

**Simon E. Overall**

(James Cook University, Austrália)

## **Who were the Antipas? A linguistic and ethnohistorical investigation of a forgotten tribe\***

**ABSTRACT:** The ethnonym *Antipa* was commonly mentioned as one of the major lowland Jivaroan (also known as Chicham) tribes of north Peru in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, before disappearing both from the historical record and from the oral history of the modern Jivaroan groups. This work presents insights gained by approaching the sparse historical data from a linguistic perspective. Taking into account documented linguistic evidence, the possible etymology of the ethnonym, and evidence from oral tradition, it suggests tentative hypotheses regarding the origin and disappearance of the *Antipa* ethnonym.

**KEYWORDS:** Jivaroan languages; Historical linguistics; Chicham languages; Antipa; Ethnolinguistics.

**RESUMEN:** A finales de los siglos 19 y comienzos del 20, el etnónimo Antipa es mencionado, comúnmente, como uno de los principales pueblos de las tierras bajas Jíbaro (también conocido como Chicham) del norte del Perú, antes de desaparecer de los registros históricos y de la historia oral de los modernos pueblos jíbaros. Este trabajo presenta los conocimientos adquiridos mediante la consulta de los escasos datos históricos desde una perspectiva lingüística. Sobre la base de pruebas lingüísticas documentadas, la posible etimología del etnónimo y la evidencia de la tradición oral, se sugiere hipótesis tentativas sobre el posible origen y desaparición del etnónimo Antipa.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Lenguas jíbaro; Lingüística histórica; Lenguas chicham; Antipa; Ethnolingüística.

### **1. Introduction**

Any research into the history of Amazonian languages must begin by confronting a bewildering array of ethnonyms, the result of centuries of social upheaval, including extinction and mergers of ethnic groups and variable or inaccurate recording of names. Some ethnonyms appear just once or twice in the historical record, while others have been applied

---

\* I gratefully acknowledge the many enlightening discussions I have had with Aguaruna and Huambisa people regarding their culture and history, in particular Pablo Santiak, Walter Cuñachí, Leandro Calvo, and Eduardo Cungumas. Willem Adelaar, Sasha Aikhenvald, and Martin Kohlberger, as well as two anonymous referees, provided valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper, for which I thank them. Gerd Jendraschek helped me to translate the quotes from von Murr (1785). Any remaining errors or misinterpretations are entirely mine. The research was funded by La Trobe University and James Cook University.

widely and inconsistently, often to unrelated groups (Campbell 2012: 60-62). By combining historical research with linguistic analysis we can put together a more complete picture of the social history of the area – this type of study has been undertaken by Gnerre (1975) and Fleck (2007), yielding results that allowed them to advance our knowledge of the history of Jivaroan and Panoan peoples, respectively. The present paper discusses the ethnonym *Antipa*, which was mentioned as one of the major lowland Jivaroan tribes in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, only to disappear again from the historical record and from folk history of the region. Applying insights from linguistics to the sparse historical data, I find that the Antipas' language shared the phonological innovation that sets Aguaruna apart from the rest of the Jivaroan family, namely the change of inherited \*/r/ to /h/. I discuss the etymology of the ethnonym and also offer some discussion of the possible reasons for its disappearance. I hope to contribute a small but significant piece to the puzzle that is the history of the Jivaroan people, and illustrate the utility of historical sources to linguistic research (and vice versa). In §2 I give a brief overview of Jivaroan history and ethnonymy. In sections 3 and 4 I assess the data available relating to the appearance and disappearance of the Antipas, and in §5 offer some concluding remarks.

