguari), Cario, Kirikitoci, Guarayú-Tá
   b. Sirionó 6 (Chori)
      a. Nyoeze-Né, Tirinié, Jandé, Qurungúa

2. Toré 7
3. Porokicoa
4. Palmares (?) 8
5. Tapijé 9 (Tirumbae)
   a. Yana (Yanaigua)
6. Ubégua (?) 10
7. Chané 11

C. Araguaya 12

1. Tapirapé 13
2. Canoeiro (Avá)

II. Tupi

A. Coastal (Nyeengatu)

1. Tupina (Tupigua)
   a. Aricobé, Amopira
2. Tupinamba
   a. Apigapitanga, Araboyara, Caeté (Caheti), Guaracaió (Itatí), Muriapitanga, Potiguara (Pitonara), Ramiguara, Tamojó, Timimino, Tabayara, 14 Tupinikin, Vialan-Pernambuco

B. Guiana

1. Apoto (Aponto)
2. Calianá 15
3. Oyampi
   a. Camacom
4. Wayapi (Guayapi)
5. Emerillon
6. Paikipiranga (Parichy)

6 The former language of the Sirionó is unknown.
7 A number of the tribes mentioned below have adopted Guarani in recent centuries. Toré was formerly classified as Chapuran; a large vocabulary gathered by Nimuendaju shows beyond doubt that it is impure Tupi (Nimuendaju, 1925; Nimuendaju and Valle Bentes, 1923).
8 Palmares and Ubégua were placed by Brinton (1898 a) among the Guarani groups of the Gran Chaco; other authorities do not mention them.
9 The former language of the Tapijé may have been Arawak.
10 See footnote 9.
11 The Chané (q. v.) formerly spoke Arawak.
12 These two groups (Tapirapé, Canoeiro) apparently migrated here from the south in historical times. Both are slightly known. The Canoeiro are said to be descendants of the Carité (Guarani). Lipkind (personal communication) thinks that they may not be extinct, and may not be Tupi.
13 Wagley (personal letter) says that the Tapirapé language resembles Guarani more than northern Tupi in its use of specific pronominal prefixes, suffixes of time, place, and condition, and in high development of nasalization.
15 Distinguish from independent Caliana (q. v.).
Tupi-Guarani Classification—Continued

II. Tupi—Continued

B. Guiana—Continued

7. Cusari

8. Wara-Guaju (Araguaíá) 17 (?)

C. Southern Amazon

1. Araguaya Division (He-group)
   a. Nyengahiba
   b. Araranewara
   c. Miranyo (?) 18
   d. Amanayé (Manazo): Anambé, Paracanã
   e. Tenetihara: 19 Guajajara, Tembé, Guajá
   f. Urubá: Turivara (Turuara)
   g. Pacajá: Pacajá, Jacundá (Amiranha), Anta (Tapiraua)
   h. Cubenepré: Kupé-rôb (Jandiaht)
   i. Asurinti (?) 20

2. Xingú Division
   a. Yuruna Group 21
      a. Yuruna: Yuruna, Shipaya (Ashipaye)
      b. Manitsawa
      c. Arupái (Urupaya) 22
   b. Tacunyapé (Pewa)
   c. Upper Xingú Group
      a. Auetó: Arawiti 23
      b. Arawine

3. Tapajó Division
   a. Cawahib Group
      a. Cabahyba: Cawahib, 24 Parintintin, Apairané, Odyahuibe
   b. Apiacá 25
   a. Tapanyuna (Arino)
   c. Mundurucú 25
   a. Curuaya (Kuruaha)

17 Nimuendajú (map) distinguishes two groups of Arawá in this region, a Carib group on the Rio Paru and an unclassified group on the Rio Pacaja. (See also Nimuendajú, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 206.)
19 According to Wagley (personal correspondence), the Guajajarí and Tembé form one tribe and call themselves Tenetihara. The Guajá are neighbors of the Guajajarí who say that they speak “our” language Urubá is grammatically like Guajajarí, with a slight phonetic difference governed by regular sound shifts.
20 Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 214) says that Asurinti is reported to be like Guajajarí; as there is no record of the speech, most of the other authorities who have mentioned the language have left it unclassified.
21 According to Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 214), Yuruna, Shipaya, and Manitsawa form a group of impure Tupi, to which Arupái may also belong. It differs considerably from Tupi proper by reason of Arawak and Carib influences. Yuruna and Shipaya are almost mutually intelligible, differing by regular sound shifts. Martius (1867) and Adam (1936) doubt the Tupi relationship generally accepted. Loukotka (1935) considers Manitsawa as mixed with Ge; Yuruna and Shipaya as mixed with Arawak. Lévi-Strauss (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 322) says that Manitsawa includes much from Suya (Ge).
22 Distinguish Arupái from Gurupái of Tocantins, and from Urupái of Gy-Parana.
23 Arawiti is a mixture of Aweto and Yawalapiti, according to Lévi-Strauss (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 322).
24 Lévi-Strauss has a large unpublished vocabulary of Cawahib. Cabahyba and Parintintin are very similar and both have strong affinities with Apiaed. They are remnants of the ancient Cabahyba (Nimuendajú, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 230).
26 According to Loukotka (1935, 1939 a), Mundurucú and Kuruaya are mixed with Arawak, Mauet mixed with Carib and Arawak. Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 246) says that Mauet contains non-Tupi elements that cannot be traced to any other linguistic family.
**Tupí-Guaraní Classification—Continued**

II. Tupí—Continued  
C. Southern Amazon—Continued  
3. Tapajós Division—Continued  
d. Maué  
e. Wirafed  
f. Cayaby: Camayurá  
g. Tupinambarana  
h. Paranawat  
i. Ramarama (Itenga)  
j. Ititapuc (Ntogapid)

j. Catukinariú

D. Upper Amazon  
1. Cocama Group  
a. Cocama: Cocamilla, Xibitaona  
b. Omagua (Campeva)

2. Aizuare Group  
a. Ayusuri: Curuzicari  
b. Bonama (Ibanoma)  
c. Pawana  
d. Soliman (Yoriman)

**Footnote 26**  
For footnote 26, see page 239.

**Footnote 27**  

**Footnote 28**  
Ramarama and Ntogapid are mixed with Arawak and Arikem, according to Loukotka (1935, 1939 a).

**Footnote 29**  
Cocama and Omagua are not mutually intelligible; they also speak Quechua and Spanish. Cocamilla is the southern or Ucayali dialect of Cocama, the difference negligible.

**Footnote 30**  
These languages are all extinct. Nimuendajú (map) leaves the first three, the only ones there listed, unclassified; he considers Curuzicari a synonym of Ayusuri.

Nimuendajú lists a number of groups under the *Tupí* designation that are not found in the above outline. Some of these may be synonyms; a few others are put in other families by other authorities, or left unclassified. Most of these are in the southern Amazon region. Of these languages, found in a prevailing *Tupí* region, the following are left unclassified by Handbook authors for lack of sufficient information: Amniapé, Guaratagaja, Kepkiriwat, Macurap, Tupari, Arikem (q. v., infra), and Buruburará (Puruborá, generally considered Huari or independent).

Others in this general region, considered *Tupí* by Nimuendajú, are: Aruí, Guarayó, Ipotwat, Jabotifed, Mialat, Paranawat, Sanamaica, Taipó-shishi, Takwatib, Tucumafed, and Wayoró.

**Yurimagua (Zurimagua)**

Yurimagua is generally considered Tupian; Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 704) gives his evidence for believing that it is not related to Omagua and possibly independent; Nimuendajú leaves it unclassified.

**Arikem**

Though generally placed in the *Chapacuran* family, Loukotka (1935, 1939 a,) considers the Arikem (*Ariqueme, Arikême, Arikeni,*)
Ahόpovu) language sufficiently distinct to form a separate family, with intrusions of Tupi and Arawak. Nimuendajú (map) classifies it under Tupi, and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 406) believes that he (Nimuendajú) has proved the Tupian relationship.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Guarani.**—As an important living language of the Paraguayan region the bibliography of Guarani is large. It is, therefore, divided into two parts. Many of the works listed under Tupi refer to the Tupi-Guarani “family” and some therein may be specifically on Guarani. The more important works are: Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Bertoni, M. S., 1916, 1921, 1922; Bottignoli, n. d. (1938, 1940), 1926; Domínguez, 1912; Gez, 1915; Lafone-Quevedo, 1919 b; Medina, J. T., 1930 b; Osuna, 1923 a, 1923 b, 1924 a, 1924 b, 1924 c, 1925, 1926 a, 1926 b; Ruiz de Montoya, 1876 a, 1876 b, 1876 c, 1876 d, 1892; Teschauer, 1921.

*Also:* Bertoni, A. de W., 1924; Bertoni, G. T., 1926; Bertoni, M. S., 1914, 1920, 1927 b, 1932; Branco, 1937; Colman, 1917, 1921, 1929 a, 1929 b, 1932, 1936; Febrig-Gertz, 1927, 1932; Gandía, 1931; Martínez, T. A., 1916; Morínigo, 1931, 1935; Osuna, 1921; Recalde, 1924, 1937 b; Schuller, 1913 b; Solari, 1928; Storni, 1944.

**Caingua.**—Ambrosetti, 1895 a; Borba, 1908, pp. 73-76, 138-139 (Guayaná); Martius, 1867, 2:13-14; Müller, Franz, 1934-35 (Mbühá); Nimuendajú, 1914 a (Apopocuwí); Sampaio, T., 1890, pp. 133-148; Vellard, 1937; Vellard and Osuna, 1934; Vogt, 1904, pp. 207-214.

**Guayaquí and Setá.**—Bertoni, G. T., 1924, 1926-27, 1927, 1939; Borba, 1904, p. 57 (Aré); Ihering, 1907, p. 232 (Shoeleng); Loukotka, 1929 (Setá); Mayntzhusen, 1919-20; Panconcelli-Calzia, 1921; Steinen, 1901; Vellard, 1934-35; Vogt, 1902-03.

**Chiriguano.**—Campana, 1902, pp. 17-144, 283-289; Cardus, 1886, pp. 309-310; Giannecchini, 1896; Kersten, 1905; Nino, 1917; Nußer-Aspot, 1897; Romano and Cattunar, 1916; Schmidt, M., 1938.

**Guarayu.**—Cardus, 1916; Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 95-110; Pauly, 1928, pp. 189-190; Pierlin, 1908 b, Schmidt, M., 1936 b; Snethlage, E. H., 1936.

**Pauzerna.**—Fonseca, J. S. da, 1880-81; Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 95-110; Schmidt, M., 1936 b; Snethlage, E. H., 1936.

**Sirionó.**—Cardus, 1886, p. 280; Krause, 1911; Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 110-114; Nordensköld, 1911 a, 1911 b; Nußer-Aspot, 1897; Pauly, 1928, p. 193; Radwan, 1929; Rydén, 1941; Schermair, 1934; Snethlage, E. H., 1936; Wegner, 1934 a, 1934 b, 1934 c, pp. 5-54.

**Tapirapé.**—Nordensköld, 1910 a; Palavecino, 1930; Schmidt, M., 1937 c.

**Araguaya Group.**—*Tapirapé:* Kissenberth, 1916, pp. 52-64; Krause, 1911, pp. 405-406; 1936, p. 43. *Canoeiro:* Couto de Magalhães, J., 1902, p. 119; Rivet, 1924 d.

**Tupi (Neengatú).**—Eastern Tupi is, or is the basis of, the lingua geral of Brazil. The bibliography is, therefore, very large and has herein been divided into two parts, the first containing the more important works and those on the Tupi-Guarani family; the second, the works of lesser importance and those on the lingua geral.

Adam, 1878, 1896; Ayrosa, 1934 a, 1935 a, 1937 a, 1939, 1941, 1943; Barbosa da Faria, 1925; Barbosa-Rodrigues, 1892-94; Branco, 1935; Brinton, 1898 a; Drumond, 1944, 1946; Eckart, 1890; Figueira, 1878; Garcia, R., 1927; Garraux, 1895; Goeje, 1828 b; Goncalves, Dias, 1855; Hestermann, 1925; Ihering, 1907; Koch-

Also: Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Almèlda, 1931; Anonymous, 1937; Ayrosa, 1833, 1934 b, 1934 c, 1934 d, 1934 e, 1934 f, 1935 g, 193 b, 1935 d, 1935 e, 1935 f, 1935 h, 1935 i, 1935 j, 1935 k, 1936 a, 1936 b, 1936 c, 1936 d, 1936 e, 1937 b, 1937 c, 1938, Brandão de Amorèm, 1928; Camara Cascudo, 1934; Coqueiro, 1935 a, 1935 b; Ferreira-Franca, 1859; Friederici, 1930; Guimarães, J. J. da S., 1854; Lemos Barbosa, 1937; Machado d’Oliveira, 1936; Martins, 1867, 2: 7–11, 23–97; Nimuendajú, 1914 c; Pombo, 1931; Realde, 1937 a, 1937 b; Stradelli, 1929; Studart, 1926; Symposon, 1926; Tasso Yatayhì, 1918; Tastevin, 1919.

Tupinambá.—Lery, 1599; Platzmann, 1901.

Guiana Group.—Couderau, H., 1892, pp. 76–140; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882; Martius, 1867, 2: 17–18, 320–323; Perret, 1933 (Emerillon).

Araguaya Division.—Ehrenreich, 1894–95, pp. 163–165 (Anambé); Lange, 1914, pp. 445–446 (Ararandewara); Lopes, 1934, pp. 167–170 (Urubá); Nimuendajú, 1914 c (Amanajé, Turiwara); Ríce, 1930 (Urubá).


Cawahib.—Nimuendajú, 1924 (and Parintintin).


Mundurucuí.—Couderau, H., 1897 c, pp. 192–202; Krause, 1936; Martius, 1867, 2: 18–20; Nimuendajú, 1931 (Caruaya), 1932 a, pp. 106–108; Rondón, 1915, pp. 179–183; Snethlage, E., 1910; Snethlage, E. H., 1932 a (both Caruaya); Strömer, 1932; Tocatins, 1877, pp. 73–161.


Camayura.—Krause, 1936, p. 43; Schmidt, M., 1905, pp. 446–447; Steinen, 1894, pp. 537–540.

Tapajóz Miscellaneous.—Church, 1898, p. 64 (Catukinará); Horta Barbosa, 1922, p. 25 (Ramarama); Koch-Grünberg, 1932 (Wirafed); Nimuendajú, 1924, pp. 275–276 (Wirafed), 1925, pp. 144–145, 172 (Nogapid, Ramarama); Schmidt, M., 1929 a, (Cayabi).

Omagua and Cocama.—Adelung and Vater, 1806–17 (Omagua); Castelnau, 1852, pp. 293–294 (Cocama); Espinosa, 1935 (Cocama); Gili, 1780–84, pp. 371–375 (Omagua); González Suárez, 1904, pp. 65–66 (Omagua); Marcoy, 1875, 2: 296, 402; Martius, 1867, 2:16–17, 290–300; Orton, 1871, p. 473 (Omagua); Rivet, 1910 a; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 47, 65 (Omagua), 66 (Cocama), 82 (Cocamilla).

Yurimagua.—Veigl, 1785 a, p. 54.
Synonyms: Miranhan, Miraña, Bora, Boro.

Not recognized by Brinton’s (1891 a) classification, Miranya was first proposed as a separate family by Chamberlain (1913 a), on the basis of publications by Mochi (1902–03), Koch-Grünberg (1906 c, 1909–10), and Rivet (1911 a). Although Rivet had already published his study with his conclusion that Miranya is a very much modified and differentiated Tupí-Guaraní dialect, Chamberlain, with the comment that “more evidence is needed,” preferred to leave it unaffiliated with any other large group. Krickeberg (1922) and Pericot y García (1936) accept Rivet’s classification; Loukotka (1935) and Igalada and Castellví (1940), preferring to call the family Bora, class it as independent. W. Schmidt (1926) outlines the problem and begs the question. Tessmann (1930) calls it a mixture of Ge-Tupí; Nimuendajú (map) considers it independent. Steward (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 749), considers it under Witotoan, which latter he accepts as Tupian. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) makes it a member of his phylum Witoto-Bora-Záparo, distinct from Tupí.

A grammar of some Miranya language is a great desideratum; the data available for comparison are purely lexical. While the evidence of Tupí relationship presented by Rivet (1911 a) is not entirely convincing—witness its nonacceptance by many authorities—it is nonetheless highly probable and is herein accepted. Dr. J. P. Harrington has made an independent comparison and is convinced of the relationship. Miranya seems to be most closely related to Witoto, and several languages, such as Muinane, Coeruna, Nonuya, and Imihita, are placed by some under Miranya, by others under Witoto. Harrington’s conclusions (personal communication) are:

The Witotoan probably includes Miranya and is certainly an outlying member of Tupí-Guaraní. Miranya and Witoto are distantiy related and both are related to Tupí. The Tupí affinity is not one of admixture. Miranya shares a very considerable number of etyma with both Tupí-Guaraní and Witoto. The percentage is larger than Rivet thought and extends to fundamental words.

Rivet (1911 a) believes that Miranya is the northwesternmost of the Tupí-Guaraní languages, the remains of a very early invasion, before that of the not-far-distant and more purely Tupí languages such as Omagua and Cocama, and, therefore, more affected by borrowings from adjacent languages. The same remarks would doubtless apply to Witoto, and possibly even to Záparo.

There is great difference of opinion regarding the component languages of the Miranya-Bora group. Igualada and Castellví (1940) subdivide the Bora into the True Bora (Bora, Miraña), and the False
Bora (Imihita, Nonuya-Bora, Muinane-Bora); these last languages are considered Witotoan by several authorities. Tessmann (1930) lists 20 bands, Whiffen (1915) 41. Harrington (personal communication) says that Koch-Grünberg’s Imihita words are typically Miranya, controverting Igualada’s and Castellví’s (1940) opinion of them as “false.” Koch-Grünberg (1906 a) gives four Miranya languages: Imihita, Fā-āi, Miranya, and Miranya-Oirá-Açu-Tapuya. Martius’ (1867) “Hawk” and “Mosquito” vocabularies are also Miranya, according to Harrington (personal communication). Orejón and Coeruna have also been considered as Miranya languages. Martius’ (1867) Miranya-Carapana-Tapuya vocabulary is apparently closer to Witoto.

Bibliography.—Igualada and Castellví, 1940; Jiménez Seminario, 1924; Koch-Grünberg, 1906 a, 1906 c, 1909-10, 1910 a, 1910 b; Martius, 1867, 2: 279–281; Mochi, 1902–03; Ortiz, 1942; Rivet, 1911 a; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 267–280.

WITOTOAN

Though the independent position of Witoto has not to date been abandoned, certain languages—for instance, Nonuya, Minuane, Ocaina, and Miranya-Carapana-Tapuya—have been placed by some authorities in the Witoto family, by others in Miranya or Tupi-Guarani, suggesting possible relationship with the latter. It was originally believed to be Cariban. Dr. J. P. Harrington has compared Witoto, Cocama, proved. Ortiz (1942) does not accept the relationship to Bora Miranya, and Tupi-Guarani, and is convinced of the relationship of all. Dr. Harrington’s unpublished treatise indicates a general resemblance in morphological type, and close resemblance of morphological elements in position, meaning, and phonetic type; the lexical relationship, as presented, is not so convincing. The relationship of Witoto to Tupi-Guarani is accepted herein, though not as incontrovertibly proved. Ortiz (1942) does not accept the relationship to Bora (Miranya) but Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) makes it a member of his Witoto-Bora-Záparo phylum.

The native name for the language is Komiuweido. Castellví (1934 b) believes that the historical Quiyoya were the ancestors of the Witoto; Ortiz (1942) thinks they were the Cambeba or Omagua (Cajuane). Orellado and Orelludo are probably synonyms for Orejón; their language was known as Mativitana.

No methodical attempt seems to have been made to subdivide Witoto on a linguistic basis. There seems to be a group of true or proper Witoto, and one more closely related to Miranya. The classification of Ortiz (1942) is adopted as the basis herein. The Miranya-Carapana-Tapuya vocabulary of Martius (1867) is Witotoan.
Pinell (1928) mentioned 136 Witoto subdivisions, Tessmann (1930) 50–60, Ortíz (1942) 39, Farabee (1922) 16. Probably each of these had its particular dialect or variety; Pericot y García (1936) copies Farabee’s subdivisions, names not mentioned, except as synonyms, in the classificatory table.

The several authorities quoted, especially Ortíz (1942), mention a number of Witoto groups in addition to those given above, without indicating their relationships with other groups. Those that are not synonyms probably each has or had its own dialect. Among these are: Aefuye, Aipui, Ajayú, Bodyánisai, Gayafeno, Emenani, Eraye, Fayagene, Fusigene, Gibuñe, Idekofo, Ithibuyene, Jetuye, Jidua, Joyone, Kanieni, Kotuene, Meresiene, Neguerene, Nofuiqüe, Orotuya, Uitoto Piedra, Uiyókoe, Yane, Yari (Jómane, Neimade), Yusigene, and Yauyane.

**WITOTO**

I. Witoto

A. Witoto

1. Witoto

   a. Kaim (Caimo)
   b. Xuá
   c. Sëueni
   d. Jayruya
   e. Mekka: Yaboyano
   f. Menekka
   g. Bëe
   h. Iskune-Caimito (?)

B. Miranyan, Boran

1. Miranya-Carapana-Tapuyo
2. Nonuya (Achiote)²
3. Ocaina-Muenane
   a. Ocaina (Ducaiya); Fítita (?)²
   b. Muenane²

C. Southeastern

1. Orejón²
2. Coeruna (?)²

D. Andoke (?)²

1. North
   a. Araracuara
2. South

E. Resigero (?)²

¹ This classification is exceedingly and unusually controversial and uncertain.
² See independent short articles on these.