## 2. A brief history of Jivaroan ethnonymy

The Jivaroan people today self-identify as five groups speaking distinct but largely mutually intelligible languages (or perhaps dialects of a single language): in Peru, the **Aguaruna** (or Awajún) on the Marañón and its tributaries including the Cenepa, Chiriaco, Nieva, and lower Santiago Rivers, and the **Huambisa** (or Wampís) on the middle Santiago and Morona Rivers; in Ecuador, the **Shuar** on the Zamora, Upano, upper Santiago, and upper Morona Rivers; and straddling the border between the two countries are the **Achuar** on the upper Pastaza River and the **Shiwiar** on the Conambo, Corrientes, Bobonaza, and Tigre Rivers (see map, p. 69).<sup>1</sup> Gnerre (1975) demonstrates that some languages formerly spoken in the highlands of modern Ecuador and Peru were most likely also Jivaroan, in particular **Palta** and **Malacato** (and see Taylor 1988; Adelaar 2004 for further discussion). Aside from the Antipas, who are the topic of this paper, two other ethnic groups were historically associated with Jivaroans: the **Bracamoros**, who formerly lived in the area of the Zamora and Chinchipe Rivers (Taylor 1988); and the **Wámpukus**, known only from Aguaruna and Huambisa oral history. Although Taylor (1988: 191) suggests that the Antipa were in fact a group of Bracamoros (possibly speaking the Palta language) who migrated eastward and (partially) merged with the Aguarunas, adopting their language, she gives no evidence to support this idea. The Wámpukus, according to Aguaruna accounts, were an ethnic group who spoke a Jivaroan language and were exterminated and/or absorbed by Aguaruna settlers in the Marañón river basin.

---

<sup>1</sup> The major rivers are important resources and form natural axes of transport throughout the region. In using the rivers as convenient geographical reference points I do not mean to imply that the Jivaroan peoples are exclusively riverine, as there is a long history of Jivaroan settlement in the extensive watershed areas between the major rivers.

The ethnonym *Xibaro* (modern Sp. *jívaro* or *jíbaro*) was first recorded in the 16th century (Gnerre 1973), and is a hispanification of the Jivaroan autodenomination \**shiwari(a)* ‘person’, the source of the modern ethnonyms *Shuar*, *Shiwari*, and *Achuar* (< *achu* ‘swamp-palm’ + \**shiwari(a)* ‘person’). The earliest accounts of lowland Jivaroans place them on the Santiago River, as with the historian Rodríguez’ (1684) account of a 1655 expedition:<sup>2</sup>

[Padre Raymundo] Difpusó fus embarcaciones, y navegando el Marañon arriba, llegó à las juntas de el Rio de Santiago, y navegando por èl contra la corriente, dentro de pocos dias diò vista à la Provincia de los Xibaros...

[Padre Raymundo set forth his vessels, and travelling up the Marañon River he arrived at the mouth of the Santiago River, and travelling up that river, after a few days the province of the Xibaros came into view]. (Rodríguez 1684: 206)

The missionary Samuel Fritz published a map in 1707 on which he located “Xivaros” in the headwaters of the Santiago. The German missionary von Murr (1785) also places the Jivaroans on the Santiago River:

Die Wohnsitze der Xibaros erstrecken sich durch meistens unwegsame Berge und Thäler, mit denen beyderseits der obere Santyagofluß weit und breit umrungen ist, und mit welchen sie die Natur selbst wider alle feindliche Anfälle bestens verschanzet hat.

[The residences of the Xibaros stretch through mostly impenetrable mountains and valleys, with which both banks of the upper Santiago River are surrounded far and wide, and by means of which Nature itself has protected them very well against all enemy attacks]. (von Murr 1785: 112)

...wenn aber die Fahrt in dem Santyagofluß durch die Xibaros nicht gehemmt wäre, so könnte man leicht aus den Städten Loja und Cuenca in acht Tagen zu den Maragnon herunter kommen.

[... but if travel on the Santiago River were not inhibited by the Xibaros, one could easily travel from the towns of Loja and Cuenca to the Marañon River in eight days]. (von Murr 1785: 117)

Later, groups of Jivaroans dispersed into the surrounding lowland areas, and the modern ethnonyms begin to appear in the historical record. In 1750 Pedro Maldonado’s *Carta de la Provincia de Quito, y de sus adyacentes* [Map of the Quito Province, and its surroundings] was published, and here “Xibaros” appear on the middle and upper Santiago and “Ahuarunes” (i.e. Aguarunas) on the left bank of the Marañon, just upstream from the mouth of the Santiago. This is the first mention of the ethnonym Aguaruna in the historical record (Guallart 1990: 13). The first mention of the Antipas that I am aware of is in Raimondy (1863: 35; Bollaert’s translation – the original Spanish version was published in 1862):

---

<sup>2</sup> Stirling (1938: 20) says that this expedition was in 1656, citing Chantre y Herrera (1901: 176), and he also gives a slightly different description of the expedition: “The expedition followed the left bank of the Marañon to the junction of that river with the Pastaza and here on July 25, 1656, they founded the city of Santiago de Santander...” (Stirling 1938: 20). In fact Chantre y Herrera does not mention these details, being a more or less exact copy of Rodríguez – it is not clear what the source of Stirling’s details is.