**NONUYA**

Nonuya is considered a Witotoan language by Nimuendajú (map). Tessmann (1930) leaves it as unknown or independent. Loukotka (1935) places it, with Muenane, in his Bora (Miranya) family.
Muenane

Steward (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 750) treats Muenane under Witoto. Nimuendajú (map) omits it. Few writers have mentioned them (Whiffen, 1915; Preuss, 1921–23). Loukotka (1935) places it under his Bora family (see Miranya), with Tupi intrusion and vestiges of Witoto. Tessmann (1930) gives a vocabulary of 38 words from which, by his comparative method, he deduces that it is a mixture of Ge and Carib, a doubtful conclusion. They should be considered as unclassified.

Fitita

Steward (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 750) treats the Fitita culturally under Witotoan, possibly a subdivision of Ocaina; the linguistic evidence has not been presented. Nimuendajú leaves them unclassified, a decision herein accepted. Tessmann (1930) could find almost no information on them and no clue to their linguistic affiliation.

Orejón

The Spanish word "orejón," "big ears," was applied to native groups that wore large earplugs, distending the lobes, and, therefore, is applicable to several unrelated linguistic groups. The more important of these are in the Witoto-Tucano region. Here, the name seems to be applied to two adjacent groups, resulting in inevitable confusion. One group, apparently known by no other synonym, is southern Witoto and apparently extinct. Another tribe known as Orejón is the Coto (q. v.), which is generally agreed to be of Tucano linguistic affinity.

Coeruna

Though grouped with Witoto by all other authorities, including Rivet (1924 a) and Nimuendajú (map and index), Coeruna seems to be so different lexically that Loukotka (1935) makes it an independent family (with Witoto and Tucano intrusions). Apparently extinct, the lexical data seem restricted to the old vocabulary in Martius (1867). It is most often linked with Orejón.

Andoke

Tessmann (1930), Castellví (1934 b), and Igualada and Castellví (1940) from first-hand acquaintance with the language of the Andoke consider it independent or of unknown affiliations. Rivet (1924 a) places it in the Witoto family and thinks that it may be identical with Miranya-Carapana-Tapuyo and Nonuya. Steward herein accepts it as Witotoan, but of unknown subclassification. Ortiz (1942) does not accept the Witoto relationship. Most of the other authorities do not mention it. Dr. J. P. Harrington (personal correspondence)
believes in the affiliation with *Witoto*. Though in the southern Colombian forests, it is not far distant from the extinct *Andaki* of the southern Colombian Highlands with which it is liable to be confused.

**Resigero**

The position and affiliations of *Resigero* are most uncertain. Tessmann (1930) thinks it may be *Bora* (*Miranya*); Loukotka does not seem to mention it. Nimuendajú (map) leaves it unclassified. Igualada and Castellví (1940) believe it related to *Arawak*. Ortíz (1942) doubts the *Witoto* relationship.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Nonuya.—Tessmann, 1930, pp. 583, 617.  
Muenane.—Ortíz, 1942; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 329–337; Preuss, 1921–23; Whiffen, 1915.  
Flüta.—Ortíz, 1942; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 583, 617; Whiffen, 1915.  
Orejón.—Martius, 1867, 2:297–298.  
Coeruna.—Martius, 1867, 2:273–275.  
Andoke.—Castellví, 1934 b; Igualada and Castellví, 1940; Ortíz, 1942; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 584, 617.  
Resigero.—Igualada and Castellví, 1940; Ortíz, 1942; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 583, 617.

**Záparoan**

*Záparoan* is an important group that has been accepted as an independent family in all the major classifications since the earliest. However, while yet to be proved, it is not unlikely that it will be found to be related to *Witoto*, *Miranya*, and *Tupí-Guaraní*, and it is tentatively accepted herein as a member of the *Macro-Tupí-Guaraní* phylum. Rivet (1911 a) noted a large number of related words in these four languages and suggested the possibility of relationship but withheld final opinion. The most recent writer, Ortíz (1940 a), also continues to grant it independence, but Jijón y Caamaño, in his 1941–43 classification, makes a *Witoto-Bora-Záparo* phylum, distinct from *Tupí-Guaraní*. Loukotka (1935) finds a “*Tupí intrusion*” and Tessmann (1930) considers the *Záparo* language a *Carib-Tupí* mixture.

The linguistic data on *Záparoan* are very deficient, consisting of a few short vocabularies on a half dozen of the many component languages, and a few short translated religious prayers. Almost nothing is known of the grammar and only a few points were deduced by Beuchat and Rivet (1908). The grammar is, probably mistakenly, said to be simple, the phonetics nasal and guttural, though the effect
is "agreeable." There are said to be pronominal possessive prefixes, pluralizing suffixes and pronominal "case" suffixes.

The classification of the component languages and dialects of the Záparoan family is in utter confusion; no attempt has ever been made to do this on a scientific linguistic basis, and the available data are insufficient. Most compilers have merely given a list of names of groups, many of them geographical, and such suggestions as are made are based mainly on travelers' published remarks regarding linguistic relationships. These, as well as the deductions based upon them, are highly equivocal and contradictory.

The earliest authorities, Velasco (1840) and Hervás y Panduro (1800), were in practical agreement on three main divisions of the Záparoans proper (excluding the Iquito, not included by Hervás), and on the dialects composing these:

**Andoa:**
- Simigae of Curaray (Velasco); Simigae curari
- Simigae of Tigre (Velasco); Jini (Hervás):
  - Acamorì or Acamaorì
  - Comacorì
  - Conejorì (V.)
  - Iqeeconjorì
  - Itrenajorì (V.)
  - Panajori
  - Tremojorì

**Iquito of Tigre:**
- Iquito of Nanay:
  - Aicore
  - Ayacore
  - Eritleyne
  - Himuetaca
  - Neracamue
  - Blanco
  - Huasimooa

Most of these groups are not mentioned, and probably are extinct or amalgamated today, as well as the dozens of small groups listed by other writers (Brinton, 1891 a, listed 62). No recent compiler has attempted to classify these small groups, but Rivet (1924 a), Pericot y García (1936), and W. Schmidt (1926) recognize five main subdivisions; Loukotka (1935), four, which more or less agree with the earlier divisions:

- **Andoa**
- Conambo (Combo)
- Gae (not accepted by Loukotka)
- Iquito (Ikito)
- Záparo
Ortiz (1940 a) gives the main dialects as Gae, Semigae, Iguito, Ingorri, and Panocarri.

Tessmann (1930) considers the Iguito independent, divided into two groups, the Iguito or Iguito Proper and the Cahuarano or Kawarano; he calls it a mixed Tukano-Pano language. Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 636) believe that this is erroneous, that the Iguito language is very similar to Gae, and that Tessmann's Cahuarano may be Maracano. Soroñotoa (map) places Iguito as Záparoan. Tessmann believes the Gae to be strongly Carib: he calls the Záparo Carib-Tupí and the Andoa Carib-Ge. He also considers the Murato to be a Candoshi (Maina) subtribe.

According to other evidence (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 634), the Coronado were kinsmen of the Oa and must be distinguished from the totally unrelated (Tucano?) Coronado on the Aguarico River. "Auca" is the generic name for "pagan." Andoa, Gae, and Semigae are closely related, but Andoa and Semigae are not synonymous, as Tessmann thought. The vocabulary supposed to be Murato (Anonymous, 1928 b) has no resemblance to Záparoan. Soronotoa may be a synonym for Semigae; the latter is very similar to Andoan Murato. Many of the Roamaina and Záparo also speak Quechua. Comacor may be a subtribe of Semigae, of Roamaina, a synonym for Iguito, or a distinct tribe. Of doubtful affiliation with Záparo are Aunale, Alabano, Curizeta, Sucumbio, and Neva.

Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 634) make a Roamaina group of Záparoan, apparently including Pinche, Zapa, Pava, Arazo, and some subsidiary languages. Roamaina is generally placed with Omurano (q. v.), whose affiliations are so disputed that it probably should be considered unclassified.

Tiputini (Tiwäcuna) and Chiripuno are considered by Tessmann (1930) and Loukotka (1935) as languages akin to Sabela (q. v.), to which Loukotka accords independent status.

Záparo

I. Coronado Group
   A. Coronado (Ipapiza, Hichachapa, Kilinina)¹
      1. Tarokeo
      2. Chudavina (?)
      3. Miscuara (?)
   B. Oa (Oaki, Deguaca, Santa Rosina)

II. Andoa Group
   A. Andoa
      1. Guallpayo
      2. Guasaga
      3. Murato ²

¹ Beuchat and Rivet, 1909, classified the Coronado as Cahuapanan.
² See separate article, Candoshi and Murato.
Záparo—Continued

II. Andoa Group—Continued
   B. Gae (Siaviri)
   C. Semigae
      1. Aracohor
      2. Mocosiohor
      3. Usicohor
      4. Ichecomohor
      5. Itoromohor
      6. Maithiore
      7. Comacor (?)
   D. Iquito (Amacacora, Kiturran, Puca-Uma)
      1. Iquito
      2. Maracana (Cawarano ?)
      3. Awe
   E. Asaruntoa (?)

III. Záparo Group
   A. Záparo
      1. Muegano
      2. Curaray
      3. Matagen
      4. Yasuni
      5. Mania
      6. Nushino
      7. Rotuno
      8. Supinu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Záparoan.—Undifferentiated: Anonymous, 1928 b; Beuchat and Rivet, 1908, 1910; Igualada and Castellví, 1940; León, A. M., 1928–29; Martius, 1867, 2: 302–307; Ortiz, 1940 a; Orton, 1874; Osculati, 1854, pp. 281–301; Rivet, 1911 a, 1912 a, 1930 b, p. 696; Simson, 1879 b, 1886, pp. 263–266; Tessmann, 1930; Veigl, 1785 a, 1785 b; Velasco, 1840; Villavicencio, 1858.

Andoa.—Brinton, 1898 b; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 530, 617.

Semigae.—Anonymous, 1930 b; León, A. M., 1930 b; Tessmann, 1930, p. 534.

Iquito.—Castelnau, 1852, pp. 295–296; Gonzáles Suárez, 1904, pp. 69–74; Martius, 1867, 2: 302; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 512, 617.

OMURANO (ROAMAINA?)

Synonyms: Numurana, Hunurana, Roamayna (?).

Tessmann (1930) gives an Omurano vocabulary of about 250 words, large enough for Loukotka (1935) to decide to give it a position as an independent family consisting of Omurana (with vestiges of Chimú) and the extinct Maina. To Tessmann it is a mixture of Arawak and Carib, rather strongly Arawak. He identifies them with the historical Roamaina (Roamayna). Brinton (1891 a) classifies Humurana (evidently the same as Hunurana) and Roamaina as belonging to the Maina; this classification follows Hervás. The Maina stock of Hervás y Panduro (1800), Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a) is the
modern Cahuapana (q. v.), and Beuchat and Rivet (1909) classified Roamaina as Cahuapanan. Loukotka (1935) seems to have found little Cahuapana resemblance in Omurana.

Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 634) consider the Roamaina as a division of Záparoan (q. v.) and to be totally distinct from the Maina. It is believed to be represented by the extinct Zapa, and today by the Pinche, with the dialects Pava, Arasa, Uspa, or Llepa, and Habitoa. (See Steward and Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 634.) With such difference of opinion, Roamaina-Omurano and Pinche had best be considered as unclassified.

Bibliography.—Tessmann, 1930, pp. 444 (Omurana), 582 (Pinche).

**Sabela**

*Sabela* is a new group, discovered and named by Tessmann (1930) and mentioned by no other compilers except Loukotka (1935) and Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43). Tessmann considers it a mixed “stem,” Ge-Arawak-Pano. The data for linguistic classification seem to be limited to less than 30 words published by Tessmann, surely not enough on which to award it a status as an independent family, as Loukotka (1935) has done. “Uncertain affiliation” is the better decision for the present. The group now speaks Quechua. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) follows Loukotka in considering Sabela an independent “phylum.”

The two divisions are Tihuacuno (Tibakuna and orthographic variants) and Chiripuno (Ts chiripuno, Schiripuno); the degree of linguistic variation between them is not stated. Tiputini is close to or identical with Tihuacuno.

Steward (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 747) mentions the Sabela, with the Tihuacuno and Chiripuno as tribes of uncertain affiliation. However, Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 629) list Shiripuno and Tiputini as dialects of Záparo proper. In this region are many tribal names, Záparo, Sabela, Jívaro, Chebero, Hibito, etc., that may well be phonetic variants of one root.

Bibliography.—Tessmann, 1930, pp. 298, 617.

**Canelo**

Synonyms: Kanela, Napo, Santa Rosina, Loreto.

Canelo was superseded by Quechua about 1580. The linguistic data are so few that its affiliations will probably never be certain; they may have been with Záparo, Jívaro, or Chibcha. Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 637), following Reinburg (1921), class it with Záparoan. Karsten (1935) believes it a mixture of Jívaro, Záparo, and Quechua; Rivet is (or was) convinced that it was related to Chibcha.
Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) does not list it in his classification but apparently includes it in the Jivaro area in his map. Early accounts indicate that it included Gae, generally considered a Záparoan tongue, as well as three other unknown and extinct languages or dialects: Ymmunda or Ynmuda, Guallingo, and Sante or Santi. Other minor groups were Penday, Chontoa, and Canicha.

Bibliography.—Karsten, 1935; Reinburg, 1921; Tessmann, 1930, p. 250.

Awishira

The standard classification of Awishira (with many orthographic variants such as Abijira, Avixiri, Abira) in the Tucanoan family, accepted by Rivet (1924 a), Pericot y García (1936), and Krickeberg (1922), has been doubted in recent years. Dr. J. P. Harrington has recently examined the data and concluded that the material has so far proved insufficient for definite inclusion with Tucanoan. Evidence cited in the Handbook (vol. 3, p. 635) suggests its relationship with Záparoan. W. Schmidt (1926) leaves it unmentioned. Nimuendajú (map) puts it with the unclassified languages. Neither Tessmann (1930) nor Loukotka (1935) apparently find anything Tucanoan in it in their comparison of vocabularies. Tessmann (1930) calls it a mixed-stem language, Pano-Arawak. Loukotka (1935) gives it an independent family, Awíširi, finding vestiges of Chibchan in it. This is probably too radical; as a living language it will probably be found before many years to belong to one of the larger groups, but as that one is uncertain it had best be left unclassified for the present.

Bibliography.—Tessmann, 1930, pp. 495–489.

Northern Tropical Lowland Families of Presumed Independence

Warrauan


The independence of the Warrau linguistic family has been admitted by all authorities since earliest days. A littoral people of peculiar culture, the general feeling is that they preceded the Carib and Arawak in the Orinoco Delta and Guiana coast. No suggestions as to linguistic affiliations with other groups have been made; the Arawak vestiges that Loukotka (1935) finds are probably due to borrowing. Generally only one language is assigned to the family, but Nimuendajú (map and index) places the Mariusa and Chaguan, tribes not mentioned by others, with them. The extinct Waikeri or Guayqueri may also be related; although Rivet (1924 a) considers the latter as Carib, Humboldt (1826) reports that they claimed that their language was related to that of the Guarauno.
WARRAU

1. Mariusa
2. Chaguan
3. Waikeri (Guaiqueri)

Bibliography.—Adam, 1897 b; Brett, 1868, pp. 176–199; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 263–266; Goeje, 1930, 1930–31; Hilhouse, 1834; Humboldt, 1822–27, 3: 216; Im Thurn, 1883; Olea, 1928; Quandt, 1807; Schomburgk, 1847–58, pp. 47–48; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 120–123, 1921–22; Williams, J., 1928–29.

AUAKÉAN

Auake (Auaque, Auqué, Aoaqui, Oewaku) is probably the smallest of all the South American linguistic “families” accepted as independent by all authorities. It may be now extinct, at any rate spoken by only a very small group, possibly of only one family. Unknown to Brinton and Chamberlain, the independent status is based on a vocabulary of some 300 words recorded by Koch-Grunberg (1928) in 1913, which apparently shows no connection with any language with which it has been compared, though Loukotka (1935) sees in it vestiges of Chibchan. Consonantal endings are few. Pronominal possession is expressed by prefixes. Armellada and Matallana (1942) call the language Arutani.


CALIANAN

Caliand (Kaliana) is one of the small linguistic groups which, unknown to earlier authorities, was discovered by Koch-Grunberg in 1913. The small vocabulary, collected by him, shows no resemblance to any of the surrounding languages, and the language, without any known subdivisions, is, therefore, accorded independent position by all subsequent compilers. No studies have been made, or at any rate published, upon it, and no suggestions regarding relationship, except that Loukotka (1935) claims vestiges of Chibcha in it. It should be distinguished from the Calianá of Tumuc-Humac. Many of the words are monosyllables with consonantal endings. Pronominal possession is expressed by prefixes.


MACUAN

The Macu (Mahku) “family” of the Uraricoera River must be distinguished from several other groups of the same or similar name: the Salivan Macu, the Puinavean Macú (Loukotka uses Makú for the family name), and the Cofán Macu or Maco. The family has been accorded independent status since its discovery by Koch-Grunberg on the basis of the rather large vocabulary of nouns collected by him.
(1928). Only the single language is known. No suggestions as to wider affiliations have been made, except that Loukotka (1935) finds Arawak intrusions. The language is said to be spoken rapidly. Possessive pronominal elements are prefixed. Armellada and Matallana (1942) call the language Sope.


**SHIRIANÁ**

*Shirianá* (*Sirianá*) is one of the newer families, not recognized by Brinton or Chamberlain, but generally accepted since. Relationship with Carib has been suggested but uniformly rejected. The best linguistic source is Koch-Grünberg (1928); the languages are said to be “guttural,” the words often with consonantal endings.

The principal languages of the family seem to be *Shirianá* and the less important *Carimé* (*Karimé*). *Waiká* (*Guaiacá, Uaiçá*) appears to be closer to *Shirianá*, possibly a dialect; it must be distinguished from a Cariban *Waika* in British Guiana, and *Shirianá* must not be confused with the Arawakan Shiriana nearby.

Most modern writers are agreed that *Shirianá* and *Waiká* are descended from the historically important *Guaharibo* (*Iaribu, Guahibo, Uariba, Uajaribo, Uaharibo*), though Nimuendajú (map) leaves the latter unclassified; Brinton (1891 a) assumed that they were *Carib*.

**SHIRIANÁ**

A. *Waharibo* (*Guaharibo*)
   1. *Shirianá*
      a. *Waicá* (*Guaiaca, Uaiçá*)

B. *Carimé* (*Karimé*)


**SÁLIVAN, MACU, AND PIARÓA**

The independence of this stock has been long and universally recognized, but the names *Sáliva(n)* and *Piaróa(n)* are about equally employed to distinguish it. No suggestions for wider relationships have been made, though Loukotka (1935) sees Arawak intrusions in *Sáliva*, and *Carib* vestiges in *Piaróa*.

The majority of authorities agree that three languages compose the family: *Sáliva* (*Sáliba, Sálriba, Sálvia, Sálivi*), *Piaróa*, and *Macu* (*Macó*). Loukotka (1935) groups *Piaróa* and *Macu* in an eastern group, *Sálivi* and *Pamigua* (q. v. infra) in a western group. The *Sálivan Macu* must be distinguished from three other tribes of the
same or very similar names: the independent Macu of the Auarí River, the Puinave Macú and the Cofan Macu (q. v.).

Sáliva was one of the nine stocks of the Orinoco Valley established by Gilij (1780–84); the component languages he names as Ature, Piaróa, and Quagua. The Ature (Adole) are extinct; the name is also given as a synonym of the Piaróa. Brinton (1891 a) says the modern Quagua (Kuakua, Guagua) speak Arawak; Rivet (1924 a) puts them with the Carib. Brinton (1891 a) furthermore found no resemblance between Sáliva and Piaróa; the languages must be considerably different

Sáliva (Piaróa)

I. Western Sáliva
   A. Sáliva
II. Eastern: Piaróa
   A. Piaróa
      1. Ature (Adole)
      2. Piaróa
      3. Quagua (Guagua) (?)
   B. Macu


Pamigua and Tinigua

Castellví has recently (1940) published a vocabulary of Tinigua. He finds no resemblance to any other family, but an evident connection with the extinct Pamigua. He therefore suggests a Pamiguan linguistic family, consisting of Pamigua and Tinigua. Rivet (1924 a) placed Pamigua in the Guahiban family, and Loukotka (1935) placed it with Sáliva in the western group of Sálivan (Piaróan). Igualada and Castellví (1940) considered Tinigua as composing a third or Southern group of Sálivan. The language is still spoken in the Caquetá region of Colombia.

Bibliography.—Castellví, 1940; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43, 2: 108–109; Ernst, 1891.

Otomacan, Guamo or Guama, and Yaruran

The Otomaco and Yaruro, small groups that are close neighbors in southern Venezuela, are limited to one language each. The Otomaco are extinct, the Yaruro approaching it. Both have been accorded independent linguistic status since, at the least, Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a).

Otomaco (Otomac, Otomak).—Rivet (1924 a) says the language
is called Tarapita. Loukotka (1935) sees Carib intrusions in it, a distinct possibility.

**Guamo or Guama.**—Loukotka (1935) establishes an independent Guama family of one language, the Guama, in which he finds vestiges of Chibchan. This is apparently the small tribe of southwestern Venezuela termed Guamo by other writers. PetruIlo (1939) says that their remnants became extinct in recent years. Most authorities do not mention them; Nimuendajú (map) leaves them unclassified. Loukotka (1935) does not mention the data on the basis of which he isolates them, but it is doubtless insufficient evidence on which to establish a new family; they had better be left with the many on which we lack sufficient information for classification. Kirchhoff (Handbook, vol. 4, p. 439) believes that Guamo was very closely related to Otomaco.

**Yaruro** (Yarura, Jaruri, Jaruro, Sayuro, Zavuri, Saururi, Japaria, Yapin, Yuapin, Pume, Pumeh).—Punch is said to be their name for themselves. Loukotka’s opinion (1935) regarding “Coroado intrusions” is to be doubted. Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) considers Yaruro as related to Chibcha, forming, with Esmeralda, his first or “Paleo-Chibcha” group of his Macro-Chibcha phylum.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Otomaco.**—Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 194; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 262-263; Gilij, 1780-84, 3: 262-263; Rosenblat, 1936; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 332-374.

**Yaruro.**—Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Chaffanjon, 1889, pp. 319-320; Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 201; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 260-261; Müller, Frederich, 1882, 1: 360-363, 2; Oramas, 1909; Petruilo, 1939, pp. 265-289; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 120-133.

**GUAHIBAN**

Guaibibo (Wahibo, Goahivo, Goahiva, Guayba, etc.) has been universally recognized as an independent family since earliest days (Brinton, 1891 a; Chamberlain, 1913 a), and no suggestions as to larger relationships have ever been made. Its true status should not be difficult to determine since, in addition to a published grammar (Fernández and Bartolomé, 1895), they form a large living group not very inaccessible. Churoya, generally now recognized as one of the languages forming the family, was formerly considered as the type member of another family, the Churoyan, accepted by Brinton (1891 a) and at first by Chamberlain (1907). Not all of Brinton’s Churoyan languages, however, are now considered Guahiban; Cofán and Mako are

---

21 Rivet (1924 a) distinguishes Tarapita and Taparito, which latter Gillin and Nimuendajú agree with him in considering as Cariban (q. v.). Kirchhoff (Handbook, vol. 4, p. 464) calls Taparita a variety of Otomaco; possibly some confusion in names exists. W. Schmidt (1926) considers Taparita as isolated.
generally put with Cofán (q. v.). A careful comparison of Guahibo and Cofán is, therefore, indicated; Ortíz (1943, 1944) doubts the relationship.

**GUAHIBO**

I. Guahibo
   A. Wahibo
      1. Chiricoa
         a. Sicuane
      2. Cuíba
         a. Mella
         b. Piamo
   3. Yamu

B. Churuya
   1. Bisanigua

C. Cunimia
   1. Guayabero

Possibly: Amorua (generally placed with Arawak), Catarro, Cuíloto, Maíba.

**Bibliography.**—Chaffanjon, 1889, pp. 320–323; Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 186 (Churoya); Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882, pp. 258–260; Ernst, 1891; Fernández de San José and Bartolomé, 1895; Koch-Grünberg, 1913, p. 472, 1928, 4:443–451; Loukotka, 1929–30, 1938; Marciano, 1890; Ortíz, 1943, 1944; Ossa. V., 1938; Pérez, 1935; Reichel-Dolmatoff, 1944; Rivet, 1912 a, pp. 128–131; Sáenz, 1876, pp. 341–342 (Churoya); Schomburgk, 1849; Tavera-Acosta, 1907, pp. 85–95.

**PUINAVEAN OR MACÚ**

Puinave, a family of slight present extent, may have been formerly much more important and widespread. Rivet, Kok, and Tastevin (1924–25) suggest that it may be a substratum common to many adjacent languages, now so differentiated that a common origin is difficult to prove. It has been recognized as independent since at least the days of Chamberlain (1913 a). W. Lehmann (1920) suggests a possible relationship with Witoto (q. v.), which might tie it to Tupí. Loukotka (1935) terms the family Macú from its most important tribe, and Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) distinguishes a “Phylum Makú,” but the older and more generally accepted name Puinave is preferable to avoid confusion; Macú must be distinguished not only from the Macú family, but also from the Piaroaan Macu and the Cofán Macú.

W. Schmidt (1926) includes in the family a Cabere language, generally regarded as an Arawak dialect.

There is said to be considerable differentiation between the dialects, and much borrowing from Tucanoan languages. Some of the linguistic characteristics are: Accent generally on the ultima; vocalic harmony; noun-verb composition; postpositions; compound nouns; pronominal and reciprocal prefixes; gender, pluralizing, tense and mode suffixes.
Puinave or Macú

I. Puinave (Puinabe, Puinavis, Uaipunabis, Guai punavos, Uaipis)
   A. Puinave (Epined)
      1. Western
         a. Bravos, Guaripa
      2. Eastern
         a. Mansos
   B. Macú
      1. Macú
      2. Tikié
      3. Kerari
      4. Papuri
      5. Nadobo

BIBLIOGRAPHY


TUCANOAN (BETOYAN)

Tucano is one of the important, though not one of the great, linguistic families of South America. It occupies two adjacent homogeneous areas in the northwestern central part of the continent, separated by Carib and Witoto groups. A small isolated third group to the north is no longer credited. The name refers to the toucan bird, a translation of the native name, Daxsea. There may be 10,000 speakers of the Tucano languages today.

The name Tucano or Tukano, generally accepted today, was first proposed by Beuchat and Rivet (1911). Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a) termed the family Betoya(n) from the Betoi or Betoya tribe. The latter, however, Beuchat and Rivet demonstrated to belong to the Chibchan family, as apparently do also a number of the other languages given by Brinton (1891 a, p. 273) as members of the Betoyan stock: Anibali, Kilifaye (=Quilifaye), Situfa, Tunebo, and probably Jama.

No suggestions have been made that would connect Tucano with other linguistic families. The languages are said to be characterized by consonantal clusters, nasalization, unclear pronunciation, and unusual phonemes. Stems are composed, verbal modifications are by means of suffixes, there being apparently no verbal prefixes and no reduplication. Nominal plural is expressed by suffixes or by modifications of the ultima; prepositional relations are shown by postpositions. Indirect object is expressed by a suffix, as is feminine gender.

No careful attempt has ever been made to subdivide the Tucano
languages on a linguistic basis. It is generally assumed that linguistic divisions follow the geographical ones, adjacent tribes speaking more closely related languages than distant ones, sibs of tribes speaking dialects. This divides the family into two main groups. This classification is herein accepted as the only available one, with the realization that it may be without any basis.


**Tucano Classification**

I. Eastern Tucano
   A. Cubeo (Cobewa, Kobeua, Pamíwa)
      1. Cubeo
         a. Hóloná (Holowa?)
         b. Hahánana (Hehenawa)
   B. Tucano-Tuyuca
      1. Tucano (Dáchsea)
         a. Arapaso (Coreá)
         b. Neenoá
         c. Yohoroá
         d. Uíua Tapuyo
      2. Tuyuca (Dochkáfuara)
         a. Bará
         b. Tsolá
      3. Wanana (Ananas, Kótita)
         a. Waiana (Yurutí Tapuya)
         b. Piratapuyo (Waickea, Urubá Tapuya)
         c. Uaicana
         d. Uainana
      4. Carapaná (Mochddá)
      5. Wásöna (Pisá Tapuya)
      6. Pamóa (Tatú Tapuya)
   C. Buhágana (Carawatana-mira)
      1. Macuna
         a. Hobacana (Japuana)
      2. Buhágana
         a. Ómöa
         b. Sára
         c. Doá
         d. Tsaina
         e. Tsooloá
         f. Yúba
   D. Desana (Wind)
      1. Yupuá
   E. Cueretí
      1. Cashíita (Kusiita)

---

1 W. Schmidt (1926) considers Bara, Uaiana, Usöna, Mochddá, and Pamoa as subtribes of Uanana.
2 Loukotka (1935) considers Carapaná as Witoto, mixed with Tucano.
TUCANO CLASSIFICATION—Continued

I. Eastern Tucano—Continued

F. Yahuna
   1. Opaina (Tanimboca)
   2. Dâluana

G. Bôlôa
H. Erulia

II. Western Tucano

A. Piojé-Sioni
   1. Encabellado (Iaguate, Angutera)
      a. Piojé (Piöche)
      b. Encabellado
      c. Secoya-Gai
      d. Campuya
      e. Santa Maria
      f. Guaciguaje
      g. Cieguaje
      h. Macaguaje
      i. Amaguaje

2. Sioni

B. Correguaje-Tama
   1. Correguaje
      a. Correguaje
   2. Tama (Tamao)
      a. (Ayrico)

C. Coto

Other possible Western Tucano languages or dialects are: Tetete, Pasto, and Awishiri (q. v.).

1 See Steward (Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 737–739) for smaller Encabellado divisions; Beuchat and Rivet (1911) for many small Tucano subdivisions and synonyms.
2 The terminology among the Piojé-Sioni is greatly confused. Steward (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 738) states that the five principal names Encabellado, Iaguate, Piojé, Santa Maria, and Angutera are synonyms for the entire group as well as names of divisions used at different periods.
3 The Correguaje and Tama are said to be closely linked, but Rivet (1924 a) places Tama, together with Ayrico, the latter not mentioned by other modern sources, in a third or Northern Tucano group, leaving Correguaje with the Western Tucano.
4 Tetete is mentioned as an important Western Tucano group by Castellvi (Igualada and Castellvi, 1940) and Loukotka (1939 a).
5 On grounds of toponymy Rivet (1924 a) places the extinct and peripheral Pasto with the Western Tucano; Loukotka (1933) accepts this. It is herein classified with the Parsaca group of Chibchan.
6 One of the doubtful questions is the inclusion of the Awishiri (Abijira, etc.) (q. v.), traditionally included with the Tucano. (See independent article supra under Záparoa classification.

Other groups, considered by one or more authorities as Tucano and not disputed by others, are: Bahukiwa, Corocoro Tapuya, Corowa, Palanoa, Fatsoca, Usa Tapuya, Wantuya, Yi Tapuya, Yëboya Tapuya. Some of these may be synonyms of others given above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General.—Beuchat and Rivet, 1911; Brinton, 1892 a, pp. 62–67, 1892 b; Castellvi, 1939; Pfaff, 1890, pp. 603–606; Rivet, 1916, 1929 a.


**Western.**—Anonymous, 1909, 1919 e; Chantre y Herrera, 1901; Crevaux, 1882; González Suárez, 1904, pp. 63–64; Rivas, 1944; Roa, 1905, pp. 199–201; Simson, 1879 a, pp. 210–222, 1886; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 205–221.

**COTO**

The Coto (Koto) is one of several groups known as Orejón, “big ears,” and sometimes Coto is considered the only synonym of Orejón (Nimucendajú, index). However, an extinct group of southern Witoto was also known by this name (q. v.). The Coto (as apart from Orejón) are placed by all authorities under Tucano, and Tessmann (1930) reports that his 235-word vocabulary is nearly pure Tucano. He says that in addition to Orejón they are known as Payagua and Tutapisho. There are said to be 500 living today. They must be distinguished from the Chibchan Coto of Costa Rica.

**Bibliography.**—Marcoy, 1875; Simson, 1886; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 189–205.

**CAHUAPANAN**

The Cahuapana (Kahuapana, Cavapana, Maina) family is relatively unimportant, occupying a small region without enclaves, and spoken by a few thousand persons. Though it will probably eventually be found to belong to some greater family or phylum, no suggestions of larger relationships seem to have been made: Rivet, who has published the principal studies (Beuchat and Rivet, 1909; Rivet and Tastevin, 1931), made none. Within the family the classification is also difficult; little is known of many of the languages and dialects, and many, which would better be left unclassified pending fuller data, are generally included on purely geographical grounds. The name Cahuapana, preferred by Beuchat and Rivet, supplants the former Mainan or Mayna of Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a).

The language is said to be harsh and difficult. A kind of true inflection with different suffixes for each tense and person is found. Modal relations are expressed by either suffixes or prefixes, also some infixes, but verbal and nominal suffixes predominate over prefixes. Pronominal (except subject) and gender relations are shown by suffixes, as are nominal and verbal pluralization.

Loukotka adds an extinct Mikiri to the family. Omurano (Humuranano) and Roamaina (q. v.) were long considered prominent members of this family but are not mentioned by later authorities. Hervás y Panduro (1800) gave Chayavita as a separate stock, consisting of Cahuapano and Paranaipuro. See Handbook (vol. 3, pp. 605–608) for comments on relationships and critique of former classifications.
Steward and Métraux question the relationship of the entire *Mayna* group.

**Cahuapanan**

I. *Cahuapan*

A. *Cahuapan*
   1. *Cahuapan*
   2. *Concho* (Chonzo)

II. *Chébero* (*Xevero*)
   1. *Chébero* ¹
   2. *Chayawita* (*Chawi*)
      a. *Chayawita*
      b. *Yamorai* (*Balsapuerto*) ²
   3. *Ataguate* ³ (?)

¹ Chébero (*Xévero) must not be confused with the Jisaro (*Xivero*) (q. v.) or the Hibito.
² The Yamorai are mentioned only by Tessmann (1930), on whose opinion they are here included.
³ Ataguate is mentioned only by Beuchat and Rivet (1909, p. 619), who also include Cutinana and Tisito, languages apparently related to Aguano (q. v.).

**Bibliography.**—Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Beuchat and Rivet, 1909; Brinton, 1892 a, pp. 21–29; Ortiz 1941 b; Rivet, 1912 a; Rivet and Tastevin, 1931; Schuller, 1912 d; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 378, 415, 440–444; Veigl, 1785 a.

**Muniche**

Synonyms: Munitschi, Muniči, Paranaapura.

*Muniche* was one of the old stocks of Hervás y Panduro (1800), quoted without comment by Brinton (1891 a). The component languages were *Muchimo* and *Otanabe*, doubtless extinct and not mentioned by any recent writer. Neither was *Muniche* until Tessmann (1930) rediscovered it. He considers it a mixed-stem language, *Ge-Pano*, with 16 resemblances, in about equal proportion, out of the 33 that he used as a criterion. Loukotka (1935), the only compiler who mentions the group, gives it independent status. Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 606–607) consider *Muniche* related to *Chébero*, of the *Mayna* branch of *Cahuapan*. As Tessmann’s collected vocabulary amounts to only 38 words, this is hardly enough on which to base any opinion; it should be left unclassified pending further study. Tessmann (1930) appears to be the sole source of information.

**Muniche**

1. *Muniche*
2. *Muchimo*
3. *Otanabe*
4. *Churilana*

**Panoan**

*Pano* is one of the major linguistic families with many subdivisions. Tradition brings them from the north, but no relationship with any other family has ever been suggested, much less demonstrated.
Rivet (1924 a) observes that the *Tacana* group (q. v.), which he believes to be *Arawak*, shows considerable grammatical resemblances to *Pano*. Neighboring languages seem to have affected the *Panoan* languages little. Comparatively few of the component languages are extinct and some groups number several thousands; the total number of speakers may be about 15,000. They occupy four isolated homogeneous areas east of the Andes in far west Brazil and adjacent republics; the central one is the largest in area, number of groups, and importance. Not even vocabularies exist from many, probably from most, of the tribes, and no classification other than into the three main areas, has ever been attempted. Such comparisons as have been made indicate that the linguistic groupings on the whole follow the geographical divisions. The languages of the *Juruá-Purus* seem to fall with the central group rather than with the southwestern or the southeastern.

The main or central branch of the *Pano* comprises a very large number of tribes and subtribes, each of which doubtless spoke a more or less variant language or dialect. For lack of sufficient data, no one has attempted a classification of these languages, though some are said to be mutually intelligible, others not. On the presumption that adjacent and affiliated groups are linguistically more closely related than more distant groups some classification may be made, but this is a dangerous assumption, the groupings highly tentative. The two main groups are those on the Ucayali, the names of which typically end in *-bo* (a pluralizing suffix), and those on the *Juruá* and *Purus*, with the majority of names ending in *-nava*, meaning "strangers."

**The Chama Languages**

The *Conibo*, *Setibo*, and *Shipibo* of the Ucayali River are grouped under the *Chama* (*Tschama, Čama*), and are apparently mutually intelligible. While the groups are large and important, the speech forms would probably be classed as varieties or dialects of the *Chama* language. This must be distinguished from the *Tacanan Chama* on the Madidi River. Except for the three above-named main groups there is disagreement regarding the affiliation of certain other groups with *Chama*.

According to Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 559–560), *Setibo* is divided into two subgroups, *Sensi* and *Panobo*, which, perhaps with *Puinawa*, separated from the parent group in recent days. As regards *Panobo* there is general agreement on its close association with *Setibo*. *Pano, Pelado, Manoo*, and *Cashiboyano* are given as synonyms or subdivisions. In addition to the obvious synonyms (*Sensivo, Ssenssi, Senci, Senti, Tenti, Barbudo*, and *Mananawa* (*Mananahua,
Mananagua) are given as synonyms of Sensi. There is great diversity of opinion regarding Mananawa, which Rivet (1910 b) considers a branch of Shipibo, Tessmann (1930) a branch of Cashibo. Nimuendajú (index) refuses to classify Mananawa; K. G. Grubb (1927, p. 83), calls it a subtribe of Remo (q. v.) with the subdivisions Marubo and Pisabo (q. v.); the latter languages are not generally classed in the Chama group. Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 560) consider Yvubu, Runubu, and Casca as subdivisions of Sensi, inferentially dialects or varieties thereof. Both Tessmann (1930) and Loukotka (1935) claim that Sensi is not as pure Pano as the other Chama languages; Loukotka places it in a separate "mixed" group.

Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 561) say that Shipibo is the same language as Setibo and the extinct Caliseca (Kaliseka). Rivet (1910 b) agrees with the latter and adds Mananawa as a sub-tribe. The name Caliseca has not been used since the 17th century (Steward and Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 561) and it is disputed whether they were the modern Shipibo or Cashibo.

**CASHIBO**

Cashibo (Kaschibo, Cachibo, Cahibo, Cacibo, Caxibo, Casibo, Cahivio, Kassibo, Kasibo), also given the synonyms of Mananawa (Mananagua, Managua, Mananabua), Carapacho, Haqueti (Haqueti), and San Lorenzo, is generally placed in the Chama language, but according to a local missionary (Rankin, personal correspondence) the speech of the Cashibo is unintelligible to the Conibo-Shipibo-Setibo. The sub-groups are given as Cacataibo (Kakataibo), Cashiño, and Ruño by Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 564); as Buninawa (Bununahua, etc.), Carapacho (Karapatša, etc.), and Puchanawa (Putšanahua, etc.) by Rivet (1910 b), and as Cashinó (Kaschinó) and Shiriño (Sririño) by Tessmann (1930). K. G. Grubb (1927, p. 84) says that the Cashinawa are closely related. The differences of opinion regarding Mananawa and Caliseca, listed above as synonyms of Cashibo, have been already considered. Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 564) consider Carapacho as of uncertain affiliation; P. Marcoy (1875) calls it a synonym of Caliseca.

Nocoman (Nokamán), recently identified by Tessmann (1930, p. 172), is probably now extinct. It was formerly confused with Cashibo (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 567). Nimuendajú (map) leaves it unclassified. Loukotka (1935) and Jijón y Caamaño (1941-43) place it with Pano.

Other languages or dialects, generally agreed to be Panoan, whose closer affiliations are unknown but which probably belong in the Ucayali group, are Pichobo (Pitsubo, Pichaba, Pitsobu, Pisabo, etc.) and Soboibo (Saboibo, Soboyo, Soyboibo, Bolbo); Mochobo (Mochovo, Uni-
vitza) and Comobo (Comavo, Comambo, Univitza). K. G. Grubb (1927) calls Pisabo a subdivision of Mananawa, the latter a subtribe of Remo.

Considered as Pano by Nimuendajú (map), but not noted in other lists: Mainawa (distinct from Marinawa), Yananawa, and Yumanawa.

Considered as Pano by Nimuendajú (map); listed as unidentified tribes of Ucayali by Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 567): Puyamanawa (Punyamumanawa) and Camarinawa (Kamarianigua). Ruanawa (Ruanagua, Rununawa) and Puynawa (Poyanawa, Poianawa, Puynagua) are less often mentioned Panoan groups (Steward and Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 566).

The following groups of the Juruá-Purus Basin are considered as Panoan, without any suggestion as to their relationships inter se or with neighboring groups. Probably each is entitled to the status of a dialect or variety, though some may be radically different.

Canamari, (Kanawari, etc.)—These must be distinguished from the Arawak and Catukina Canamari. W. Schmidt (1926) places them with the Catukina in a separate Middle Group of Pano, a division of the Northern Pano not recognized by other authorities.

Curina (Kutino, etc.)—These must be distinguished from the Arawak Culino or Kurina.

Contanawa (Kuontanaua, etc.).
Espinó.

Marinawa.

Nana, probably same as Nawa.
Nawa.

Pacanawa (Pakanaua, etc.).
Shanindawa (Shaninawa, Šaninaua). Distinguish from Saninawa.
Shipinawa (Šipinawa, etc.).
Tushinawa (Tušinaua, etc.).

Yaminawa (Jaminawa, Yuminawa, etc.).

Yawavo (Jauabo, Yawabu, etc.). Distinguish from Southeastern Pano Jauanavo or Caripuná.

Yura.

Remo (Rhemo), Sacuya, Maspo (Impeniteri), Nucuini, Cuyanawa, and Niara (Niamagua) seem to form a related group. Possibly all belong with the Chama language, since Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 565) call Remo a Conibo dialect. Mananawa is mentioned as a subtribe of Remo, but this is not generally accepted. Nucuini is considered by Loukotka (1935) as a synonym of Remo. Sacuya (Sakuya) is generally linked with Remo and probably is a subgroup. Maspo or Impeniteri is also generally linked with Remo. Cuyanawa (Kuyanahua, etc.) is apparently associated with Nucuini.

Possibly to the above group belongs Capanawa (Kapanagua, Kapahuana, etc.) with its subgroup Buskipani (Busquipani). The
latter name has also sometimes been considered as a synonym of Amawaca.

Various opinions seem to correlate the languages or dialects Catukina, Arara, Ararapina, Ararawa, Saninawa, Saninawacaana, and Shawanawa. Catukina (Katoquino, etc.) must be distinguished from four other languages of the same name of other families. Schmidt (1926) places it with Canamari in a separate Middle Group of Pano. Pericot y García (1936) considers Arara, Ararapina, and Ararawa as subgroups of Catukina, and Rivet (1924 a) states that these three are doubtless identical with Saninawa. Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 660) links Shawanawa with the Arara group, and believes that Saninawa is related to Saninawacaana.