In that portion of the Marañon between the Pongo de Manseriche and the mouth of the Pastaza, the wild Jévaros<sup>3</sup> are found, divided into Muratos,<sup>4</sup> Huambisas, Aguarumas [sic], and Antipas; they generally go naked, are of good figure and active, very warlike, and use the lance with dexterity. This portion of the Jévaros are continually at war with each other, but mostly the Aguarumas with the Antipas, who live above the Pongo de Manseriche.

The Aguarumas dwell between the mouth of the Nieva and the Pongo de Manseriche.

Hamy (1873) mentions the same four tribes (Muratos, Huambisas, Aguarunas, and Antipas) as being the only Jivaroan groups living south of the Marañon:

En comparant ces divers documents, on trouve que la famille jivaro, localisée spécialement au nord du Marañon, entre les rivières Pastassa et Chinchipe, comprend néanmoins quatre tribus au sud du fleuve, sur le territoire péruvien: les Muratos, les Uambisas [=Huambisas], les Aguarunas et les Antipas. (p.387)

[Comparing these different documents, one finds that the Jivaro family, mainly located north of the Marañon, between the Pastaza and Chinchipe rivers, has even so four tribes south of the river, in Peruvian territory: Muratos, Huambisas, Aguarunas and Antipas].

In fact Hamy is at odds with other reports in placing all these groups south of the Marañon. Colini (1883) cites communication from Lucioli that conflicts with Hamy's information, and gives a picture of settlement that accords much better both with other historical reports and with modern locations.

Quanto agli Antipa, agli Aguaruna, agli Uambisa e ai Murati l'informazioni somministratemi dal cav. Lucioli non sono perfettamente conformi alle notizie raccolte dall'Hamy. Il Lucioli riferisce, che gli Antipa abitano sopra ambedue le rive dell'Amazzoni dalla foce del fiume Nieva al Santiago, gli Uambisa vivono sul Santiago, sul Morona e sopra ambedue le rive del Maragnone vicino e lungo il Pongo de Manseriche. Gli Aguaruna, secondo il Lucioli, s'incontrerebbero ad est del Pongo de Manseriche fino al rio Potro o Cahuapanas. (p.339)

[As for the Antipas, Aguarunas, Huambisas, and Muratos, the information given to me by Mr. Lucioli is not completely in agreement with the data collected by Hamy. Lucioli states that the Antipas live on both banks of the Amazon [=Marañon] from the mouth of the Nieva to the Santiago, the Huambisas live on the Santiago, on the Morona, and on both banks of the Marañon near and along the Pongo de Manseriche. The Aguarunas, according to Lucioli, are found east of the Pongo de Manseriche as far as the river Potro or Cahuapanas].

Von Hassel (1905) gives the following brief descriptions of Aguarunas, Antipas, and Huambisas; his characterisation of the linguistic identity of Antipa and Aguaruna is noteworthy, and I return to it in §3.1 below.

Aguarunas: Tribu de unas 2.000 á 2.500 almas que habita la banda derecha del Marañon hasta el Imasa, abajo del río Cahuapanas. (p.34)

---

<sup>3</sup> In his translation of Raimondy 1863, Bollaert confounded the ethnonyms *Jivaro* and *Jebero*, the latter being a linguistically unrelated group. A few other authors followed this error – see Beuchat & Rivet (1909: 807) for discussion.

<sup>4</sup> “Muratos” are the modern Candoshi (Kandozi) and Shapra (Chapra) peoples. They share a great deal of traditional culture with Jivaroans (Surrallés 2007; Wallis 1965), but they are linguistically unrelated. Interestingly, Fritz' map places “Muratos” on the Huallaga River just south of its mouth, and a few other reports also place the Murato people south of the Marañon (e.g. Hamy 1873), while their present location is in the area between the Pastaza and Morona Rivers and Lake Rimachi (Wise 1999).