According to Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 565), the Amawaca (Amaguaco, Amajuaka, Ameuhaque, etc.) are close relatives of the Cashinawa (Kachinawa, Cushinahua, Caxinagua, etc.). Rivet (1924 a) gives Maspo and Impetineri as synonyms of Amawaca but Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 566) place the former in another group. Sayaca (Sacuya ?) and Busquipani have also been given as synonyms (or subdivisions) of Amawaca, but these also seem to belong to other groups (vide supra); nevertheless, the possibility of the relationship of all these must be considered. Pericot y García (1936) calls Arawa a subtribe of Amawaca; Arawa is generally placed with the Southwestern Pano group (q. v.). Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 566) believe that the extinct Amenwaca (Amen-guaca) is a synonym of Amawaca; it has many groups and subgroups, the best known of which are Inuakeu and Viiviakeu (Viiviakeu). W. Schmidt (1926) links Cashinawa with Sheminawa.

Of the groups mentioned above, Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 567) consider these Ucayali languages unidentified but probably Panoan: Camarinawa, Puyamanawa, Saninawaca, and Sinabu. Also these not before mentioned: Awanawa (Aguanagua), Chunti, Diabu, Isunawa (Ysunagua), Ormiga, Trompetero, and Viabu.

There is general agreement as to the composition of the Southwestern Panoan group in the region of the basin of the Inambari. The two important groups seem to be Arasa (Arasaire, Arazaire, Aratsaira) and Atsawaca-Yamiaca. The Atsawaca (Atsahuaka, etc.) or Chaspa, and the Yamiaca (Yamiaka) or Hasuñeiri dialects (?) must be very similar, as they are said to have separated in historic times. Arasa is probably more divergent. Some of the Arasa and Atsawaca also speak Tacana (Arawak ?) and are often classified in that group. Nordenskiöld’s Arasa vocabulary (1908) is Tacana, but Llosa’s Arasaire vocabulary (1906) is Panoan.

A doubtful member of this group is Araua, which language must be considerably different from the others. Nimuendajú (map) leaves
it unclassified; others consider it a link between the southern and northern Pano. Stiglich (1908) considers it a small group of Amawaca (northern Pano). It must be distinguished from the Arawak Araua.

The southeastern Pano group is generally known as Pacaguará (Pacawara, Pakavara). The consensus is that the Pacaguará group consists of four languages, the interrelations of which are not suggested. These four are Chacobo (Tschakobo), Caripuná, Capuibo (Kapuibo), and Sinabo; the position of the latter alone is disputed. The Caripuná (Karipuná) or Jau-navo (Jaun Avó) are divided into subtribes, the Jacarí (Jakarí, Yacariae, Jacaré-Tapuíya, Yacará-Tapuuya) and the Pamá (Pamaná).

The position of the Sinabo is uncertain. Two groups are mentioned in the literature, the Sinabo and the Shenabu, with intermediate orthographical variants. Rivet (1924 a) classifies them both as members of the Pacaguará group, and probably synonymous. One or the other is also classified as a subtribe of Shipibo (northern Pano), as related to Sensi, and as unidentified. Doubtful also is the position of Zurina; Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 450) apparently considers it a member of the Pacaraguá group while Nimuendajú (map) leaves it unclassified; the others fail to mention it.

**Pano**

I. Central

A. Chama (Ucayali)

1. Conibo
   a. Conibo
   b. Shipibo
      a. Caliseca, Sinabo (?)
      b. Manamabobo, Manava
   c. Setebo
      a. Sensi: Casca, Runubu, Ynubu, Barbudo, Tenti, Mananawa (?)
      b. Panobo: Pano, Pelado, Manoa, Cashiboyano

2. Cashibo (Comabo)
   a. Cacataibo
   b. Cashíño
   c. Ruño
   d. Buninawa
   e. Carapacho (?)
   f. Puchanawa
   g. Shirinó

B. Curina (Kulino)

C. Capanawa

1. Capanawa
   a. Buskipani

2. Remo
   a. Sacuya

1 Distinguish from neighboring Arawak Culino or Culina.
Pano—Continued

I. Central—Continued

C. Capanawa—Continued

3. Maspo
   a. Epetineri (Impenitari)

4. Nucuini
   a. Cuyanawa

5. Niarawa

6. Puyamanawa (?)

D. Amawaca (Amenguaca ?)

1. Amawaca
   a. Cashinawa
      a. Sheminawa
   b. Inuvakeu
   c. Viwivakeu

2. Pichobo
   a. Pichobo (Pisobo)
   b. Soboibo
      a. Ruanawa
   c. Mochobo
      a. Comobo

E. Catukina

1. Arara
   a. Shawanawa

2. Ararapina

3. Ararawa

4. Saninawa
   a. Saninawacana

F. Jurúá-Purús

1. Povanawa

2. Shipinawa

3. Ararawa

4. Yauavo

5. Yaminawa

6. Rununawa

7. Contanawa

8. Yawanawa

9. Pacanawa

10. Yumbanawa

11. Yura

12. Tushinawa

13. Marinawa

14. Espíñó

15. Manawa

16. Canamari


3 Distinguish from Arawak and from Catukina Catukina.

4 Distinguish from Arawak and Catukina Canamari.
II. Southwest
A. Arasaire
B. Atsawaca
   1. Atsawaca
   2. Yamiaca
C. Arauá (?)

III. Southeast
A. Pacawará
   1. Chacobo
   2. Caripuna (Jau-navo)
      a. Jacariá
      b. Pamá (Pamaná)
   3. Capuibo
   4. Sinabo
B. Zurina (?)
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MAYORUNA

Synonyms: Mujuruna, Mazuruna, Mashoruna, Mashobuna, Maioruna, Morike, Pelado.

Mayoruna is generally accepted as a Panoan language (Brinton, 1891 a; Rivet, 1924 a; Krickeberg, 1922: Schmidt, W., 1926; Nimu-
endajú, map and index; Jijón y Caamaño, 1941–43). However, Tessmann and Loukotka see nothing Panoan in it. Tessmann (1930) considers it a mixture of Arawak and Tupí; Loukotka gives it independent status, at first (1935) terming it Mayoruna family, Morike language, and later (1939 a) Morike family; he sees Arawak intrusions in it. Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 551) consider it a Panoan group. It had best be left unclassified; the linguistic data are poor.

Two subtribes are generally recognized, Maruba and Chirabo (Tessmann, 1930). However, the opinions regarding these and other possible subdivisions are very contradictory. The synonym Pelado is also given as a synonym for Panobo. Maruba (Marubo, Moruba, Marova, Marahua) is considered by Loukotka a synonym for Mayoruna; Tessmann (1930) considers it of uncertain affiliation but probably Panoan; K. G. Grubb (1927) calls Marubo and Pisabo subdivisions of Mananawa (q. v.); others agree to the Pano affinities. Chirabo (Čirabo, Tširabo) is generally accepted as Panoan.

Bibliography.—Castelinau, 1852, pp. 299–300; Martius, 1867, 2:236–239; Tessmann, 1930, pp. 368–378, 582.

**ITUCALE, SIMACU, AND URARINA**

**Itucalean** was considered as an independent family until at least the time of Chamberlain (1913 a), though he noted the suggestion of Beuchat and Rivet (1909) that it might be Panoan. The latter opinion has been accepted by most recent authorities. **Itucale, Urarina, Shimacu, Chambira, Singacuchusca, and Arucui** have been placed in this group by various writers; it is not unlikely that not all are related, some Panoan, others not. Tessman (1930) finds no Panoan resemblances in Simacu, and considers it a mixture of Tucano and Arawak, with about equal lexical resemblance to Tucano, Arawak, and Ge. Loukotka (1935) agrees with him, finds only vestiges of Pano, and makes Simacu an independent family. The Itucale and Urarina, at least, are probably extinct; the latter is generally classified as Panoan. According to Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 557), Urarina was once reported to be related to Mayoruna (q. v.), while the Itucale were said to have spoken the same (Tupian) language as the Cocamilla.

As the lexical resemblances reported by Tessmann (1930) total less than 10 percent of his collected vocabulary of over 300 words they may well all be borrowed words of no value for classificatory purposes. This vocabulary should be sufficient for a determination of the true relationship of Simacu, at least, without further field investigation. In the present status, all these languages had best be considered as unclassified.
Bibliography.—Beuchat and Rivet, 1909, p. 621; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 189–190; Rivet, 1912 a; Tessmann, 1930, p. 486.

AGUANO

It is disputed whether the Aguano (Aguanu, Awano, Santa Crucino) group of languages was independent, Panoan, or Cahuapanan. Whatever the former language, it was given up in favor of Quechuan, probably some time after the Spanish Conquest. The group apparently consisted of three divisions (see Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 557–558), the Aguano Proper, Cutinana, and Mapurina. Other tribes of uncertain affiliation and subclassification are Chamicura and possibly Siculuna. Chamicura and Mapurina are considered Panoan by Rivet (1924 a). Cutinana Beuchat and Rivet (1909) consider as akin to Chebero, that is, belonging to the Cahuapanan family. But the Cutinana are reported as having spoken the same language as the Aguano and Mapurina, and whatever affiliation can be proved for any of these languages would seemingly apply to the entire Aguano group.

AGUANO

A. Aguano Proper
   1. Seculusepa
      a. Chilicowa
   2. Melikine
      1. a. Tivilo
B. Cutinana
C. Mapurina

Bibliography.—Tessmann, 1930, p. 253.

CHAMICURO

Chamicuro (Chamicura, Tschamikuro, etc.) is generally considered a Chama (Panoan) language, and Steward and Métraux (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 559) call it "closely related to Shipibo," with the subtribe Chiculuna, but, unless an entirely different language of the same name is referred to, some other opinions are at entire variance. While Rivet (1924 a) agrees that it is Pano, both Tessmann (1930) and Loukotka (1935) find nothing Panoan in it, but consider it a mixture of Arawak and Tucano. Elsewhere (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 558) Steward and Métraux remark that if Chamicuro is Panoan, then all the Aguano group of languages is.

Bibliography.—Tessmann, 1930, p. 397.

SOUTHERN TROPICAL LOWLAND FAMILIES OF PRESUMED INDEPENDENCE

UNCLASSIFIED LANGUAGES OF EASTERN PERÚ

In the forests of eastern Perú are, or were, a large number of slightly known tribes, some now extinct, assimilated or deculturized. On
most, there are little or no linguistic data. In addition to a few specifically discussed elsewhere, the more important of them are: Alon, Amasifuin, Carapacho, Cascoasoa, Chedua, Cholto, Chunanawa, Chusco, Cognomona, Chupacho, Huayana, Kikideana (Quiquidcana), Moyo-pampa, Nindaso, Nomona, Pantahua, Payanso, Tepqui, Tingan, Tulumayo, and Zapazo. Most of these spoke Quechua when first discovered.

SMALL "FAMILIES" OF BOLIVIA

There are at least seven languages of northern and western Bolivia that are generally considered independent: Itonama, Canichana, Cayuwava, Movima, Moseten, Leco, and Yuracare. Most of them are without known subdivisions, and no evidences for larger affiliations have ever been presented. Most of them have been the subject of special studies. None is known to be extinct, though the speakers are not numerous. Scientific linguistic field research and study upon them is greatly needed, and it will probably eventually be found that they are very variant members of better known families. All have always been known by minor orthographical variants of their standard name.

ITONAMAN

All authorities consider Itonama as independent, isolated, or unclassified. Machoto is given as a synonym. Markham (1910) considered it a branch of Mojo. Loukotka (1935) believed he saw evidences of Arawak intrusion.

The available linguistic data are limited to about 300 words in several collected vocabularies and prayers. The language seems to be both grammatically and lexically different from all its neighbors, rather complex in distinction to other Bolivian languages, which Rivet believes to be rather simple. The pronominal subject is said to be different for men and for women in the second person. "Prepositions" are prefixed, as are possessive pronouns. The verb employs both prefixes and suffixes.

Bibliography.—Adam, 1897-98; Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Cardus, 1886; Chamberlairn, 1910 a; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1916-17; Fonseca, J. S. da, 1880-81; Gillin, 1940; Métraux, 1942 a, p. 83; Nordensköld, 1915 a; Orbigny, 1839; Pauly, 1928, p. 173; Rivet, 1921 a.

CANICHANAN

Synonyms: Kanichana, Kanišana, Kanīčana, Kanitschana, Canisiana, Kanisiana, Canesi, Caneci.

Except that Markham (1910) considered it a branch of Mojo, there has never been any suggestion of wider affiliations for Canichana. The extinction of the language seems to be disputed.
The available linguistic data are limited to about 240 words in three vocabularies. These seem to show no resemblance to any surrounding language. Canichana shows less resemblance to Uro than does Chapacura. The pronominal possessive is prefixed. There are classificatory nominal prefixes and also apparently nominal suffixes. Pluralization is by suffix. The verb employs both prefixes and suffixes.

Bibliography.—Cardus, 1886; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 182–83; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 f; Gillin, 1940; Heath, E., 1883; Métraux, 1942 a, p. 81; Orbigny, 1839, p. 80; Pauly, 1928, p. 171; Teza, 1868.

**CAYUVAVAN**

Synonyms: Kayubaba, etc., Cayuaba, Chacobo.

Loukotka (1935) saw evidences of Arawak intrusion in Cayuvava and Markham (1910) considered it a branch of Mojo, but there has been no evidence presented for its wider relationships. Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1920) found some lexical resemblance to Guai-curú but not enough on which to assume any relationship; some, but even less resemblance was found to Tuyoneiri, Canichana, and Movima.

A few hundred words are known in seven collected vocabularies, and a few short texts. The nominal plural is by means of a prefix, much similar to that in Movima. Also like Movima, there is an article or indefinite demonstrative. Pronominal possession is by prefixation; prepositions are also prefixed. Both verbal and nominal prefixes and suffixes are employed.


**MOVIMAN**

This small one-language family is of doubtful validity, but on the basis of the not-too-large available lexical data it has been accorded independent status by all from Chamberlain (1913 a) and Brinton (1891 a) down. No synonyms for the group except minor orthographical variants have been used in the literature. Markham (1910) considers it a branch of the Mojo (Arawak); relationship with the neighboring Canichana might be suspected. There are few if any speakers left.

Bibliography.—Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Cardus, 1886, p. 516; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 192–193; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1914–19; Métraux, 1942 a, p. 81; Nordenskiöld, 1922, pp. 76–77; Orbigny, 1839; Pauly, 1928, pp. 162–163; Rivet, 1929 b.
MOSETENAN

A small "family" of doubtful validity that will probably be incorporated in some larger group when more careful studies are made and/or more data available. Up until the present all authorities have granted it independent position and none has even hinted at broader relationships. Métraux suggests personally that a comparison with Yuracare might prove significant. It consists of two main languages, Moseten and Chimane. A number of affiliated groups are mentioned in the literature, but it is not certain how these are related, which ones are synonyms, or whether the linguistic divergences are on a dialectic level or greater. There are probably a few Moseten left, and several thousand Chimane.

Moseten

1. Moseten
   a. Amo
   b. Aparono
   c. Cunana
   d. Chumpa
   e. Magdaleno
   f. Punnucana
   g. Rache
   h. Muchanes
   i. Tucupi

2. Chimane
   a. Chimaniza
   b. Chumano
   c. Nawazi-Montji

Bibliography.—Armentia, 1888, 1903; Bibolotti, 1917; Cardus, 1886, pp. 310–311; Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 192; Groeteken, 1907; Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 15–17; Pauly, 1928, pp. 104–105; Schuller, 1916.

LECAN

Synonyms: Leko, Leka, Lapalapa, Chuncho, Ateniano.

The small Leco group has been accepted as independent at least since Chamberlain's day (1910 a). Brinton (1892 a), lacking any lexical material, at first placed them with Tacanan on geographical grounds. The language is called Lapalapa. It seems to have been the language spoken at the mission of Aten, whence the natives were referred to as Atenianos; the latter are sometimes considered a subgroup of Leco; otherwise there are no subdivisions of the family. D'Orbigny (1839) classified the Ateniano as Tacanan. Markham (1910) called them Mositen (Moseten, q. v.). Probably a few hundred still survive.

Bibliography.—Brinton, 1892 a; Cardus, 1886, p. 314; Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 190; Lafone-Quevedo, 1905; Métraux, 1942 a, pp. 27–29; Orbigny, 1839.
Yuracarean

Synonyms: Yurukare, Yurujure, Yuruyure, etc.

Modern writers prefer Yuracare to the older standard Yurucare. Métraux (personal conversation) suggests that a comparison with Moseten might prove fruitful. Markham (1910) considered them a branch of the Chiquito; Loukotka (1935) sees Pano vestiges. However, no evidence for wider relationships has ever been presented though, like the other independent (?) small languages in this region, its isolated status is doubted and will probably eventually be disproved.

Though most authorities mention no subdivisions, the Yuracare are said to be divided into two main subgroups, probably of the status of languages, the eastern and the western. Their components are probably of dialectic quality.

Yuracare

1. East
   a. Soloto (Mage)
2. West
   a. Mansinyo
   b. Oromo
Possibly: Cont, Cuchi, Enete (Brinton, 1891.)

Bibliography.—Cardus, 1886, pp. 314–315; Castillo, 1906; Chamberlain, 1910 a; Cueva, 1893; Holter, 1877; Ludewig, 1858; Métraux, 1942 a; Nordenskiöld, 1910 b, 1911 b; Orbigny, 1839; Pauly, 1928, p. 177; Richter, 1928.

Small Languages of the Brazil-Bolivia Border

(Havari, Masáca, Capishaná, Puruborá, Mashibi, etc.)

Huari, Masáca (Massaka), and Capishaná (Kapišaná) are located very close together on Nimuendajú’s map, Puruborá (Burubord) nearby. The first three, Nimuendajú considers separate isolated families. He apparently had some notes on the Capishaná, but it is practically unknown in ethnological literature.

Huari has long been recognized as independent (Rivet, 1924 a; Pericot y García, 1936; Schmidt, W., 1926; Loukotka, 1935), though it is too small and unimportant to have been known to Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a). There are few data on it and apparently no component languages of the family. Gillin (1940) doubts its validity, and Métraux herein leaves it unclassified. Levi-Strauss (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 372) apparently considers Huari equivalent to Massaka (Masáca), and both linguistically related to Buruborá (Purubord). The latter, Puruborá, Loukotka (1935) considers as an independent family, consisting of one language with Tupí intrusions. Nimuendajú (map), however, places it in the Tupí family.
Koch-Grüenberg (1932) published a vocabulary. With the exception of *Huari* and *Masóca* all these groups are too small and unimportant to be mentioned by Rivet (1924 a) and W. Schmidt (1926). Rivet considers *Masóca* Arawakan.

*Mashubi* (Mašubi), also in this general region, was given the status of an independent family by Rivet (1924 a) and accepted by Loukotka (1935, 1939 a). Rivet’s opinion is based on a short vocabulary collected by Colonel Fawcett in 1924. This apparently passed into the possession of Nordenskiöld and was examined by Rivet; it seems never to have been published. The “family” is, therefore, of doubtful validity; Nimuendajú does not list it or place it on his map. An independent family should not be posited on such slim evidence.

*Kepikiriwat*, *Sanamaicá*, *Tupará*, *Guaycarú*, *Aricapu*, *Yaputi*, *Aruashi*, and *Canoa* are languages occupying tiny areas in a small region. The data on them are few, and they had best be left unclassified pending further information. None is classified by Rivet. Nimuendajú considers *Kepikiriwat*, *Sanamaicá*, *Tupará*, and *Guaycarú* as *Tupí*: *Aruashi* and *Canoa* he leaves unclassified.

**Bibliography.**—Koch-Grüenberg (Puruborá), 1932.

**CATUKINAN**

**Synonyms:** *Katokena, Catequina*, etc.

The *Catukina* family is one of rather recent acceptance; Brinton (1891 a) believed that it was a jargon, and Chamberlain (1913 a) did not include it among his families. The name seems to be a descriptive *Tupí* word, not originally a proper name, and thus has been used as the name for a number of different tribes that are, therefore, liable to confusion and must be distinguished. Rivet (1924 a) lists five tribes of this name, most of them of different linguistic affinities, one *Tupí-Guaraní*, one Arawak, one *Pano*, and two belonging to the present group. Several of the subtribes, *Catawishi* and *Canamarí*, also have duplicates in other families so that the possibility of confusion is very great. There are *Pano* and *Arawak Canamarí*, and an unclassified *Catawishi*, according to Nimuendajú (map).

The *Catukina* family area is a large one and the component tribes very numerous, but there seems to be no general agreement regarding the grouping of these into languages and dialects. The fullest list seems to be on Nimuendajú’s map, with little suggestion as to sub-groupings.

*Catawishi, Canamarí*, and *Catawishi* are the most important and best-known languages. The *Katokina of Spix* (Martius, 1867, 2:161–163) belongs with the *Canamarí* of the Juruá. Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a) mistakenly identified this with the *Katukinaru* of Bach (Church, 1898), a *Tupí Guaraní* language, which probably
accounts for Brinton’s considering Catukina a jargon. If these Catukina and Canamari are Arawak, they belong to a new and very variant subgroup. The Katukino of Marcoy (1867) on the other hand go with the Catawishi, and may be identical with the latter.