Antipas: Tribu que vive á la izquierda del Marañon, entre el Tumbero y el río Santiago. Su número no excede de dos mil almas. Su idioma, costumbres, armas y leyendas, son las mismas que las de los Aguarunas. (p.34)

Huambisas: Tribu de unas 800 á mil almas, vive en las márgenes de los ríos Santiago y Morona y es hostil á los blancos. Su idioma es dialecto del Aguaruna. Sus armas, costumbres, &, son como las de los Aguarunas. (p.40)

[Aguarunas: Tribe of some 2,000 to 2,500 souls who inhabit the right bank of the Marañon as far as the Imasa, below the Cahuapanas.

Antipas: Tribe that lives on the left bank of the Marañon, between the Tumbero and the Santiago rivers. Their number is no more than two thousand souls. Their language, customs, weapons, and legends are the same as those of the Aguarunas.

Huambisas: Tribe of some 800 to 1,000 souls, living on the banks of the Santiago and Morona rivers, and hostile to whites. Their language is a dialect of Aguaruna. Their weapons, customs etc. are like those of the Aguarunas].

Rivet (1907) places Aguarunas on the right bank of the Marañon to the East of the Nieva, and Antipas in the Cordillera del Cóndor, to the northwest. Stirling (1938) places the Antipas on the left bank of the Santiago, from the Zamora in the north to the Marañon in the south.

In sum, by the late 19th century Antipa, Aguaruna, and Huambisa (along with the non-Jivaroan Murato) are the most important groups in the region. Although the geographical locations given by various authors are somewhat contradictory, all sources agree that both Antipas and Aguarunas lived in the region of the Marañon and Santiago rivers, with Antipas to the west of Aguarunas. They are consistently characterized as being among the southernmost Jivaroan groups; compare Ecuadorian historian Villavicencio's (1858: 169) list of ethnonyms from the northern part of the territory, which includes neither Antipa nor Aguaruna (these appear to be *ad hoc* names based on local watercourses, and only "Achuales", i.e. Achuar, has persisted until modern times):

Esta basta nacion [i.e. Jivaros] habita entre los rios Chinchipe i Pastassa; se compone esta familia de numerosas i grandes tribus, las cuales toman los nombres de los rios á cuyas orillas habitan, como Moronas, Pantes, Zamoras, Gualaquisas, Upanos, Pindos, Pastassas, Agapicos, Achuales, Copatasas i otros.

[This vast nation lives between the Chinchipe and Pastassa Rivers; the family is composed of numerous large tribes which take their names from the rivers on whose banks they dwell, such as Moronas, Pantes, Zamoras, Gualaquisas, Upanos, Pindos, Pastassas, Agapicos, Achuales, Copatasas, and others].

Up de Graff (1923) reports on personal meetings with Antipa and Aguaruna people in 1899, and this is the last report of Antipas based on personal contact that I am aware of. There is a time span of 37 years between the first and last report (from 1862 to 1899), long enough to show that this was not an *ad hoc* ethnonym. So how is it that this ethnonym has been lost while the others continued into modern times? And what happened to the people known as Antipas? In the following sections I will consider the available linguistic data, previous hypotheses about the Antipas, and modern Aguaruna and Huambisa oral traditions.

### 3. Linguistic evidence

The Antipas dropped out of the historical record some time in the early 20th century, leaving no linguistic data (Loukotka 1968). However, Up de Graff spent some time living among Antipas in the late 19th century, and some information can be gleaned from his memoir, published in 1923. The anthroponyms listed in Table 1 are all explicitly stated to be names of Antipa men.

Table 1. Antipa names in Up de Graff (1923)

QUOTED FORM	MODERN FORM
<i>Pitacunca</i>	? (the phonological form of this name suggests a Quechua origin)
<i>Ungucha</i>	Shu. <i>uṅkuchi</i> ‘man’s name’, also the name of an edible plant; Agr. <i>uṅkucha</i> ‘edible plant’
<i>Najáncos</i>	< Sp. <i>naranjos</i> ‘orange grove’; cf. Shu. <i>naraṅka</i> ‘man’s name’ < Sp. <i>naranja</i> ‘orange’
<i>Itsampi</i>	Shu. <i>itsampi</i> ‘man’s name’
<i>Anguacha</i>	Agr. <i>aṅkuash(a)</i> ‘man’s name’ (< <i>aṅku</i> ‘evening’?)
<i>Chijatso</i>	(cf. Agr. <i>chihap</i> ‘man’s name’?)
<i>Noagra</i>	(cf. Agr. <i>nuwátham</i> ‘recently married man’? – see note 6 below)
<i>Quiájui</i> ‘darkness’	Agr. <i>kiyahui</i> ‘it has become dark’ (ex. 1)