**Catukina**

1. Beń-Dyapá (Bendiapa)
2. Burue (Buruhe)
3. Canamari
4. Catawishi (Hewadie)
5. Catukina
   a. Pidá-Dyapá
   b. Kutid-Dyapá
6. Catukino
7. Parawa
8. Tawari (Tawar6)
   a. Cadekili-Dyapá
   b. Wadyo-Paraniñ-Dyapá (Kairara)
9. Tucun-Dyapá (Tucano Dyapa, Mangeroma)
10. (Miscellaneous)
   a. Amená-Dyapá
   b. Cana-Dyapá
   c. Hon-Dyapá
   d. Maró-Dyapá
   e. Ururu-Dyapá
   f. Wirí-Dyapá

**Bibliography.**—Brinton, 1898 b; Marcoy, 1867 (1869); Martius, 1867, 2:161-163; Rivet, 1920 b; Tastevin, 1928 a.

**Chapacuran**

The Chapacuran (Čapakura) family has always been known by orthographical variants of the above name though Chamberlain (1912 c) proposed, but never employed, the alternative Pawumwa(n). It now includes the former Itenean stock of Hervás y Panduro (1800) and the former extinct Ocoronan stock; Chamberlain (1913 a) included the latter in his definitive classification, believing that Créqui-Montfort and Rivet’s identification (1913 b) of Ocoronan and Chapacuran needed more proof; this is now generally accepted.

According to Rivet, the extinct Ocorono group had been strongly influenced by Arawak and especially by Uro (q. v.) (Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1921, p. 104). Some of the tribes had been previously classified as Pano. Loukotka (1935) also finds Arawak intrusions in all the languages except Tora which he considers mixed with Carib. Martius (1867) thought them connected with the Paraguayan Guache, a Guaicura group, but Brinton (1891 a, p. 303) sees slight resemblance.

Wanyam (Huañam), the modern name for Pawumwa, has always been considered a member, and often the most typical member, of
Chapacura, but it has been considered by some a separate linguistic stock (see below).

No definite classification of the Chapacura languages and dialects has ever been proposed on a linguistic basis. As usual, it may be assumed that each group named, if not a synonym, had its own dialect, that affiliated groups had closely related languages, and that the linguistic divisions roughly followed the geographical ones. On this basis three main divisions might be proposed, the languages of the Guaporé River Basin, those of the Madeira River Basin, and the extinct Ocorono group.

If they are Chapacuran, Wanyam, and Cabishi belong in the Guaporé group. The languages or dialects of the Madeira River group cannot be very variant, as they are said to have moved there in post-Columbian days.

Arikém (Ariqueme, Ahopovo) (q. v.) is generally considered in this group, but the language seems to be very different from the others; Loukotka (1935) gives it an independent family, and Nimuendajú (map) and Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) apparently consider it Tupí.

Chapacura

I. Guaporé Division
   A. Chapacura Group (Huachi, Guarayo, etc.)
      1. Chapacura
      2. Kitemoca
         a. Napeca
      3. Moré (Itén)
         a. Itoreauhip
   B. Wanyam ¹ (Pawumwa)
      1. Wanyam
      2. Cabishi

II. Madeira Division
   1. Torá (Toraz)
   2. Jarú
   3. Urupá
   4. Pacas Novas

III. Ocorono Division
   A. Ocorono (Rokorona)
      1. Sansimoniano ² (?)
   B. San Ignacio
      1. Borja
   C. Herisobocona

¹ See following separate section on these.
² Jijón y Caamaño places Sansimoniano under Chiquitano.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Undifferentiated.—Cardus, 1886, p. 320; Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 184; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 b; Métraux, 1940, 1942 a, pp. 86–95; Nordenskiöld, 1915 b; Orbigny, 1839, p. 164; Pauly, 1928, pp. 168–169; Snethlage, E. H., 1931; Teza, 1868.
**Guaporé division.**—Cardus, 1886, p. 320; Chamberlain, 1910 a, pp. 188–189; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 b; Orbigny, 1839; Pauly, 1928, pp. 168–169.


**WANYAM (HUANAM) AND CABISHI (KABIČI)**

Wanyam seems to be the rediscovered Pawumwa, and the name has displaced the latter. To date they have always been considered one of the Guaporé Chapacuran groups, and are accepted by Métroix (Handbook, vol. 3, p. 398) and by Nimuendajú (map) as such. The latter considers Abitana Wanyam a subdivision, the former a synonym. However, Lévi-Strauss who pursued studies in their region, believed in a Huanyam linguistic stock, consisting of Matawa Cujuña (Cuñana), Urunamakan, Cabishi, Cumaná, Snethlage’s Abitana-Huanyam, and Haseman’s Pawumwa. Only the last four are at all known to science, and the last two probably constitute one group. All of these are generally considered as Chapacura, with the exception of Cabishi, which name seems to be applied to several groups of different linguistic affiliations. (See Nambicuara.)

**WANYAM**

1. Cabishi
2. Cuñuna
3. Cumaná
   a. Cutianá
4. Matama (Matawa)
5. Urunamacan
6. Pawumwa
   a. Abitana Wanyam

Rivet (1924 a) considers Cabishi as Nambicuara; Schmidt (1926) (Paresí-Kabici), Arawak; Nimuendajú, Nambicuara or Chapacura. There may be several groups of Cabishi.

**Bibliography.**—Chamberlain, 1912 c; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 b, pp. 141–68; Haseman, 1912; Snethlage, E. H., 1931.

**MASCOIAN**

A confusion of identities and of groups of the same names but of different linguistic affinities characterizes this family, which consists of one language. Ehrenreich first used the name Machicui or Muscovi; Koch-Grünberg (1902 a), Mascoi. Boggianni (1900) called them Enimagá, confusing them with the true Enimagá (Cochabot, q. v.), which name was applied to the Mascoi family by Chamberlain (1913 a) and by Brinton (1898 a). To avoid further confusion the Enimagá are now termed Macá (q. v.). One of the constituent dialects is the Lengua. These are the “new” Lengua, the Lengua of W. B. Grubb (1911); the “old” Lengua are a Macá (Enimagá) group.
D’Orbigny (1839) insisted that the Mascoi were Guaicurú, like the Toba, but Lafone-Quevedo (1896–97) compared the vocabulary with Abipon with a negative conclusion. Brinton (1898 a) found a few similarities to Chon.

There is practically no difference of opinion regarding the components of Mascoi, six scarcely differentiated dialects, except that W. Schmidt (1926) includes Suhin (Sujén, Suzén), a neighboring language, generally classed as Mataco and connected with Ashluslay, and Toosle (Toowothli), now placed with Macá (Enimagá). Nimuendajú (map) differentiates Angaité from Enenslet, Machicuy from Mascoi; by others they are considered synonyms. Métraux (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 227) mentions the following extinct groups that may have been either Mascoi, or Arawakan Guana: Guatata, Nohaague, Empirú, Yaperú or Apirú, and Naperú.

Mascoi

1. Angaité
   a. Enenslet
2. Caskihd (Guana 1)
3. Lengua 2 (Geoinlakaac)
4. Mascoi
   a. Machicui (Tujetge)
5. Sanapaná
6. Sapuki

1 Distinguish Mascoi and Arawak Guana.
2 Distinguish Mascoi and Macá Lengua.

Bibliography.—Baldus, 1931; Boggiani, 1900; Brinton, 1898 a; Cardus, 1886, p. 271; Cominges, 1892, p. 245; Coryn, 1922; Ehrenreich, 1891; Grubb, W. B., 1911, pp. 318–321; Hunt, 1917; Kersten, 1905; Koch-Grünberg, 1902 a; Lafone-Quevedo, 1896–97; Loukotka, 1930; Orbigny, 1839.

ZAMUCOAN

The Zamuco (Samucan) “stock” occupies a relatively small area in the northern Chaco. The people and their languages are of slight cultural importance and little known, few in number and disappearing, though the names of a large number of groups are known, many of them extinct. No other name has ever been applied to the group. The differentiation between the component languages and dialects seems to be relatively slight. Brinton (1898 a) pointed out many lexical resemblances with Arawak but refused to posit any genetic relationship; the common elements may be largely due to borrowing. Métraux personally suggests that a comparison of Zamuco with Bororo-Otuque might prove significant, and, as in the case of most small groups at present considered independent, an intensive study will probably tie it to some large family or phylum.

The grouping and subclassification of the languages and dialects
are uncertain since the various authorities, as usual, do not agree. That adopted below follows Métraux (Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 241–245) so far as possible. Even the major divisions, apparently, do not differ greatly, and some of the names may be synonyms, or merely bands without linguistic differentiation.

The language is reported to be mellifluous.

ZAMUCO

I. North: Zamuco
   A. Zamuco
      1. Zamuco (Samuca)
      2. Satiency (Zatieño, Ibiraya)
   B. Morotoco (Coroino)
      1. Cucarate (Kukutade)
      2. Orebate (Ororobate)
         a. Carerá
      3. Panono (Panana)
      4. Tomoeno
   C. Guaranyoca (Guarañoca)
      1. Tsiracua (Empelota)
         a. Moro (remnants of Morotoco and Guaranyoca)
   D. Ugaranyo (Ugaróno)
      1. Ugaranyo
   E. Tapii (Tapio) (?)
   F. Poturero (Ninaguilá, Ninaquiguila)

II. South: Chamacoco
   A. Chamacoco (Tumanahá, Timinihá)
      1. Ebidoso
      2. Horio (Ishira)
      3. Tumerehá
   B. Imono
   C. Tunacho (Tunaca)
   D. Caipolorade

Also (Nimuendajú map): Aguiteguedichagá, Laipisi.

1 The Tapii may have been Otukean.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Zamuco.—Baldus, 1932; Brinton, 1898 a; Huonder, 1902; Kersten, 1905, pp. 64–66; Loukotka, 1931 a; Nordenskiöld, 1912, p. 324; Oefner, 1942; Orbigny, 1839, p. 164; Steinen, 1912.

Chamacoco.—Baldus, 1927; Belaieff, 1937; Boggiani, 1894, 1929; Cardus, 1886, p. 327; Loukotka, 1929–30, 1930, pp. 560–572; Steinen, 1895.

GUATOAN

No question has ever been raised regarding the independence of the Guató; no suggestion has been made of relationship with any other group. No linguistic subdivisions are known, but the Guaxarapo (Guachi) are always associated with them. (See Métraux, Handbook,
vol. 1, pp. 214, 225, 409.) The Guató verge on extinction. The principal source is Max Schmidt (1914 b).

Bibliography.—Castelnau, 1852, pp. 283–284; Chamberlain, 1913 c; Koslowsky, 1895; Martius, 1867, 2:209–210; Monoyer, 1905; Schmidt, M., 1902, 1905, 1912, 1914 b.

BOROROAN AND OTUKE

The Bororo and the Otuke (Otuké, Otuqui) were long considered separate and independent, and the former was once thought a Tupí tongue (Brinton, 1891 a). Cogent arguments for their linkage were presented (Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1912, 1913 a) and all recent authorities have linked them, either under the name Bororo or Otuke. Métraux, however, is not convinced of the connection, and it needs further study and corroboration. The Otuke are probably extinct. Two, possibly four, extinct languages, formerly given independent status, Covareca and Curuminaca, and possibly Corabeca, Curave, and Curucaneca (q. v.), compose, with Otuke, the Otukean group. Brinton (1891 a) noted a distant resemblance to Tacana. Bororo-Otuke will probably eventually be incorporated in some larger phylum. Métraux suggests that a comparison with Zamuco-Chamacoco might prove significant. The Bororo are sometimes known as Coroado, a name applied to a number of different groups, especially of Ge and Macro-Ge, from which they must be distinguished.

Borotoke ¹

I. Bororo (Coroado)
A. Bororo
   1. Eastern
      a. Orarimugudoge
   2. Western
      a. Cabasal
      b. Campanya
   3. Acioné
   4. Aravira
   5. Biriruné
   6. Coroa (?)
   7. Coxipo (?)
B. Umotina (Barbado)
II. Otuké
   A. Otuké
   B. Covareca ²
   C. Curuminaca ²
   D. Coraveca (?) ²
      1. Curave (?) ²
   E. Curucaneca (?) ²
   F. Tapii (?) ³

¹ Hybrid name suggested here for group of Bororo-Otuke.
² See following section.
³ The Tapii may have been Otukan or Zamucoan.
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Coraveca and Covareca; Curucanea and Curuminaca

The similar names in these two groups are not metathesized synonyms. In close geographic propinquity, some close relationship would seem indicated, but the available vocabularies on these extinct languages indicate that the four are separate and very different. In the older classifications all four were considered as independent families. Some authorities, such as Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1912, 1913 a), place all under Bororo or Otuké (q. v.). The inclusion of Covareca and Curuminaca is generally accepted, but Coraveca (Curave) and Curucanea (Curucane), showing less resemblance to Otuké, are included with hesitation or reservations, left unclassified, or awarded independent status. By some, Curave and Coraveca are considered as separate, not as synonymous. The arguments for the inclusion of Covareca and Curuminaca in the Otuké family have been published (Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913 a), but not those for Corave and Corabeca, Curucaneca and Tapii. The languages are all in the Chiquito region, but no Chiquito connections have been suggested, although all four groups are said to have spoken Chiquito a century ago (Métraux, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 381). The names of many groups in this region have a similar ring: Saraveca, Paiconeca, Paunaca (Arawak), Kitemoca (Chapacura), Waranyoca (Zamuco), etc. The four languages in question may be closely related, the recorded vocabularies at fault, but as they are extinct their degree of relationship will probably never be known. (See Otuké–Bororo for table.)

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1912, 1913 a.

Nambicuaran

The relatively recently discovered Nambicuara were unknown to and not classified by the earlier authorities; they and their languages have recently been studied carefully by Claude Lévi-Strauss. No detailed comparisons with other linguistic families have been made, but Lévi-Strauss states that the logical structure is much like Chibcha, with also some similarities in vocabulary, but nothing conclusive. Loukotka (1935) sees vestiges of several eastern Brazilian languages in several of the component Nambicuara languages but nothing that
characterizes the family as a whole. The outstanding characteristic of the group according to Lévi-Strauss (personal correspondence) is an extensive use of classificatory suffixes dividing things and beings into about 10 categories.

According to Lévi-Strauss (personal correspondence), the classification of the Nambicuara languages by Roquette-Pinto (1917) is not good. There are two main groups, the Nambicuara Proper and the pseudo-Nambicuara. The latter, northern group, the Sabane, never before mentioned in literature, is considerably different from the other languages in structure and has a vocabulary rich in Arawakan elements probably borrowed from the Paressi. It may be found to belong to some other, or to be a new linguistic family.

The Nambicuara Proper are divided into two languages and each of these into two dialects, as shown in the following table. The endings of words is the only difference between the Cocozú and Anunzé dialects. The Tamaindé vocabulary of Max Schmidt (1929 a, p. 102) belongs to the western dialect, characterized by a new form for the verbal suffix.

In addition to orthographical synonyms, such as Nambikwará, they are known as Mambyuara, Mahibarez, and Uaikoakore; the dialect names have also many orthographical variants. A few groups not mentioned by Lévi-Strauss are included in the Nambicuara family by some of the other authorities, sometimes by several of them, and contradicted by none. These are Salumá, Nêné, Congoré, and Navaité; some of them may be synonyms. Métraux suggests the possible inclusion of Guayuakuré and Tapanhuana, apparently little-known groups.

**Nambicuara**

I. **Nambicuara Proper**
   A. Northeastern
      1. Eastern
         a. Cocozú
      2. Northeastern
         b. Anunzé
   B. Southwestern
      1. Central and Southern
         a. Uaintazu
         b. Kabishi
         c. Tagnani
         d. Tauité
         e. Taruité
         f. Tashuité
      2. Western
         a. Tamaindé

II. **Pseudo-Nambicuara**
   A. Northern
      1. Sabane
CABISHI

Cabishi is one of those names applied to a number of different tribes. Authorities such as Nimuendajú and Rivet seem to agree that the true Cabishi are a branch of the Nambicuara, and Nimuendajú equates the term with Waintázú (Uaintaçú). Another Cabishi are a branch of the Wanyam. (See Chapacura.) The Paressí-Cabishi are Arawak (q. v.). The name Cabishiana (Kabixiana, Kapišana, q. v.) is probably related.

MURAN

A moderately small group, Mura is considered as forming an independent linguistic family by all modern authorities except Brinton (1891 a). He states that the majority of its words are from Tupi roots; as his opinions—and often his guesses—are generally good, and as no other authority has noted this resemblance, we may suspect that the vocabulary that he used was unsuitable in this connection. No other suggestions regarding larger relationships have been made, though Loukotka (1935) finds vestiges or intrusions of Camacan and Caingang—an unlikely possibility.

The Mura family may consist of two main divisions, Mura Proper and Matanawi or Matanauy (q. v.). But the latter is so divergent that Nimuendajú (map) considers it isolated. Mura Proper is divided into three “dialects,” those of Bohurá, Pirahá, and Yahahi. (See Nimuendajú, Handbook, vol. 3, pp. 255–258.) Mura must not be confused with the Bolivian (Chapacuran?) Mure.

MURA

A. Bohurá
B. Pirahá
C. Yahahi

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a; Martius, 1867, 2: 20–21; Nimuendajú, 1925, 1932 a; Nimuendajú and Valle Bentes, 1923.

MATANAWI

Rivet (1924 a), who uses the spelling Matanauy, Loukotka (1935, 1939 a), and Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) place Matanawi in the Mura family; Loukotka sees Caingang intrusions. But Nimuendajú (map and linguistic index), whose vocabulary (1925, pp. 161–171) seems to be the basic source, prefers to list it among his “isolated languages.”

TRUMAIAN

Trumai has been accepted as independent ever since its discovery by Von den Steinen. No suggestion as to larger affiliations has ever been made. The linguistic data, however, are few, and when it is better known an attachment to some larger family is likely. A single language composes the "family."

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a; Steinen, 1894, pp. 540-542.

CARAJÁN

Synonyms: Carayá, Karayá, Karadžá.

Universally recognized as an independent family, at least since the days of Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a), no other variant synonym has ever been proposed for the stock. Lipkind (vol. 3, p. 179), who has recently recorded and studied it, says it is unrelated to at least the four great families of Arawak, Carib, Tupí, and Ge. The speech of men and women differ. Brinton (1891 a, p. 261) found a little lexical resemblance to "Tapuya" (Ge), which may probably be ascribed to borrowing.

While no classificatory subdivisions of the family have been proposed, there is general agreement that Carajá (see same synonyms as for family) or Karayaki (Carajáki), Yavahé (Yavahai, Javahé, Javahai, Zavažé, Shavayé, Jawagé), and Shambioá (Schambioá, Šambioá, Chimbioá, Ximbioá) are the principal component languages. Linguistic differences in the three are slight and on a dialectic level (Lipkind, Handbook, vol. 3, p. 179). W. Schmidt (1926) also includes Asurini (probably Tupian). Brinton (1891 a) distinguishes Carajáki from Carajá. Nimuendajú (map) distinguishes from the Carajá of the Araguaya an earlier unclassified extinct group of the same name in Minas Gerais, possibly ancestral.

1. Carajá (Karayá)
   a. Carayáki
2. Yavahé (Shavaye)
3. Shambioá

Bibliography.—Castelnau, 1852, pp. 268-269; Chamberlain, 1913 c; Coudreau, H., 1897 b, pp. 259-270; Ehrenreich, 1888, 1894-95, pp. 20-37; Krause, 1911, pp. 458-469; Kunike, 1916, 1919; Martius, 1867, 2: 264-266.

CARIRIAN

Synonyms: Kariri, Kairiri, Cairiri, Kayiri, Kiriri, Cayriri.

Cariri has always been recognized as an independent family. The suggestion has been made that it belongs with the great Carib stock (Gillin, 1940), but no evidence in support has been offered. As a
grammar (Mamiani, 1877) and other studies on the language (Adam, 1897) have been published, the determination should not be difficult. The family is on the verge of extinction; the few remnants of Camurú probably do not use their language in its former purity.

The linguistic subdivisions of the family seem to be:

A. Cariri
1. Kipea
2. Camurú
3. Dzubucua
4. Pedra Branca

B. Sapuya
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MACRO-GE

Macro-Ge is a term here proposed for the first time as an equivalent for the *Ge* or "Tapuya stock" or "family" as constituted until recent years, synonymous with Rivet's (1924 a) Ze and W. Schmidt's (1926) Ges-Tapuya. As herein conceived, it consists of *Ge* and some eight other "families," "stocks," or languages, formerly considered as members of the great *Ge* family, which some recent authorities suggest as independent. Future research will have to give the final decision as to their independence; they are herein considered as far from proved. There is considerable lexical resemblance, which may or may not be a result of borrowing. Had these languages always been considered independent, articles would certainly have been written to prove their relationship with *Ge*, as cogent, and as convincing or unconvincing, as many others linking other groups, formerly considered independent, with larger entities. It may eventually be decided that some of these languages are independent, but it is more likely that other small languages will be added to make Macro-Ge an even more inclusive phylum.

Rivet (1924 a, p. 697) summarized the *Ge* situation well in his remarks:

This family, of all the South American families, is the one most artificially constituted. It is the *caput mortuum* of South American linguistics. Its careful and complete revision, on truly scientific grounds, is imperative.

Rivet, who made researches on most of the South American families, left *Ge* severely alone. Loukotka took up the problem and, with his usual "radical conservatism," split the old *Ge* into nine independent families: Ze (*Ge*); Kaingán (Caingang); Kamakán (Camacan); Masakali (Mashacali); Coroado; Patašo (Patasho); Botocudo; Opaié (Opayé);
Iaté (Fornio, Fulnio). He sees Ge “intrusions” in all but the first and last. In his earlier studies Loukotka retained Caingang under Ge Proper, but finally (1935, 1939 a) decided to separate this also. It was his intention to publish a monograph on each of these new families, with large comparative vocabularies, written in the same pattern, but to date he has published on only Mashacalí (1931–32 a), Camacán (1931–32 b), Coroado (1937), and Patasho (1939 c).

Nimuendajú and Lowie herein accept all these components as independent from Ge Proper, either as families or as isolated languages, with the exception of Caingang, which they still consider as a member of Ge Proper. Herein Caingang (q. v.) is considered as separate from Ge Proper as the other components of Macro-Ge.

As conceived herein, Macro-Ge consists of nine groups or families as follows: (1) Ge; (2) Caingang; (3) Camacán; (4) Mashacalí; (5) Puri; (6) Patashó; (7) Malalí; (8) Coropó; and (9) Botocudo.