Note in particular the forms *Najáncos* and *Quiájui*, which show clear examples of a change of \*/r/ to /h/ (orthographic <j>). This merger is the most salient feature distinguishing Aguaruna from the other Jivaroan languages (see Overall 2008 for details). The name *Najáncos* is a straightforward case of a loan from Spanish *Naranjos*, a toponym meaning ‘orange grove’. As is usual for loans into Aguaruna, the flapped /r/ of Spanish has been replaced with /h/. The name *Quiájui* is said by Up de Graff to mean ‘darkness’, and must have the morphological structure shown in example (1).

- (1) *kiyáhui*  
 kīya-ha-u=i  
 become.dark-PERFECTIVE-NOMINALIZER=COPULA:3:DECLARATIVE  
 ‘it has become dark’

The Aguaruna perfective suffix *-ha* has cognates *-ra* in the other Jivaroan languages, and is the reflex of an inherited form *\*-ra*. Again, this name shows evidence of the same change of \*/r/ to /h/.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> What of the form *Noagra*, which does contain an <r>? While there is no clear connection to a modern cognate, Uwarai, Paz, & Regan (1998) give the word *nuwátham* ‘recien casado, o unido con una mujer’ [recently married, or in a relationship with a woman] (< *nuwa* ‘woman’), and this seems like a likely candidate for a male name. In modern Aguaruna the sequence /th/ often surfaces as a flap [ɾ] between vowels, so we would expect the pronunciation [nuwár(h)am] in casual speech. The [ɾ] is the same sound represented in Spanish by a single <r> word internally, thereby giving a plausible explanation for the presence of orthographic <r>; of course this is highly speculative, but it does show that an orthographic <r> is not completely inconsistent with Aguaruna phonology.

Finally, it is worth noting that *Ungucha* has the same final vowel /a/ as the Aguaruna form, where Shuar has final /i/; a further peculiarity shared by Antipa and Aguaruna. From this evidence we can conclude that the Antipas spoke Aguaruna or a very closely related variety, and this accords with von Hassel's (1905) assessment (quoted above) that Antipas spoke the same language as the Aguarunas, while Huambisa is a "dialect".

### 3.1. The ethnonym Antipa

The etymology of the name *Antipa* is obscure. An obvious first place to look for etymological source is *Anti*, a Quechua word applied to the eastern parts of the Inca empire, including the eastern foothills of the central Andes, and to the Campa peoples who lived there. The final *pa* is not easily explained, however. An anonymous reviewer suggests a source in the Quechua genitive suffix *-pa*, but there is no evidence that this suffix was used to form ethnonyms – instead, one would expect to see the word *runa* 'people', as in González Holguín's (1608) dictionary: "*Anteruna*, o *anti*. El indio hombre de los andes" [*Anteruna*, or *anti*. The indian man of the Andes].

Siverts (1975: 667) suggests that "the Antipa may well have been an Aguaruna group distinguished from other Jivaro on account of a powerful leader by the name of Antipa." Siverts does not elaborate this idea, and as far as I am aware Antipa is not a Jivaroan anthroponym. There is, however, a traditional male name *Nantip(a)* still in use today,<sup>6</sup> and this name was used as an ethnonym by Prieto (1885: 66):

Dos meses ántes que yo entrase á esta conquista se dieron una horrorosa batalla entre los jívaros *Nantipas*, que están en uno de los rios colaterales de Zamora, y otros que habitan en las inmediaciones del pongo de *Manseriche*; igualmente otra entre éstos y los *Pafocamas*, que están á las cabeceras del rio Marañon, cerca de Jaen. En la actualidad los Jívaros de *Mayalico* y *Suinde* se están previniendo para hacer una cruel guerra á los Jívaros del gran *Achual* cerca de Canelos.

[Two months before I entered this area there was a horrific battle between the *Nantipa* Jívaros, who are on one of the tributaries of the Zamora, and others who live in the region of the Pongo de Manseriche; and the same between these and the *Pafocamas*, who are in the headwaters of the river Marañon, close to Jaen. At present the Jívaros of *Mayalico* and *Suinde* are preparing to wage a cruel war against the Jívaros of the great *Achual*, near Canelos].

The idea that the ethnonym *Antipa* comes from a personal name thus has some merit, but it must have outlived the eponymous leader, as it appears in the historical record for nearly 40 years.

<sup>6</sup> The source of the name *Nantip* itself is unknown. Jimpikit and Antun' (2000:53) suggest that it comes from the word *nant* 'un salto' [a leap], but this appears to be simply folk-etymology.

#### 4. Oral tradition

Most observers describe the Antipas as being in constant warfare with the Aguarunas. My own field data include a good deal of Aguaruna (and some Huambisa) oral history and semi-mythical accounts of warfare, but nobody that I spoke to has ever heard of Antipas – the name simply does not feature in Aguaruna or Huambisa oral history (Siverts 1975 makes the same observation). Stories of warfare amongst the Aguarunas only ever refer to Huambisa adversaries, if any reference to actual groups is given at all (but note that Cuestas 1961 describes an extensive oral tradition describing war with the Wámpukus).

Aguaruna and Huambisa oral traditions describe four named “types” within the population. The names of these groups in Aguaruna are given in (2); they are all compounds with the noun *shiwaj* ‘person’.

(2) <i>anta</i>	<i>shiwaj</i>
?	person
<i>pinchu</i>	<i>shiwaj</i>
hawk.sp	person
<i>chapi</i>	<i>shiwaj</i>
palm.sp	person
<i>wampukus</i>	<i>shiwaj</i>
(ethnonym)	person

These types are described in terms of physical attributes (e.g. “*anta shiwaj* tended to be tall”), and/or as inhabiting particular regions (e.g. “*pinchu shiwaj* mainly lived in the community of Úut”), but speakers do not always agree on the properties assigned to the different types. Their existence is presented as a historical phenomenon, as intermarriage has mixed the types in the modern population, but the mixing is relatively recent: although people do not self-identify this way, they will often claim a grandparent or other ancestor as being of one or another type.

While *pinchu* and *chapi* are readily understandable Aguaruna words (perhaps originally referring metaphorically to associated physical attributes?), there is no word *anta* in the modern language other than in the compound *anta shiwaj*. Oral history tells us that the Wámpukus were a distinct group who were exterminated and/or absorbed by Aguarunas and Huambisas. The other groups may well be the remnants of similarly absorbed groups, and it is tempting to associate *anta* with *Antipa*, although there is at present no evidence aside from phonological similarity to support this association.

#### 5. Conclusion

We can now draw together the threads of the preceding discussion. The Antipa appeared in the historical record by 1862, and the last firsthand description of them was Up de Graff’s expedition in 1899. We know from the evidence in Up de Graff (1923) that

the Antipas must have spoken Aguaruna or a variety very similar to it, as had already been observed by von Hassel (1905). We do not know for sure where the Antipas came from or what happened to them, but given the linguistic identity it seems most likely that they were a group of Aguarunas who split off under the leadership of a man named Nantipa/Antipa, as suggested by Siverts (1975). The fact that the ethnonym *Aguaruna* antedates *Antipa* by 100 years is also consistent with the latter group having emerged from the former. Later they appear to have been (re)absorbed into the Aguaruna ethnicity, and possibly formed the basis of the type known as *anta shiway*. This hypothesis is supported by the absence of any reference to Antipas in Aguaruna oral history, which suggests that they ceased to be considered a separate ethnic group at some point. There is no evidence to connect the Antipas with any other group known to have existed in the area, and any such identification remains purely speculative.