It will be noted that, in addition to orthographic variations, this list, while equal in number to Loukotka’s, differs slightly. The name Puri is preferred to Coroado. Malalí and Coropó have been added because their classification in some one of the other groups is so uncertain. As regards Loukotka’s last two, Opayé and Iaté (Fornio), the resemblance to any Ge language seems to be so slight that they are better considered for the present as independent and non-Ge.

Of the nine above, Nimuendajú considers Ge, Camacán, Mashacalí, Puri, and Botocudo as “stocks”; Patashó and Malalí as “isolated”; Caingang he places under Ge; and Coropó with Puri.

Apparently all the Macro-Ge groups were termed “Tapuya” (enemies) by the Tupí, and this name was formerly used as a synonym for Ge. They inhabit the infertile regions of eastern Brazil, off the rivers. From the coast they were displaced by the Tupí. Somatological and cultural evidence suggests that they were among the most autochthonous of all South American natives; as such it is unlikely that any connections will be found with other great families or phyla. As languages of people of low culture they have been neglected more than their scientific importance warrants, and the morphologies are not well known. They are said to be phonetically difficult, and harsh. Except for the Ge Proper and the Caingang, most of them were close to the Brazilian coast; most of them are now extinct, and the others practically so.

GE

The Ge group, as herein recognized, consists only of the Ge Proper, one section of the Ge family as previously constituted, which latter is herein termed Macro-Ge (q. v.). That is, a number of other groups, Mashacalí, Camacán, etc., formerly considered as constituting the Ge
family, have been removed from it and, together with Ge proper, considered as constituent parts of the phylum Macro-Ge. The Ge occupy a solid large area in eastern Brazil. They were displaced in some regions by the Tupí, and the language is losing ground to modern Brazilian Portuguese. They were formerly known as “Tapuya,” the Tupí word for “enemy.” Cran or Gueren, meaning “ancients” or “natives,” is another synonym; their self-name is Nac-nanuc. Many of the names of groups end in zhe (Ge, Že).

The classification of the Ge languages here presented is taken primarily from Lowie and Métraux (Handbook, vols. 1 and 3). These, however, are probably based principally on present political association, cultural resemblance, and geographical propinquity rather than on linguistic grounds. A thorough independent study has not been possible, but a brief comparison of vocabularies of a few of the better-known Ge languages suggests that a truer picture of linguistic relationships may cut across the proposed divisions. This short study indicates:

A. A rather closely connected group consisting of: Apinayé, Northern and Southern Cayapó, Carahó, Gradahó, and Mecubengocré.

B. Ushikring and Suyá are slightly more variant.

C. Ramcocamécran and Aponegicran probably should also be placed in this group. (All the above languages are in the Northwestern division.)

D. More distantly affiliated: Shavanté, Sherenté, Tażé and Crenyé.

E. Possibly affiliated: Aroa and Jeicó.

F. Of uncertain affiliation: Mehín, Purecamécran, Piskobó, Capiecrán, Crao, Shicriabá. (Crenyé shows some resemblance to Crao and to Mecubengocré; Capiecrán to Northern Cayapó.)

GE

I. Northwest

A. Timbira

1. West Timbira
   a. Apinayé ¹ (Apínages)

2. East Timbira (Hotî)
   a. Northern
      a. Gurupó
      b. Crenyé (Crenye) of Bacabal
      c. Nucoecamécran of Bacabal
   b. Southern
      a. Canela: ² Apanyecra (Aponeticran), Kencateye (Kencatazi), Ramcocamécran (Capiecrán)
      b. Carateye
      c. Craho (Krao), Macamecran
      d. Crepumcateye
      e. Crenyé (Orange) (of Cajuapara), (Tażé)

¹ Traditionally the Apinayé are offshoots of the Krikati. Pericot suggests that they may be the same as the Aenaguig, but Lowie considers the latter independent.

² Canela is the Brazilian name for the savage Timbira. Some other groups here listed are considered as Canela. Rivet (1924 a) gives as additional Canela bands: Temembá, Bucobú, or Mannosé, Poncagé. Some of these may be synonyms of others here listed.
I. Northwest—Continued
   A. Timbira—Continued
      2. East Timbira (Hoti)—Continued
         b. Southern—Continued
            f. Cricati (Krikateye, Caracaty, Makraya)
            g. Gaviões
            h. Nyurukwayé (Norocoage)
            i. Porekamékra (Purecamecran)
            j. Pucobyé (Piokobzé)
            k. Chacamekra (Sacamecran, Matheiro)
            l. (Auguget)
            m. (Patcoge)
            n. (Mehin)

   B. Cayapó
      1. Northern Cayapó (Coroá, Carajá)
         a. Carahó (Karahó)
         b. Gorotire
         c. Gradahó (Gradaó, Gradau)
         d. Ira-Amaire
         e. Pau d'Arco
         f. Purucaród (Purukaru)
            a. Curupité
            g. Mecubengokre
            h. Ushiering (Chicri, Byoré)
            i. Crúati-e
            j. Cayamo
      2. Southern Cayapó

   C. Suyá
      1. Suyá (Tsuvd)

II. Central
   A. Akwe (Acua, Akva)
      1. Shacriaba (Chikriaba)
      2. Shavante 3 (Chavante, Créca, Pusciti, Tapacud)
      3. Sherente (Cherente)
   B. Acroá
      1. Acroá
         a. Northern
         b. Southern
      2. Guegué (Gogué)

III. Jeicó (Jaicó, Geicó)
   A. Jeicó

3 The name Shavante (q.v.) is applied to a number of different groups. The Shavante included here are those of the Rio dos Mortes. They must be distinguished from the Oti Chavanté and the Opaye Chavanté (q.v.), of other linguistic affinities. The Tupi Canoeiro, the Timbira Nyurukwayé and the Orajonmapré are also termed Chavanté. Other names applied to the Akwe-Chavanté are Criza (Curiza), Pusciti, and Tapacud. Shavante and Sherente are essentially the same.
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CAINGANG

Caingang, also sometimes called Guayaná, Coroado, Bugre, Shoeleng, Tupí, Botocudo, etc., is still considered a member of Ge Proper by Nimuendajú, Lowie, and Métraux. Loukotka also placed it under Ge until his 1935 classification when he gave it independent status. A perusal of the lexical data indicates that it is at least as different from Ge Proper as most of the other components of Macro-Ge. Henry (1935) is also of the opinion that Caingang should be separated from Ge.

Caingang seems to show even less lexical resemblances to Ge than do Mashacalí, Camacán, and Purí (Coroado). In spite of the large vocabularies available very few words show any resemblance to words of similar meaning in any of the other families. Nevertheless, as in the comparisons of all of these languages, there are a fair number of possible connections, and a small number of certain, close, or even identical resemblances, generally in common basic words that would not be likely to be borrowed. In spite of the apparent great lexical differences it is probable that Caingang is distantely related to all these languages. Though the differences are not great, either qualitatively or quantitatively, Caingang seems to show slightly greater resemblance to Purí. Loukotka considers the family as showing Ge intrusions, and most of the constituent languages to show Arawak or Camacán vestiges.

Bugre is an opprobrious term; Botocudo and Coroado are descriptive, and the Caingang groups to whom they are applied must be distinguished from the other Macro-Ge groups of these names. Few
Caingang languages seem to be extinct. They occupy an interior region coterminous with the Ge Proper, not, like the other Macro-Ge divisions, a coastal region.

The subdivisions are uncertain and disputed. Loukotka divides them into 10 languages: four dialects of Caingdn, Kadurukrê, Kamé, Wayana, Ivitorokai, Ingain, and Aweicoma. The classification of Métraux, herein adopted, is probably based on political and regional groups rather than on linguistic variations, but, nevertheless, gives the impression of greater reliability. According to him, Cayurucrê (Kadurukrê) is a moiety; the Wayaná (Guayaná) were the ancestors of the present Caingang; Ivitorocai and Ingain are synonyms of Taven and Tain, and Aweicoma a synonym of the more usual term Shoclang. There were apparently two groups of Wayaná, one speaking Tupí-Guaraná, the other ancestors of the Caingang.

The best linguistic data are found in Father Mansueto Barcattá Valfloriana, 1918 a, 1920.

Caingang

I. Caingang
   A. São Paulo (Coroado) ¹
      1. Nyacsateitei
   B. Paraná
   C. Rio Grande do Sul

II. Shoclang (Socré, Chocré, Xocren, Bugre, Botocudo,² Aweicoma, Cauuba, Caahans, Caagua, Caaigua ³)

III. Taven
   A. Tain
   B. Ingain (Wayana, Guayaná ⁴)
      1. Palle (Basa)
      2. Chowa
      3. Chovaca
   C. Ivitorocai
   D. Gualacho (Coronado ⁴)
      1. Gualachi
      2. Chiki
      3. Cabelleudo

IV. Dorin
    (Bands: Jahuataic, Venharo)
    (Moieties: Cayurucrê, Votoro, Camé)
    Possibly Caingang: Aricapú, Yabult.⁵

¹ Distinguish from other Macro-Ge Coroado (Puri).
² Distinguish from other Macro-Ge Botocudo.
³ Distinguish from Chiriguano (Tupí-Guaraná) Caaigua.
⁴ Distinguish from Guaraná Guayaná. (See Métraux, Handbook, vol. 1, p. 446.)
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CAMACÁN, MASHACALÍ, AND PURÍ (COROADO)

On these three groups, formerly considered as members of the great Ge family, Loukotka has published linguistic sketches (1931–32 a, 1931–32 b, 1937), including vocabularies compiled from all known sources, and lexical comparisons with Ge and other neighboring languages. His deductions are that all are independent from each other and from Ge, but with Ge "intrusions." All three with their several language divisions are supposed to be extinct, though a few members may still live with other groups in some of the missions. Presumably, therefore, no new linguistic data will be found, and their relationships must be determined on the basis of the material at hand, compiled by Loukotka. Unfortunately, no grammatical studies are known, and the basic data consist of vocabularies of varying size, mainly of rather ancient date and all uncritically recorded. The few phrases afford very little morphological information.

The phonetics of the three groups are similar in general type, and the few morphological deductions made by Loukotka show no great difference; on these grounds the three might be closely related. Lexically, however, they are very different. The compiled vocabularies are large enough to afford sufficient data for tentatively conclusive results, nearly 900 words for the Coroado group, about 350 for Mashacalí and Camacán. Using very uncritical methods of comparison and noting every case of stems showing the slightest resemblance, many of which will doubtless be thrown out when a critical linguistic study is made, Loukotka finds the following proportion of possible stems connected with Ge and Caingang combined: Coroado, 10.7 percent; Mashacalí, 12.6 percent; Camacán, 17.2 percent.

My reworking of Loukotka's data, eliminating the most improbable of his correspondences, gave the following results:

Camacán showed most resemblance to Ge with 37 probable correspondences, 7 of them close; next to Mashacalí with 18 probable correspondences, 7 close; and next to Caingang with 25 probable correspondences, 2 close. There were 12 probable correspondences to Botocudo, 4 close ones. The correspondences with Iaté, Patashó, and
Opayé are ignored on account of the very slight amount of data on these languages. In spite of the large Coroado vocabulary, the largest of all, the correspondences are very few, only 7, with 2 of them close, less than the resemblance to Iaté, with 10 probable correspondences. Camacán obviously stands in much closer relationship to Iaté than to Coroado.

The closest resemblance of Mashacali, on the other hand, is about equally to Coroado, with 23 probable correspondences, 9 of them close, and to Ge with 26 probable correspondences, 8 of them close. Next follows Camacán, with 18 probable correspondences, 7 of them close, and then Caingang with 20 probable correspondences, 4 of them close.

Coroado has its closest resemblance to Ge, with 35 probable correspondences, 17 of them close; with Caingang, with 30 correspondences, 9 of them close; next with Mashacali with 23 probable correspondences, 9 of them close; and last with Botocudo, with 13 probable correspondences, 3 of them close. The slight resemblance to Camacán, a significant point, is noted above.

As may be deduced from the above, Ge shows about equal resemblance to Coroado and to Camacán, the former showing 35 possible correspondences, 17 of them close; Camacán, 37 possible correspondences, 7 close (but with a much smaller vocabulary to compare). Next follows Mashacali, with 26 possible correspondences, 8 of them close; and then Caingang, with 14 possible correspondences, 6 of them close.

Camacán

The Camacán languages are all extinct, all the data being now on record. Loukotka (1931–32 b) has published a monograph on them, giving them independent rank. In this he is followed by Métraux and Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 547). Rivet (1924 a), W. Schmidt (1926), and earlier authorities considered the group a component of Ge. It is here classified as a component of Macro-Ge (q. v.). It shows more and closer lexical resemblances to Ge Proper, Mashacali, Caingang, and Iaté than can be explained on grounds of borrowing. Though probably related to Puri also, the lexical resemblances are surprisingly slight. The resemblance is about equal to all the Ge Proper groups, except to Suya and Jeicó. The Camacán are not an Acroa horde, as Martius thought.

There is general agreement as to the languages composing the family. As regards the closer relationships of these languages, there is less agreement. The classification here accepted is based primarily on Métraux and Nimuendajú.
Camacán

I. Camacán (Kamakán)
   A. Mongoyó ¹
   B. Monshocó (Ezeshio)

II. Cutashó (Kotozó)
   A. Catethoy (Katathoy) ²

III. Menián (Manyó)

IV. Masacard

¹ Schuller's identification (1930 a) of Ilaté or Fulinó (q. v.) with Mongoyó is certainly based on insufficient evidence. The vocabularies of Etienne and Guimarães are said to be very incorrect plagiarisms of Wied.
² No linguistic material on Cutashó is extant.
³ Loukotka (1935) differentiates Masacard from the others as a language mixed with Ge, though he had earlier termed it merely a slightly variant form of Camacán Proper.

Bibliography.—Etienne, 1909 (Mongoyó); Guimarães, J. J. da S., 1854 (Mongoyó); Ignace, 1912; Loukotka (with complete bibliography), 1931–32 b; Martius, 1867, 2:153–54, 156–158 (Kotozo), 155 (Meniens), 144–145 (Masacaró); Métraux, 1930; Moreira-Pinto, 1894, 1:387; Wied-Neuwied, 1820–21, 2:325–330.

Mashacali

Mashacali, an extinct language, was first separated from the old inclusive Ge by Loukotka, who published the standard monograph upon it (1931–32 a); it is now accepted as an independent family by Métraux and Nimuendajú (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 541). However, it has obvious resemblances with Ge and has, therefore, herein been considered one of the members of the Macro-Ge phylum. The available data are slight, old, and poor. The resemblance is about equal, and not great, to Purí and Ge Proper, slightly less to Camacán and Caingang. In the Ge group, Mashacali seems to show the greatest connection with Cayapó, the least with Northern Ge.

Six “languages” are placed by all authorities in this family, all given equal rank, and no further subdivisions proposed. With regard to three languages, Malali, Potashó, and Coropó, placed by some in the Mashacali group, there is great difference of opinion. These three are treated separately.

1. Caposhó (Kaposó)
2. Cumanashó (Kumanaró)
3. Macuni (Makoni)
4. Mashacali (Maxakari)
5. Monoshó (Monoxó)
6. Panyame (Pahame)

Bibliography.—Loukotka, 1931–32 a (containing full bibliography); Martius; 1867, 2:169 (Mashacali), 170–172 (Capoxó, Cumanachó, Panháme), 173–176 (Macuni); Saint-Hilaire, 1830–51, 1:47 (Maconi), 213 (Mashacali), 423–429 (Monoshó); Wied-Neuwied, 1820–21, 2:319, 323–325 (Mashacali, Maconi).

Purí (Coroadó)

For this extinct group or family the name Purí is preferable to Coroadó, to avoid confusion with Caingang and Bororo groups of the same
name, which means "crowned" or "tonsured." The group was formerly considered a part of Ge, and is herein considered one of the components of Macro-Ge. It was separated from Ge by Loukotka, the author of the principal monograph upon it (Coroado) (1937); Nimuendajú accepts it as independent (Puri), as does Métraux (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 523).

The languages are probably extinct but a number of vocabularies are extant, and the lexical data, compiled by Loukotka, amount to some 900 words (including Coropó). Lexically, Puri-Coroado shows the closest relationship with Ge Proper, closest with Cayapó, least with Suyá, about equal with Northern and Eastern Ge, little with Jeicó. Resemblances with the Caingang and Mashacali groups are a little less and about equal. The lack of resemblance to Camacán is significant.

A century ago, the Coroado remembered when they formed a single group with the Puri; the differences between them must, therefore, be in the degree of dialects, that of their component bands even less. Puri and Coroado are the only certain members of the group. Other proposed members are Coropó and Waitacá (Guaitaka, Goyataca). These are treated separately herein, for reasons there given. Métraux herein (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 523) considers Coropó related.

Puri (Coroado)

I. Coroado
   A. Maritong
   B. Cobanipake
   C. Tam/prun
   D. Sasaricon

II. Puri
   A. Sabonan
   B. Wambori
   C. Shamishuna


Patashó

The classification of Patashó is most uncertain. The older classifications of Rivet (1924 a) and W. Schmidt (1926) placed it in the Mashacali group of Ge. Loukotka (1935) separated it and gave it independent rank on an equal footing with Mashacali; in this he is followed by Métraux and Nimuendajú. Métraux and Nimuendajú say (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 54) that Nimuendajú found a close relationship between his Patashó and Mashacali vocabularies, but that Wied-Neuwied’s Patashó and Saint-Hilaire’s Mashacali vocabularies are very different.
An independent reworking of Loukotka's published comparative material left the present author doubtful of the Macro-Ge relationship of Patashó. A brief comparison of Wied-Neuwied's Patashó vocabulary (1820-21), however, showed a marked resemblance to Mashacalí, and considerable to Coropó (q. v.), but little to Ge proper. Some 20 of the Patashó words show apparent connections with Mashacalí, and more than half of these are very close, and mainly in words not likely to have been borrowed. The inclusion of Patashó in the Mashacalí group or family thus seems to be strongly indicated. However, it is quite possible that the vocabularies showing this resemblance are somehow faulty in ascription, and the example of Nimuendajú and Loukotka have been followed herein in leaving Patashó apart as a separate member of Macro-Ge.

Patashó may not be entirely extinct. No grammar or linguistic study is known. The standard vocabulary by Wied consists of only 90 words, but Loukotka possesses an unpublished study, and apparently Nimuendajú also had unpublished material.

Bibliography.—Ehrenreich, 1891, 1894-95; Loukotka, 1939 c (full bibliography); Martius, 1867, 2:172-173; Métraux, 1930 b; Wied-Neuwied, 1820-21, 2:320-321.

**MALALÍ**

In view of the great disagreement regarding the affinities of the extinct Malalí it should be regarded for the present as an independent member of the Macro-Ge group as do Métraux and Nimuendajú herein (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 542). Nimuendajú (map and index) puts it among the isolated languages. W. Schmidt (1926) makes it the sole member of the coastal division of his South Group of Ge, an opinion with which Loukotka records his disagreement. Loukotka (1931-32 a, 1935, 1939 a) and Rivet (1924 a) place it with Mashacalí, though the former does so with a little hesitation, as a language mixed with Coroado.

A hasty comparison of the available Malalí data suggests that its closest lexical resemblances are with Patashó and Macuní (Mashacalí). Its resemblances to Puri-Coroado, Camacán (mainly to Manyá or Menien), Ge Proper, and Caingang are much less, and those to Botocudo Opaye, and Itäé are very slight. The available lexical material is a little over 100 words; no textual material or grammatical sketch are known. Loukotka (1931-32 a) gives a critique of the value of the three extant vocabularies.

Bibliography.—Loukotka, 1931-32 a; Martius, 1867, 2:207-208; Saint-Hilaire, 1830-51, 1:428-429; Wied-Neuwied, 1820-21, 2:321-323.
COROPÓ

The classification of the extinct Coropó language is uncertain and in disagreement; it is, therefore, treated separately and considered an independent member of Macro-Ge. Loukotka (1937) calls it the most interesting of all the languages in the old Ge group; he believes that it contains a large number of words borrowed from unidentified non-Ge languages. Unfortunately, it is extinct without any known textual material.

A comparison by the present author of the two known small vocabularies appears to indicate a fair number of stems showing relationship to the languages of the Mashacalí group, especially to Maconi, a little less to Caposhó, Cumanañashó, and Monoshó, about the same to Matalí and Patashó (q. v.), a little less to the Puri-Coroado languages. Considerable resemblance was also seen to Ge Proper, Caingang, and Botocudo, but little to Camacán, Opaye, and Iaté.

The authorities disagree greatly as to whether Coropó should be classified with the Puri-Coroado group (Nimuendajú, map; Loukotka, 1935, 1937, 1939 a; W. Schmidt, 1926) or with the Mashacalí (Rivet, 1924 a). In view of this disagreement, Métraux's statement (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 523) that Coropó is "closely" related linguistically (as well as culturally) with Coroado and Puri can hardly be accepted.

Bibliography.—Eschwege, 1818, pp. 165-171; Loukotka, 1937; Martius, 1867, 2: 167-169.

BOTOCUDO

The name "Botocudo" signifies wearers of large lip-plugs and as such has been applied to several groups of different linguistic affinities which must be carefully distinguished. One Botocudo group, the Itaparé, Are, Sheta, or Notobotocudo, is Tupí. The best-known Botocudo, however, are Macro-Ge peoples. Here two groups must be differentiated. One, of the State of Santa Catarina, is the Caingang (q. v.). The larger and better-known group, of Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo, has a language formerly considered Ge. It is, however, quite different from Ge Proper, and has been accorded independent status by Loukotka (1935, 1939 a) and Nimuendajú (map) and accepted by Métraux (Handbook vol. 1, p. 532). It is here considered as a member of the Macro-Ge phylum.