## References

- Adelaar, Willem F. H. (with P. Muysken) (2004). *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beuchat, Henri; Rivet, Paul (1909). La langue Jíbaro ou Šiwora. *Anthropos* 4: 805–22.
- Campbell, Lyle (2012). Classification of the indigenous languages of South America. In Lyle Campbell; Verónica Grondona (eds.). *The indigenous languages of South America*, pp. 59–166. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chantre y Herrera, José (1901). *Historia de las misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañón español por el P. José Chantre y Herrera*. Madrid: Imprenta de A. Avrial.
- Colini, Giuseppe Angelo (1883). Osservazioni etnografiche sui Givari. In *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei* (3rd series) 11: 337–80.
- Cuestas, José (1961). Los Huámbucos, una tribu indígena del río Chinchipe desaparecida. *Perú Indígena: Órgano del Instituto Indigenista Peruano* 9(20/21): 67–72.
- Fleck, David W. (2007). Did the Kulinas become the Marubos? A linguistic and ethnohistorical investigation. *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 5(2), article 2, pp. 137–207. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/tipiti/vol5/iss2/2>
- Gnerre, Maurizio (1973). Sources of Spanish Jívaro. *Romance Philology* 27(2): 203–4.
- Gnerre, Maurizio (1975). L'utilizzazione delle fonti documentarie dei secoli XVI e XVII per la storia linguistica jíbaro. In E. Cerulli; G. Della Ragione (eds.). *Atti del XL Congresso Internazionale degli americanisti*, vol. 3, pp. 79–86. Genoa: Tilgher.
- González Holguín, Diego (1608 [2007]). *Vocabulario de la lengua general de todo el Perú llamada lengua Qquichua, o del Inca*. Digital edition published by Runasimipi Qespiqa Software.
- Guallart, José María (1990). *Entre pongo y cordillera: Historia de la etnia aguaruna – huambisa*. Lima: Centro Amazónico de Antropología y Aplicación Práctica.
- Hamy, Théodore Ernest (1873). Nouveaux renseignements sur les indiens Jivaros. *Revue d'Anthropologie* 2: 385–397.

- von Hassel, Jorge M. (1905). Las tribus salvajes de la región Amazónica del Perú. *Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Lima* 17: 27–73.
- Jimpikit, Carmelina; Antun', Gladys (2000). *Los nombres Shuar: Significado y conservación*. 2nd edition. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Loukotka, Čestmir. 1968. *Classification of South American Indian Languages*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- von Murr, Cristoph Gottlieb (1785). *Reisen einiger Missionarien der Gesellschaft Jesu in Amerika*. Nurnberg: Johann Eberhard Zeh.
- Overall, Simon E. (2008). On the non-phonemic status of the velar nasal [ŋ] in Jivaroan. *LIAMES* 8: 45–59.
- Prieto, A. J. 1885. Descripción de la provincia de los jívaros, su religión, costumbres y producciones. In Francisco María Compte (ed.) *Varones ilustres de la Orden Serafica en el Ecuador; desde la fundación de Quito hasta nuestros días* (2nd ed., vol. 2), pp. 63–68. Quito: Imprenta del Clero.
- Raimondy, Antonio (trans. W. Bollaert) (1863). On the Indian tribes of the Great District of Loreto, in Northern Peru. *Anthropological Review* 1(1): 33–43.
- Rivet, Paul (1907). Les indiens Jíbaro. Étude géographique, historique et ethnographique. *L'Anthropologie* 18: 333–368; 583–618.
- Rodríguez, Manuel (1684). *El Marañón y Amazonas: Historia de los descubrimientos, entradas, y reducción de naciones*. Madrid: Imprenta de Antonio González de Reyes.
- Siverts, Henning (1975). Jivaro head hunters in a headless time. In Martin A. Nettlehip R. Dalegivens Anderson Nettlehip (eds.). *War, its causes and correlates*, pp. 663–674. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Stirling, Matthew Williams (1938). *Historical and ethnographical material on the Jivaro Indians* (Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 117). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Surrallés, Alexandre (2007). Los Candoshi. In Fernando Santos; Frederica Barclay (eds.). *Guía etnográfica de la Alta Amazonía*, vol. 6: 243–380. Lima: Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute/Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos.
- Taylor, Anne-Christine (1988). *Al Este de los Andes: Tomo II*. Lima/Quito: IFEA/Abya-Yala.
- Up de Graff, Fritz W. (1923). *Head hunters of the Amazon: Seven years of exploration and adventure*. New York: Garden City Publishing.
- Uwarai Yagkug, Abel; Paz Suikai, Isaac; Regan, Jaime (1998). *Diccionario Aguaruna – Castellano: Awajún Chicham Apáchnaujai*. Lima: Centro Amazónico de Antropología y Aplicación Práctica.
- Villavicencio, Manuel (1858). *Geografía de la República del Ecuador*. New York: Robert Craighead.
- Wallis, Ethel Emily (1965). *Tariri: My story from jungle killer to Christian missionary* New York: Harper & Row.
- Wise, Mary Ruth (1999). Small language families and isolates in Peru. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *The Amazonian Languages*, pp. 307–340. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