It might be better to allow Botocudo independence. No study of it has been presented, and the morphology is unknown. The vocabulary shows a small number of words related to other Macro-Ge languages (but relatively few), and some probably due to borrowing. The greater number of resemblances are with Coroado, next with Camacán. The Macro-Ge affinities in the data available are greater
than those of Opayé, Iaté, and Patashó, but this may be due to greater amount of data.

The constitution of the Botocudo group, since the latter is not well known, is uncertain. The divisions are probably mainly political or geographic. At least four of the languages marked as Botocudo by Nimuendajú (map), Anket, Nacnyanuk, Pimenteira, and Yiporok, are considered independent by various authors herein. Pimenteira (q. v.) is rather distant from the main Botocudo group, and is considered Cariban by some authorities.

Botocudo (Aimboe, Borun)

Araná (Aranya)
Creemun
Chonvugn (Crenak)
Guren
Gutucrac: Minya-yirugn (Minhagirun)
Nachehe (Nakrehe)
(Yiporok [Giporok]: Poicá [Poyishá, Pożitzá])
(Anket ?)
(Nacnyanuk ?)

Bibliography.—Adelung and Vater, 1806-17 (Engerekumung); Almeida, 1846; Anonymous, 1852 (Positzá); Castelau, 1850-59, pp. 249-259; Ehrenreich, 1887, 1896; Etienne, 1909 (Borun); Froes de Abreu, 1929 (Crenaque); Ignace, 1909; Jomard, 1846, 1847; Marlière, 1825 a, 1825 b (Pajaurum, Krakmun, Naknanuk); Martius, 1867, 2: 177-194 (Encreckmung, Crecmun, Djiopouroco); Reye, 1884; Renault, 1904; Rudolph, 1909; Saint-Hilaire, 1830-51, 1: 104-199; Silveira, A. A., 1921, pp. 529-543 (Positzá); Simões da Silva, 1924 (Crenak); Trança, 1882; Tschudi, 1866-69, 2: 288; Wied-Neuwied, 1820-21, 2: 305-314. (Undifferentiated items are all of the Crecmun group.)

SHAVANTÉ (CHAVANTE, ŠAVANTÉ)

Four groups of Southern Brazil of very different linguistic affinities are known to the Brazilian natives by the name Chavante. They must be carefully distinguished. Three of them, the Oti, Opayé, and Cucurd (q. v.), form small independent (provisionally) families; the fourth, the Akwé (q. v.), is a Ge language.

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a, 1913 e; Ihering, 1907; Martius, 1867, 2:135-139.

OTI

The extinct Oti (Chavante, Shavanté, Eoachatante) are one of the four groups, all of different linguistic affinities, known as Chavante; they must be distinguished. Now extinct, the small group was named Eoachatante by Von Ihering. The language has been accepted as constituting an independent family by all authorities; Rivet (1924 a) terms the family Šavanté. No suggestions as to larger affiliations have been made by anyone.

Bibliography.—Borba, 1908, pp. 73-76; Ihering, 1912; Vocabulario Comparado . . ., 1802.
OPAYÉ

Until recently accepted as one of the Ge languages, Opayé or Opayé Shavante was separated from it and considered an independent family by Loukotka (1935, 1939 a). Nimuendajú (map) also calls it isolated. Though probably not extinct the data on it are scant. No grammatical sketch and no linguistic study are known. The lexical material is limited to vocabularies collected by Nimuendajú and published first by Von Ihering (1912) and later, enlarged, by Nimuendajú (1932 a). Each consists of less than 300 words. There are very few resemblances, even distant, with Ge, Camacán, Mashacali or Coroado, and almost all words are very different. The Ge and Camacán “intrusions” noted by Loukotka (1935, 1939 a) are not evident, and Opayé should be considered unclassified until future careful studies may prove otherwise.

In his vocabulary, Nimuendajú gives a few words from a variant dialect Vaccaria, which Loukotka terms Guachi (Guachi) of Vaccaria.

Bibliography.—Ihering, 1912; Nimuendajú, 1932 a.

CUCURÁ

The sole evidence for this “family,” and apparently for the existence of the tribe, seems to be a vocabulary of 31 words gathered by the Czech explorer Frič in 1901 and published by Loukotka (1931 b). These natives of the Rio Verde of Mato Grosso are one of a number of groups known to the Brazilians as Shavante (q. v.). The Shavante-Cucurá are apparently mentioned by no other writer and do not appear in Nimuendajú’s map and index. The vocabulary seems to have no resemblance to any of the surrounding languages with which Loukotka compares it, Opayé, Otí, Akwé, and Tupí-Guarani, but might show affinity with some more distant stock. A very few words are apparently borrowed from Tupí-Guaraní. At any rate such a small vocabulary, taken through an interpreter, can hardly be accepted as definitely establishing a new linguistic family. The language is now presumed to be extinct.

Bibliography.—Loukotka, 1931 b; Nimuendajú, 1932 b.

GUAITACÁN

Goyatacá (Guateká, Waitacá, etc.) was adopted as the name of a stock or family by Chamberlain (1913 a), and as a substock of “Tapuya” (Ge) by Brinton (1891 a); the latter included under it the Mashacali languages, Patashó and Coropó. W. Schmidt (1926) accepted it for the name of his subgroup that included the Purí-Coroado languages, and Rivet (1924 a) included it in that group.

As Guaitacá became extinct before a word of it was recorded (see
Handbook, vol. 1, p. 521; Métraux, 1929 b), it cannot be regarded as anything but an unclassified language, as Nimuendajú places it. There is no reason for classing it with Puri-Coroado or with any other group. It very likely, however, was a Macro-Ge language. Four subdivisions are known.

Guaitacá

1. Mopi
2. Yacorito
3. Wasu
4. Mirí

Bibliography.—Ehrenreich, 1905; Koenigswald, 1908 b; Métraux, 1929 b; Steinen, 1886.

SMALL LANGUAGES OF THE PERNAMBUCO REGION

(Fulnió, Natú, Pancararú, Shocó, Shucurú, Tushá, Carapató, Payacú, Teremembé, Tarairiu or Ochucayana)

Along and to the northeast of the San Francisco River in the States of Alagoas, Sergipe, Pernambuco, and Bahia are, or were, a number of small tribes the languages of which seem to be sufficiently variant from themselves and from others with which they have been compared to be classified by Nimuendajú (map) and accepted by Lowie (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 553) as isolated or independent. All are so small, unimportant, or newly identified that none of them is mentioned by Rivet (1924 a) or by earlier compilers, and only Fulnió (Iaté) is listed by Loukotka (1935, 1939 a), and rates especial mention. On all but the last the lexical data seem to be very slight and difficult of access; most of them seem to be in unpublished notes and observations of Estevão de Oliveira and Nimuendajú, whose opinion as to the isolated status must therefore be accepted for the present.

Fulnió.—Fulnió (Fornió, Carnijó, Iaté) is the native name; the Brazilians of Aguas Bellas call them Carnijó. Loukotka (1935, 1939 a) terms the family Iaté. There are no subdivisions. Loukotka sees Camacán intrusions, and this is borne out by a superficial comparison of the data published by him; Fulnió seems to show closer resemblance to Camacán than to any other of the Macro-Ge languages, but not enough to be itself placed in this group for the present. Schuller (1930 a) improperly identified the language with Mongoyó.

Pancararú.—Pancararú (Pankaru, Pancarú) has sometimes been classified as a Cariri language but is better considered as isolated in agreement with the opinions of Lowie and Nimuendajú. (See Handbook, vol. 1, p. 561.)

Shocó.—Shocó (Šokó, Chocó) must not be confused with the Isthmian Chocó.

Shucurú.—Shucurú (Šukurú) is divided by Nimuendajú (map) into
two groups, those of Cimbres and those of Palmeira dos Indios. The latter appear to be known only by the notes of Oliveira.

Teremembe.—Though more important historically than most of the above groups, nothing is known of the language of the Teremembe (Métraux, Handbook, vol. 1, p. 573).

Tarairiu or Ochucayana.—Though generally classified as a Ge language, the available linguistic data do not support the affinity, and Lowie (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 563) thinks that it may be considered a distinct stock as proposed by Pompeu Sobrinho (1939)—probably too radical a decision, Nimuendajú's preference (map) to leave it unclassified is better. Schuller (1930 a) also called it "ein stamm"; Ehrenreich (1894) believed it affiliated with Ge and especially with Patashó. Loukotka (1935, 1939 a) calls it Carib, mixed with Ge, which is doubtful, in view of its distance from any other Carib group.

Natú, Tushá, Carapató, Payacú.—Little is known of these languages. Nimuendajú leaves them unclassified; other authorities ignore them.

Lowie (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 553) speaks of "six unrelated linguistic families within the area": Fulnió, Shucurú, Pancararú, Natú, Shocó, and Tushá. Thus to accord them familial status is certainly not justified by the few data on them.

Bibliography.—See bibliographies in Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 556, 561, 566, 571, 574. Most of the more recent works (Branner, 1887; Melo, 1927, 1929; Pompeu Sobrinho, 1935, 1939; Schuller, 1930 a) refer to the Fulnió. Pinto, 1938, treats of the Pancarú; Schuller, 1913 c, of the Tarairiu.

SOUTHERNMOST LANGUAGES

ATAGUITAN

Ataguíta is here for the first time proposed as a hybrid term for the hypothetical Atacama-Diaguita linguistic group. It is unproved, and no definite proof of the relationship has been offered, but the connection has been accepted by several authorities. First suggested by Schuller (1908), W. Schmidt (1926) proposed a Cunza-Diaguita Group, and Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) adopts it as an Atacameño-Diaguita phylum.

ATACAMA

Synonyms: Atacameño, Cunza, Kunza, Likananta, Likanantai, Lipe, Ulipe.

Though a few individuals may still speak the old Cunza language little is known of it. A modern study and grammar is urgently needed, though even a thorough study of the grammar of San Román (1890) might link it to one of the larger linguistic families. Most authorities from Chamberlain (1911 b) down have accorded Atacama an independent position. Loukotka (1935) sees vestiges of Arawak in it. Von Tschudi (1866–69) suggested that it is a descendant of
Calchaqui-Diaguita, and W. Schmidt (1926), accepting the arguments of Schuller (1908), proposes a Cunza-Diaguita group, uniting Atacama and Calchaqui. (See Handbook, vol. 2, pp. 599, 605, 606.)

Bibliography.—Boman, 1908; Brand, 1941 c; Chamberlain, 1911 b, pp. 465–467; Darapsky, 1889; Echeverría y Reyes, 1890, 1912; Maglio, 1890; Moore, 1878; San Román, 1890; Schuller, 1908; Tschudi, 1866–69; Vaisse, Hoyos, and Echeverría y Reyes, 1895.

Omahuaca (Omawaka)

The affinities of the extinct Omahuaca (Omawaka, Omaguaca, etc.) and Humahuaca are, and probably always will be, uncertain. It is one of the four South American languages that Loukotka (1935) declined to classify. Rivet (1924 a) places it with Quechua, Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) with Atacameño-Diaguita.

The Omahuaca are said to have been a mixture of Diaguita and Aymara, and spoke Quechua at the time of their extinction as a tribal entity. (See Handbook, vol. 2, p. 619.)

Diaguita or Calchaqui

Since not one word of the extinct Diaguita or of its related languages has been positively identified, its status depending on early statements and proper-name etymologies, its independent position, relationship with other “families” and with its probably component languages will probably never be conclusively determined, unless a copy of the lost Barcena grammar is found. Diaguita (Diaguite, Diagit) is the term most frequently used for the group, but Calchaquí(an) was the earlier term employed by Chamberlain (1912 a, 1912 b) and his followers, and Brinton (1891 a) preferred Catamareña.

The language of the Calchaquí-Diaguita was known as Caacán(a) or Kakán(a). It was replaced by Quechua in the 17th century. The Calchaquí were but one tribe or nation of the group; other affiliated languages as given in the table were probably of the status of dialects. The Lule enter to complicate the problem even more. This name was probably applied to several different groups in this general region—or else to a group speaking several different languages. The Lule of Padre Barcena seem to have been Diaguita, to be distinguished from the Lule of Machoni, which is Vilela. (See Lule-Vilela, Vilela-Chulupi, etc.)

The relationship of the extinct Sanavirón and Comechingón is also in dispute. Most authorities consider these as forming the independent Sanaviron(an) family. Krickeberg (1922) and W. Schmidt (1926) place them under Diaguita. Loukotka (1935) puts Kakana (Calchaquí), Sanavirona, and Vilela together in his Vilela family. (See Handbook, vol. 2, pp. 657, 661–663.)
Brinton finally accepted the suggestion that Diaguita had affinities with Quechua. Relationships with the Atacama or Atacameño family (q. v.) were suggested by Schuller (1908) and accepted by W. Schmidt (1926), who lists a Cunza-Diaguita Group, Kunza being the name of the principal Atacama language. The Diaguita "dialects" he lists as Kaka(na), Tonokote (placed by others in Lule, Vilela and Mataco), Zanavirona (though he also makes a Sanavirón family), and Indamu (generally placed with Sanaviron). All of the above conflicting opinions seem to be based on the most inferential evidence, from which every seeker after knowledge may take his choice.

Diaguita subgroups:—Abaucan, Amaycha, Anchapa, Andalgalá, Anguinahao, Calchaquí, Casminchango, Coipe, Colalao, Famatina, Hualfina, Paquilin, Quilme, Tafí, Tocpo, Tucumán, Upingascha, and Yocabil. Possibly also: Acalian, Catamarea, and Tamano.

Bibliography.—Barcena, MS., Boman, 1908; Cabrera, P., 1927, 1931; Canals Frau, 1943 a, 1943 b; Chamberlain, 1912 a, 1912 b; Kersten, 1905; Lafone-Quevedo, 1898, 1919 a, 1927; Lizondo Borda, 1938; Schuller, 1908, 1919–20 b, pp. 572–573; Serrano, 1936 b.

CHARRUA, KERANDÍ, CHANÁ, ETC.

Synonyms: Tsarrua, Čarrua, Chaná, Güenoa.

Charrua has been accepted as an independent family from the time of Hervás y Panduro (1800), but suggestions as to affiliation with all neighboring groups—Arawak, Ge, Guaicurú, Guarani, and Puelche—have been made, as well as its connection with Querandi, for which latter various connections have also been proposed (vide infra). Brinton (1898), D’Orbigny (1839), M. S. Bertoni (1916), Outes (1913 b), Serrano (1936 a, 1936 c), Schuller (1906), and others have entered into this argument, as well as the recent classifiers such as Rivet (1924 a), W. Schmidt (1926), and Loukotka (1935). One of the most recent writers, S. Perea y Alonso (1942), considers all the Chané-Chaná languages, including Charrua, as Arawak. Even the present authors herein, Lothrop, Serrano, Cooper, and Métraux, do not agree. Serrano (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 192) considers it related to Caingang. Nor is there any agreement as to name; most authorities use variants of Charrua, but Serrano herein insists that the generic name should be Güenoa.

Most of the arguments are based on historical evidence and inference, since all of the languages have long been extinct with little recorded data; no more than 7 words of Charrua were known. Recently, however, some 70 more words have been found and published (Gómez Hardo, 1937), but never scientifically compared with other languages. The opinions of present contributors may be cited as the most
modern. Serrano is certain that Charrua is a dialect of Chaná and related to the Caingang of Rio Grande do Sul (cf. Macro-Ge). Mét-
raux doubts the Ge affiliation, and suggests that a comparison with Puelche and other Patagonian and Chaco languages might prove fruitful; Lothrop wisely makes no suggestions as to wider affiliations. Nimuendajú’s decision to leave Charrua unclassified is doubtless the wisest one. Charrua subtribes are said to be Guayantiran, Palomar, and Negueguian.

In the La Plata region were many other languages, now long extinct, on which the data are very deficient, with consequent great differences of opinion regarding their affiliations. All these had best be left unclassified. Most of them have been traditionally considered Charruan. Prominent among these is the Querandi (Kerandi), which has variously been considered of Guaicurá, Het (Tehuelche), Araucana-
ian, and Guaraní affiliations. Cooper (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 137) says there is good argument for considering it Puelche. Güenoa and Bohane may relate closely to Charrua, possibly also Caracaná. Other of the more important groups are Minuané, Yaró, Colastiné, Corondó, Timbú, Mbeguá, and Cararañá. Of lesser importance are Kilozaí, Cayastá (Chaguayá), and Macwrendá (Mocoretá). (See Lothrop, Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 177–190.)

Bibliography.—Brinton, 1898 a; Chamberlain, 1911 b, pp. 469–471; Gómez Hardo, 1937; Kersten, 1905; Lothrop, 1932; Martínez, B. T., 1919; Orbigny, 1839; Outes, 1913 b; Perea y Alonso, 1938 b, 1942; Rivet, 1930 a; Schuller, 1906, 1917; Serrano, 1936 a, 1936 c; Vignati, 1931 d.

**Chaná**

Synonyms: Tshaná, Tschaná, Čaná.

One of the important groups in this area, undifferentiated in locale, is the Chaná. Nimuendajú accepts the Chaná as a linguistic entity, leaving all the other before-mentioned languages as unclassified. Affiliated with the Chaná seem to be the Chaná-Mbeguá, Chaná-Timbú, and the Yaró. Perea y Alonso (1942) relates these Chaná to the Chané (q. v.) of southern Brazil and apparently believes almost all the above-mentioned groups, including Charrua and all the natives of the Banda Oriental of Uruguay, to be Arawak. For geographic reasons this is open to doubt, pending further exposition.

Chaná is a descriptive term and as such applied to a number of dis-

tinct groups of different linguistic affiliations that are liable to be con-

fused. It is said to be a Tupi word, probably meaning “my relations.” It seems to have been applied to certain Tupí, Guaraní, and Chiri-
guano groups. It also seems to be a synonym for the Layana, a southern Arawak group (according to W. Schmidt, 1926; Nimuendajú considers the Layana to be Guaicurá, q. v.).
Larrañaga (1924 b) says the language was guttural, an amateurish characterization applied to many Indian languages. Larrañaga's vocabulary and grammar was published by Lafone-Quevedo and Torres. (See also Chané.)

Bibliography.—Brinton, 1898 a; Cardus, 1886; Kersten, 1905; Lafone-Quevedo, 1897 a, 1922; Larrañaga, 1924 b; Lothrop, 1932; Orbigny, 1839; Outes, 1913 b; Serrano, 1936 a, 1936 c.

ALLENTIAC OR HUARPEAN

_Huarpe_ might be a better term than _Allentiac_ for this linguistic group, and is preferred by some modern writers, but the latter name is probably too well established to make a change advisable. It has been accepted as an independent family or stock by all authorities since Brinton (1891 a) and Chamberlain (1913 a), generally under the name _Allentiac_ or variations thereof. _Huarpe_ (Guarpe) is a synonym of _Allentiac_. There is general agreement that the _Millcayac_ language was rather closely related.

The languages became extinct in the 18th century. However, grammars of both _Allentiac_ and _Millcayac_ by Padre Valdivia are known, though the first editions are extremely rare. Though the group will probably eventually be tied up with some of the neighboring languages, and probably affiliated with some one of the larger phyla, few suggestions as regards such relationships have been made, and none accompanied by good evidence. Some early statements suggest a relationship with _Puelche_, and Brinton (1891 a) placed _Huarpe_, _Puelche_, and _Araucanian_ in his _Aucanian_ linguistic stock.

Canals Frau (1944) presents extensive evidence and argument that the _Comechingón_ (q. v.) were related to the _Huarpe_, and terms the linguistic group _Huarpe-Comechingón_. He considers the group to consist of the following languages:

(1) _Allentiac_ or _Huarpe_ of San Juan; (2) _Millcayac_ or _Huarpe_ of Mendocino; (3) _Puntano_ _Huarpe_; (4) _Puelche_ of Cuyo; (5) Ancient _Pehuenche_; (6) Southern _Comechingón_, language: _Camiare_; (7) Northern _Comechingón_, language: _Henia_; (8) possibly _Olongasta_ (Indians of Southern Rioja). (See Canals Frau, Handbook, vol. 1, p. 169.)

As subgroups or dialects Pericot y García (1936) names _Zoquillam_, _Tunuyam_, _Chiquillan_, _Morcoyam_, _Diamantino_ (Oyco), _Mentuayn_, _Chom_, _Titiyam_, _Otoyam_, _Ultuyam_, and _Cucyam_.

Bibliography.—Cabrera, P., 1928–29; Canals Frau, 1941, 1942, 1943 a, 1943 b, 1944; Chamberlain, 1912 b; La Grasserie, 1900; Márquez Miranda, 1943, 1944; Medina, J. T., 1918; Mitre, 1894; Schuller, 1913 a, 1913 d.; Valdivia, 1607 a, 1607 b.
SANAVIRÓN AND COMECHINGÓN

SANAVIRÓN

There are few linguistic data on which to classify the extinct Sanavirón and its affiliated languages, and the opinions are, therefore, very variant. Most authorities, such as Chamberlain (1913 a), Rivet (1924 a), and Nimuendajú (map and index), class it as an independent family. Krickeberg (1922) places it under Diaguita; W. Schmidt (1926) equivocates by establishing a Sanavirón family, but also placing Zanavirona in his Cunza-Diaguita group. Loukotka (1935) groups Sanavirona, Kakana (Calchaquí-Diaguita), and Vilela in his Vilela family. Jijón y Caamaño (1941–43) also places Sanavirón in his Vilela-Lule phylum.

Sanavirón is omitted from the accompanying linguistic map, the occupied area being allotted to Comechingón.

Bibliography.—Chamberlain, 1910 a, p. 198.

COMECHINGÓN

So little is known of the extinct Comechingón that its affiliation may never be determined, and there is no present consensus. It has been connected with three families, also all extinct. Most authorities place it with Sanavirón; Krickeberg (1922) considers it related to Diaguita. The most recent writer, Canals Frau, (Handbook, vol. 1, p. 169; also 1944) links it with Huarpe (Allentiac). It is one of the few languages that Loukotka (1935) wisely refuses to attempt to classify. There seem to have been five subgroups or dialects. Michilingue apparently belonged to the same group. Indâm or Indamu is generally associated with Comechingón, but W. Schmidt (1926) puts it with Zanavirona in the Cunza-Diaguita group, not with Comechingón under Sanavirón.

I. Comechingón
   A. Comechingón
      1. Main
      2. Tuya
      3. Mundema
      4. Çáma
      5. Umba
   B. Michilingue
   C. Indama

Bibliography.—Canals Frau, 1944.

ARAUCANIAN

The Araucanian (Araukan, Aucanian, Aucan) languages occupied a moderately large solid area in northern Chile and adjacent Argentina; their modern range is considerably reduced though the language is
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still vigorous, with speakers said to number upward of fifty thousand. Their relationship with Puelche, Het, and Tehuelche or Chon (q. v.), as well as with other "families" to the north of these, is likely but unproved. Considerable confusion is caused by the fact that names of certain groups in almost all of these families end in "che," and others ending in "het" are also thus divided. No one seems to have attempted to subdivide the family on a linguistic basis, or to have presented concise data on which this could be done. The linguistic divisions probably coincide with the political and geographical ones, but many groups, especially the extinct ones, are of doubtful relationship, even as to the Araucanian family. The classification here given is based primarily on Brand (1941 c), so far as that goes. Few of the other authorities agree with him or among themselves as regards the minor groupings. The living groups are said to be of the order of dialects, all mutually intelligible. The linguistic affinities of the Pewenche (Pehuenche-Puelche) and the Huilliche Serrano are questionable. (See Cooper, Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 128, 132, vol. 2, pp. 688-696; Canals Frau, Handbook, vol. 2, pp. 761-766.)

The Araucanian languages are said to be pleasant and harmonious.

Araucanian

I. North
   A. Picunche
   B. Mapuche
      1. Pewenche
         a. Rankel(che)
      2. Moluche

II. South
   A. Wiliche (Huilliche)
      1. Wiliche
         a. Serrano
         b. Pichi-Wiliche
      2. Manzanero
   B. Veliche (Chilotec)
   C. Chikiyami (Cuncho)
   D. Lewuiche

III. East
   A. Taluhet (Taluche)
   B. Divihet (Diviche)

Possibly member of separate Het family (q. v.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelung and Vater, 1806-17; Amberga, 1914; Ameghino, C., 1913; Anonymous, 1876; Augusta, 1903, 1916, 1922; Barbara, 1879; Brand, 1941 a, 1941 c; Canías Pinochet, 1902, 1911 a; Darapsky, 1888; Echeverría y Reyes, 1900; Englert, 1934; Falkner, 1899; Febres, 1765, 1864, 1882; Figueroa, 1903; Groeber, 1926; Gusinde, 1936; Gutiérrez, 1871; Huaquillaf, 1941; La Grasserie, 1808; Latcham, 1942; Lenz, 1895-97, 1904-05; Lillo, 1928; Loukotka, 1929-30, pp. 75-83; Milanesio, Domingo, 1918; Mitre, 1894, 1909, pp. 311-338; Moesbach, 1929-31, 1936,
Outes, 1914; Rodríguez, Z., 1875; Santa Cruz, 1923 b; Schuller, 1908; Sigifredo, 1942–45; Speck, 1924; Valdivia, 1887, 1897; Zeballos, 1922 b.

**CHONO**

The *Chonoan* "family" of the Chilean coast, recognized by Chamberlain (1913 a) and his followers, is no longer accepted. Only three words seem to be known, and its independence was presumed on grounds of early statements. Affiliations have been suggested with all the neighboring groups, Araucanian, Tehuelche, and Alacaluf. Rivet (1924 a) placed it with the last. It had best be left unclassified. It must be distinguished from the Chon (Tson) or Tehuelche, but doubtless these names are of common origin. (See Handbook, vol. 1, pp. 48–49).

**Bibliography.**—Chamberlain, 1911 a; Cooper, 1917 a, 1917 b; Ferrario, 1939.

**PUELCHEAN**

Synonyms: Pueltše, Puelče, Kunnu, Gennaken, Pampa.

The group has been recognized since early days but its constitution is greatly under discussion. Brinton (1891 a) grouped Puelche, Araucanian, and some other languages in his Aucanian stock; Chamberlain (1911 a, 1913 a) and all subsequent authorities have accepted a Puelche(an) family. They are often referred to as northern Tehuelche, or merely Tehuelche, but belong to a separate family from the true or southern Tehuelche; the latter is the older name for the southern family but leads to confusion with the Puelche, so the modern name Chon (q. v.) is preferable for the former.

All authorities recognize but one language in the family, Puelche, unless Chechehet is related; this is now often placed in a family of its own, Het (q. v.). Ten dialects are said to have been spoken, but today only two, eastern and western, are reported. Relationships have been suggested with Guaicurú, Araucanian, Het, Chon, and Charrua, none of which would be in the least surprising. The old source, Valdivia (1607), says that Puelche differs very slightly from Millcayac (Allentiac), but he may have been referring to another group of Puelche.

**Bibliography.**—Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Brinton, 1892 d; Chamberlain, 1911 b; Harrington, T., 1925; Milanesio, Domenico, 1898; Outes, 1928 a; Outes and Bruch, 1910; Valdivia, 1607 a.

**HET (CHECHEHET)**

Although only 15 words and some place names seem to be known, Lehmann-Nitsche argued that the language of the Chechehet (Tšetšehet, Čechet), formerly considered as a Puelchean (q. v.) language, is radically different from the latter and entitled to be considered an
independent family. He called the family "Het"; Rivet (1924 a) adopts the same name. Loukotka (1935) and Nimuendajú prefer their orthographic variants of Chechehet; the former accepts it as a family, the latter as "isolated." Together with the Chechehet go a group who lived with the Araucanian Diviuet (Divihet) and were known by that name only. The pertinent linguistic data are based on Falkner (1774), Hervás y Panduro (1800), and Dobrizhoffer (1784). The solution became extinct about the close of the 18th century.

The solution of the Het question is an historical, not a linguistic, one. (See also Handbook, vol. 1, p. 134.)

Bibliography.—Dobrizhoffer, 1784; Falkner, 1774; Hervás y Panduro, 1800; Lehmann-Nitsche, 1918 a, 1922, 1925 b, 1930 a.

CHONAN OR TEWELCHE (TEHUELCHE) AND ONA

The Chon or Tehuelche (Tšon, Tschon, Čon, Tsonekan, Tehuelchean) has been considered independent since earliest classifications, and no suggestions of larger relationships have been made except for those of Rivet (1925 a, 1925 b, 1925 c, 1926 a, 1926 b, 1927 b, 1927 c) whose revolutionary belief in a connection with Australian languages has been accorded ex-cathedra condemnation by all North American anthropologists, probably without sufficient scientific consideration.

The term Tehuelche was often used in a geographical rather than a linguistic sense, and the northernmost Tehuelche, the Küni, seem to have spoken a Puelche tongue. The three languages of Tehuelche proper were almost unintelligible, but now are less so (Cooper, Handbook, vol. 1, p. 130). The two divisions of the Ona could understand each other only with difficulty; the dialects differ slightly (Cooper, Handbook, vol. 1, p. 108). However, Tehuelche and Ona are rather closely related. The various classifications differ but slightly. The affiliations of the Paya are uncertain.

Ona was long considered as forming a separate family from Tehuelche. Though the names are probably connected in origin, the Chon must be differentiated from the Chono (q. v.) of the Chilean coast.

CHON

I. Chon (Tehuelche)
   A. Tehuelche
      1. Tá'úushn (Tewesh)
      2. Northern: Payniken (Pá'ánkún'k)
         a. Poya
      3. Southern: Inaken (Ao'núkún'k)
   B. Ona
      1. Haush (Manekenkn)
      2. Shelknam
         a. Northern
         b. Southern

1 Brinton (1891 a, p. 331) gives Huemul and Peschere (Ire) as other divisions of the Ona.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Ameghino, C., 1913; Beauvoir and Zeballos, 1915; Brinton, 1892 c, 1892 d; Chamberlain, 1911 a, 1911 b; Cooper, 1917 a, 1917 b; Ferrario, 1942; Furlong, C. W., 1917 b; Hunziker, 1910, 1928; La Grasserie, 1906; Lahille, 1928, 1929, 1934; Lehmann-Nitsche, 1912 a, 1912 b, 1913, 1923; Lista, 1896; Lothrop, 1928; Lowie, 1933; Müller, Frederick, 1882; Outes, 1913 a, 1926, 1928 a, 1928 b, 1928 c; Rivet, 1925 a, 1925 b, 1925 c, 1926 a, 1926 b, 1927 b, 1927 c; Schmid, 1860, 1912 a, 1912 b; Spegazzini, 1888; Tonelli, 1926; Zeballos, 1915.

YAHGANAN

The independence of the Yahgan (Yagan, Yámana, Yahganan) family or stock has never been doubted. Except from this point of view it is unimportant; it is practically extinct; probably not more than 20 Yahgan survive. The tongue is said to be markedly euphonic, soft, melodious, agreeable, with a rich vocabulary.

There is only one language, with five mutually intelligible dialects, of which the Central and Western are said to be most alike.

I. Yahgan
   A. Eastern
   B. Central-Western
      1. Central
      2. Western
   C. Southern
   D. Southwestern

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, 1885; Brand, 1941 c; Bridges, 1884–85, 1933; Brinton, 1892 c; Chamberlain, 1911 a; Cooper, 1917 a, 1917 b; Darapsky, 1880; Denuce, 1910; Garbe, 1883; Gusinde, 1928 b, 1934; Haberl, 1928; Hestermann, 1927 b, 1929; Knudsen Larrain, 1945; Koppers, 1926, 1927, 1928; Lothrop, 1928; Müller, Frederick, 1882; Outes, 1926–27 a, 1926–27 b; Platzmann, 1882; Spegazzini, 1888; Wolfe, 1924.

ALACALUFAN

The Alacaluf (Alikuluf, Alukulup, and similar orthographical variants), the southernmost language of South America, has been recognized since earliest times as constituting an independent family. No relationships with any other group have been suggested, except Rivet’s (see Chon) belief in their connection with Australian languages. The language is said to be harsh, with explosives and gutturals, though not so strong as in Ona. Three “dialects” are reported, but 10 or more groups, presumably each with its dialect, are named; how they group in subdivisions is unknown. The northernmost, Chono (q. v.), is of uncertain affiliation. Most of the languages or dialects are extinct. The same may almost be said of the group; estimates of their number vary from 250 to none.
The following groups or dialects are reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cucaue (Kaukahue, etc.)</td>
<td>Adwipiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoo or Peshera (Pésera)</td>
<td>Alikulip, Alakaluf, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecheyel (Leleteyel)</td>
<td>Calen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yekinave (Yequynthiaure, etc.)</td>
<td>Taijatof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chono (Tsono) (q. v.)</td>
<td>Caraiaka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chona may also belong.

Bibliography.—Borgatello, 1924, 1928 a, 1928 b; Brand, 1941 c; Brinton, 1892 c; Chamberlain, 1911 a; Cooper, 1917 a, 1917 b; Ferrario, 1939; Gusinde, 1927 b; Hestermann, 1927 c; Lehmann-Nitsche, 1918 b, Lothrop, 1928; 1921; Skottsberg, 1913, 1915; Specazzini, 1888.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

The following bibliography is an attempt to cite all the known sources for South American native languages, without qualification as to value. Very few of them were consulted in the preparation of the preceding monograph. Many of them were taken from Dr. Paul Rivet’s bibliographies published annually in the Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris; many others from Jijón y Caamaño’s El Ecuador Interandino y Occidental, vol. 3, 1943.

Abreu, 1895, 1914, 1938 a, 1938 b; Acosta Ortega, 1938; Acuña, 1641; Adam, 1878, 1879, 1885, 1800 a, 1890 b, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1896, 1897 a, 1897 b; 1897–98, 1899, 1902, 1905, 1906; Adam and Henry, 1880; Adam and Leclerc, 1877, 1880; Adelung and Vater, 1806–17; Agüero, 1929; Aguilard, 1939; Ahlbrinck and Vinken, 1923–24; Albis, 1855, 1860–61, 1934; Albuquerque, 1916; Alemany, 1906 a, 1906 b; Alemany y Bolufer, 1929 a, 1929 b; Almeida, H., 1846; Almeida, W., 1931; Altieri, 1939 a, 1939 b; Alvarado, 1919 a, 1919 b, 1921; Amanal, 1920; Ambeira, 1914; Ambrosetti, 1894, 1895 a, 1895 b; Ameghino, C., 1913; Amorim, 1928; Anchorena, 1874; Anonymous, 1852, 1876, 1879, 1882, 1897, 1902, 1905, 1908, 1909, 1914, 1917, 1918 a, 1918 b, 1918–19, 1919 a, 1919 b, 1919 c, 1919 d, 1919 e, 1921, 1924, 1925, 1926–27, 1927 b, 1928 a, 1928 b, 1928 c, 1929, 1930 a, 1930 b, 1930 c, 1930 d, 1931, 1932, 1933 a, 1933 b, 1933 c, 1933 d, 1934, 1936, 1937, 1939, 1941; Arcaya, 1918; Archivo Nacional. . . n. d.; Arcila Robledo, 1940; Armellada, 1936; Armellada and Matallana, 1942; Armintia, 1888, 1898, 1902, 1903, 1904; Astete, 1936–37, 1937 a, 1937 b; Augusta, 1903, 1916, 1922; Ayllon, 1926; Ayrosa, 1933, 1934 a, 1934 b, 1934 c, 1934 d, 1934 e, 1934 f, 1934 g, 1935 a, 1935 b, 1935 c, 1935 d, 1935 e, 1935 f, 1935 g, 1935 h, 1935 i, 1935 j, 1935 k, 1936 a, 1936 b, 1936 c, 1936 d, 1936 e, 1936 f, 1936 g, 1937 a, 1937 b, 1937 c, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1943; Azá, 1923, 1924 a, 1924 b, 1924 c, 1927, 1928, 1930 a, 1930 b, 1930 c, 1930–32, 1931, 1933 a, 1933 b, 1935, 1937; Azpilcueta, 1938.

Bacarceza, 1910; Bach, 1916; Bachiller y Morales, 1883; Balbi, 1826; Baldus, 1927, 1931, 1932, 1935, 1937; Bancroft, 1874–76; Baptista, 1931–32; Barbará, 1879; Barbosa da Faria, 1925; Barbosa Rodrigues, 1855, 1892–94; Bareatata de Valifloriana, 1918 a, 1918 b, 1920; Bárcena, 1590, 1893; Barranca, J. S., 1914, 1915–20, 1922; Barranca, S., 1868, 1876; Barrett, 1925; Barros Araña, 1893; Basadre, J., 1939; Basadre, M., 1884; Bastian, 1876, 1878–89; Beauvoir and Zeballos, 1915; Belaieff, 1931–34, 1937, 1940; Bell, C. N., 1862; Berekenhagen, 1894, 1905, 1906; Berendt, 1874 a, 1874 b; Berengueras, 1934; Bernal P., 1919; Bernard de Nantes, 1709; Berrios, 1919 a, 1919 b; Bertoni, A. de W., 1924; Bertoni, G. T., 1924, 1926, 1926–27, 1927, 1939; Bertoni, M. S., 1914, 1916, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1927 b, 1932; Bertonio, 1879 a (1603), 1879 b (1612); Beuchat and Rivet, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1909–10, 1910, 1911; Bibolotti, 1917; Bingham, 1922, 1930; Boas, 1911, 1922, 1933; Boggianí, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1900, 1929; Bolinder, 1917,
1924, 1925; Bollaert, 1860; Boman, 1908; Booy, 1929; Borba, 1882, 1904, 1908; Borgatello, 1924, 1928 a, 1928 b; Botelho de Magalhães, 1946; Bottignoli, n. d. (1938, 1940), 1926; Branco, 1935, 1937; Brand, 1941 a, 1941 c; Brandão de Amorim, 1928; Branner, 1887; Breton, 1665, 1666, 1669, 1877; Brett, 1868; Briceño-Iragorry, 1920; Bridges, 1884–1885, 1933; Britton, 1869 a, 1869 b, 1871, 1884, 1885 a, 1885 b, 1885 c, 1886 a, 1886 b, 1886 c, 1887, 1889, 1890, 1891 a, 1891 b, 1892 a, 1892 b, 1892 c, 1892 d, 1894 a, 1894 b, 1895 a, 1895 b, 1896, 1897, 1898 a, 1898 b, 1898 c; Brüning, E., 1904, 1913; Brüning, H. H., 1928; Buchwald, 1908 a, 1908 b, 1915, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1924.

Caballero, 1933; Cabanera, P., 1924, 1927, 1928–29, 1931; Caillet, 1930–33; Calandreli, 1896; Caldas, 1899, 1903; Camara Cascudo, 1934; Campana, 1902; Campanella, 1838–39; Canals Frau, 1941, 1942, 1943 a, 1943 b, 1944; Cañas Pinochet, 1902, 1911 a; Candelier, 1893; Capistrano de Abreu, 1938 a, 1938 b; Cardona Puig, 1945; Cardus, 1886, 1916; Carrasco, 1901; Carrera, 1939 (1644); Carrocera, 1935; Carvalho, 1929, 1931; Castellví, 1934 a, 1934 b, 1934 c, 1938, 1939, 1940; Castelnau, 1850–59; Castillo, 1906; Castillo y Orozco, 1871; Castro, A., 1935; Castro, E. de, 1937; Cáfada, 1920, 1921; Celedón, 1878, 1886, 1892 a, 1892 b; Céspedez Marin, 1923; Chaffanjon, 1889; Chagas-Lima, 1842; Chamberlain, [1903], 1907, 1910 a, 1910 b, 1911 a, 1911 b, 1912 a, 1912 b, 1912 c, 1913 a, 1913 b, 1913 c; Chandless, 1866, 1869; Chante y Herrera, 1901; Christensen, 1917; Christian, 1924, 1932; Chuquiwanqa, 1928; Church, 1898; Cieza de León, 1851 (1918); Cimitile, n. d.; Cipriani, C. A., 1902; Clarke, 1937; Colbacchini, n. d., 1925; Colbaccini and Alibusetti, 1942; Coleti, 1771; Collins, F., 1879; Colman, 1917, 1921, 1929 a, 1929 b, 1932, 1936; Cominges, 1892; Constancio, 1939; Conzemius, 1923, 1927–28, 1929 a, 1932 b, 1930 b, 1932; Cook, O. F., 1916; Cooper, 1917 a, 1917 b; Coqueiro, 1935 a, 1935 b; Cordeiro, 1875; Cordero Palacios, 1924; Coryn, 1922; Cosio, 1916, 1919, 1923, 1924; Cotheal, 1848; Coudreau, H., 1886–87, 1892, 1897 a, 1897 b, 1897 c; Coudreau, O., 1901, 1903 a, 1903 b; Couto de Magalhães, J. V., 1876; Couto de Magalhães, J., 1902; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1912, 1913 a, 1913 b, 1913 c, 1913 d, 1913 e, 1913 f, 1914, 1914–19, 1916–17, 1917–20, 1921, 1921–23, 1925–27; Crévaux, Sagot, and Adam, 1882; Cueva, 1893; Cullen, 1851 a, 1851 b (1853), 1866, 1865, 1875; Cúneo-Vidal, 1913, 1914, 1915 a, 1915 b, 1915 c, 1916, 1918 a, 1918 b, 1920 a, 1920 b, 1922, 1930 a, 1930 b.

Dangel, 1930, 1931 a, 1931 b; Darapsky, 1888, 1889; Deletang, 1926–31; Delgado, A, and Vacas Galindo, 1929; Delgado, E., 1896–97; Denison, 1913; Denuee, 1910; Díaz Romero, 1918; Díaz, L, et Díaz, hijo, 1939; Dijour, 1931–32; Dobrizhoffer, 1784 (1822); Domínguez, M., 1912; Domville-Fife, 1924; Donay, 1890; Dornas Filho, 1938; Dorsey, 1898; Drumond, 1944, 1946; Ducci, 1904, 1905, 1911–12; Durand, 1915–18, 1921; Duroni, 1924 (1928), 1928; Dyott, 1926.

Echeverría y Reyes, 1890, 1900, 1912; Eckart, 1890; Ehrenreich, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1891, 1894–95, 1896, 1897 b, 1905; Englert, 1934; Eraso Guerrero, 1944; Ernst, 1885, 1885 a, 1887 b, 1891, 1895; Eschwege, 1818, 1830; Espinoza, L., 1935; Espinoza, A., 1938; Etienne, 1909, 1910; Ewerton Quadros, 1892.

F. M., 1907; Fabo, 1911; Falkner, 1774, 1899; Farabee, 1918 b, 1922, 1924; Farfán, 1939, 1941–42, 1942, 1943, 1944; Febres, 1765, 1864, 1882; Febres Cordero, 1921, 1924; Feijoo Reyna, 1924; Fejos, 1943; Fellechner, Müller, and Hesse, 1845; Fernandes, J. A., 1892; Fernández, L., 1884; Fernández Guardia and Ferre, 1892; Fernández de San José and Bartolomé, 1895; Fernández y González, 1893; Ferraz, 1927, 1928, 1934, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1942; Ferreira-França, 1859; Ferreira-Penna, 1881; Fiebrig-Gertz, 1927, 1932; Figueira, 1878; Figueredo, 1701; Figueroa, 1903; Flornoy, 1938; Fonseca, A., 1914 (1920); Fonseca, J. S. da, 1880–81; Forero, 1934, 1939; Franco, 1882; Franco Inojoa, 1937; Freitas, 1910; Frío,
ms.; Friè and Radin, 1906; Friederici, 1926, 1930; Fritz, 1922; Froes de Abreu, 1929, 1931; Fuhrmann, 1922; Furlong, C. W., 1917 b.
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